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ABSTRACT

It was the purpose of the study to determine whether there were significant differences among district superintendent's rule administration behavior, leadership behavior and staff militancy as perceived by principals in their districts, using scores on three behaviorally based instruments as well as a number of demographic characteristics. The investigator set the stage for the study by discussing the nature of organizations and providing a historical view of the development of management and leadership theory with a special focus on leadership behavior in school systems. Four hypotheses were presented: 1) that there is no significant difference in each of the three rule administration behavior subscales among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents as perceived by principals in their districts, 2) that there is no significant difference in leadership behavior among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents as perceived by the principals in their districts, 3) that no significant difference exists in level of militancy among principals in the seven Hawaii State Department of Education districts, and 4) that there are no significant differences in perceptions of district superintendent's rule administration behavior and leadership behavior by age, length of service as a principal and sex
among principals. Also additional analysis was conducted whether there was significant variance in perception of leadership of the seven district superintendents which were related to their rule administration behavior. Personal and demographic variables of the principals were also included.

The null hypotheses for the first, second, and third hypotheses were rejected. The null hypothesis stated for the fourth hypotheses could not be rejected. Thus it was concluded that: 1) among the seven district superintendents there were perceived differences in their rule administration behaviors, 2) if the principals within a district rated a superintendent as high (or low) on representative or punishment-centered administrative style it was not a function of demographic or personal differences among them, 3) that higher scores on the leadership instrument were linked positively to perception of a representative rule administration style, as well as, to a positive but much weaker relationship to punishment-centered rule style, 4) that principals responses on the militancy instrument were independent of their perception of the leadership of the district superintendent, and 5) that only two variables (representative and punishment-centered rule administration) contributed to an explanation of the variation in the perception of leadership by the principals.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Chapter One serves to present the purpose of the study and provide the context for the research questions. In addition the chapter points out the need for the study, contains a statement of the problem, spells out the hypotheses to be tested, provides for a definition of terms and defines the scope and limitations of the study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research is to determine if any differences exist between the manner in which district superintendents administer rules and the principal's perception of district superintendent's leadership, and staff militancy. The study will also test a number of subordinate hypotheses to determine the effects of the background variables (i.e., age, years of experience, and sex) on the types of rule administration.

Context of the Problem

The success of a corporation or governmental agency is influenced greatly by its capacity to achieve cooperative coordination rather than hostile conflict among its functional departments. Also to stimulate differences and then to capitalize on them by productive problem solving leading to creative and acceptable solutions. The knowledge yielded by current and past research concerned with organizations as well as the continued development of
organizational theory clearly have contributed to improving the capability to successfully manage the wide array of conflicts which often occur within contemporary educational organizations.

The notion of achieving cooperative coordination rather than hostile conflict evolves from studies conducted on leadership styles. Social scientists have investigated and studied leadership extensively and from a variety of theoretical and or empirical perspectives for the past several decades. One of the prevalent approaches to leadership is the research done at the Ohio State University in the 1950's. The Ohio State researchers found, through numerous empirical studies, that there are two major categories of actions by which any leader's behavior patterns can be described. These broad categories entail attending to the system and attending to the individual people (Silva, 1983).

In other words, any job related action in which a leader engages can be classified in one of two broad categories, either primarily system-oriented or primarily person-oriented. In the leader behavior research, these two dimensions have usually been described as initiating structure or consideration. System-oriented behaviors are those directed primarily toward fulfilling the goals and accomplishing the tasks of the social system or organization. System orientation includes actions that are
intended to clarify roles of the participants, establish patterns of interactions among them, specify and delineate the tasks to be achieved, and focus the energies of the participants toward the directions of organizations' goals. Six categories of behavior make up the system orientation dimension of the leader's behavior pattern: production emphasis, initiating structure, representation, role assumption, persuasiveness and supervisor orientation (Stogdill, 1963). On the other hand consideration or person-oriented behaviors are those directed primarily toward satisfying the idiosyncratic needs and preferences of the individuals within the organization. This dimension of leadership refers to actions that are intended to express concern for and interest in the group members; to express their unique needs, talents and interests; to increase their comfort and satisfaction within the organization; and to support their individual growth and development. Six classes or categories of the leader's behavior constitute the person orientation dimension: tolerance of uncertainty, tolerance of freedom, consideration, demand for reconciliation, integration, and predictive accuracy (Stogdill, 1963).

Other social scientists have concluded that organizations must be concerned with employees' goals, that organizational goals are better met as they are made more
concordant with individual employee needs, and that administrators are more effective as they are perceived as considerate of their subordinates. This theme emerges from the pioneering work of Chester Barnard (1938), Roethlisberger and Dickson (1938), Parsons (1951), Bales (1953), Argyris (1964), McGregor (1967), Fiedler (1967) and Brown (1967). More recently individuals such as Olsen (1982), Bennis and Namus (1985), Merriot (1986), Posner and Randolph (1988), Batten (1989), and Bardwick (1991) continue to conclude that organizations and their respective leaders must be concerned with their employees' goals. Further, that organizational goals are better achieved as they are more compatible with individual employee needs, and that leaders are more effective as they are perceived as concerned about their subordinates.

Another researcher Rensis Likert (1967) in *The Human Organization* and (1976) in *New Ways of Managing Conflict*, conceptualizes four management styles ranging from "Exploitive-Authoritative" to "Participative-Group" and strongly advocates an increased use of a participatory management style by today's executives. Likert insists that participative managers are more creative, successful, and effective. Blake and Mouton (1968) by means of a descriptive instrument created a managerial grid utilizing the variables of concern for people, and concern for production mirror this same notion.
Bolman and Deal (1984, 1991) distilled theories of organizations into four categories or traditions, which they labeled as frames. The structural frame emphasizes rationality, efficiency, structure, and policies. Structural leaders value analysis and data, keep their eye on the bottom line, set clear directions, hold people accountable for results, and try to solve organizational problems with new policies and rules or through restructuring. The human resource frame focuses on the interaction between individual and organizational needs. Human resource leaders value relationships and feelings and seek to lead through facilitation and empowerment. The political frame emphasizes conflict among different groups and interests for scarce resources. Political leaders are advocates and negotiators who spend much of their time networking, creating coalitions, building a power base, and negotiating a compromise. The symbolic frame sees a chaotic world in which meaning and predictability are socially constructed and facts are interpretative rather than objective. Symbolic leaders pay diligent attention to myth, ritual, ceremony, stories, and other symbolic forms. Bolman and Neal conclude that in a world of increasing ambiguity and complexity, that the ability to use more than one frame increases and individual's ability to make clear judgement and to act effectively. Moreover, they believe
that leadership is contextual; that is different situations require different patterns of thinking.

Humanistic management which stresses an individual's worth, dignity and capacity for self-realization through reason and participation in decisionmaking is regarded by many as a means for both enhancing productivity and for developing the human potential. Humanistic management is distinctively behavioralistic and focuses primarily on human motivation. It subsumes an almost eclectic set of writings on organizational behavior encompassing the work of such noted scholars as Chris Argyris (1957), Warren Bennis (1966), Frederick Herzberg (1959, 1966), Rensis Likert (1961, 1967, 1976), Abraham Maslow (1954, 1965) and Douglas McGregor (1960).

An early paucity of empirical research on this topic (Gibson and Teasley, 1973) has in the past decade begun to be redressed. Recent "popular" management literature has been quite laudatory of humanistic participative management style and the productivity/effectiveness that it can motivate (Ouchi, 1981; Pascale and Athos, 1981; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Blanchard and Johnson, 1982; Bennis and Namus, 1985; Peters and Austen, 1985; Garfield, 1986; Bardwick, 1991; and Horton, 1992). Academic literature has also blossomed with numerous motivational studies (Greiner, et al., 1981; Perry and Porter, 1982; Marriot, 1986; and Seyfarth, 1991).
From this perspective of humanistic management, the attitudes and perceptions of employees with regard to the organization's leadership are in themselves important factors contributing to the organization's success.

Educational Administration Research

Educational administrators and supervisors have been studied quite extensively from the perspective of the leader behavior framework. Of particular significance to education is the work of Halpin (1959) and Getzels and Guba (1957). Halpin identified two very significant dimensions of leadership in school systems, "consideration" and initiating "structure-in-interaction."

Getzels and Guba (1957) attempt to describe administration as a social process and propose a model with nomothetic and idiographic dimensions. These dimensions represent organizational goals and individual needs, and in the words of the authors, "the unique task of administration is to integrate the demands of the institution and the demands of staff members in a way that is at once organizationally productive and individually fulfilling."

Building on these findings (Lutz and Evans, 1968) conducted an investigative field study in New York City to determine if Gouldners (1954) topology which classifies administrative behavior into three types of rule
administration (punishment-centered; mock-centered; representative-centered) could account for the leadership climate of the school as perceived by teachers. They are more specifically defined as follows: 1) representative rule administration was typified by joint support for implementation or modification of rules, wherein both parties through shared decisionmaking support conformity to and enforcement of the rules; 2) mock rule administration was defined as the behavior associated with ignoring rules that are imposed from external sources; and 3) punishment-centered rule administration behavior was typified by conflict between the rule enforcer and the individual affected by the rule; for example, rules promulgated and enforced by principals that are evaded or accepted as punishment by teachers.

In the Gouldner and Lutz studies mock behavior was defined as the administration of rules imposed upon the school by outside constraints (such as union contracts and Board of Education rules) that were jointly ignored by the principal and teachers. Punishment behavior was the administration of rules initiated by one or the other group (either the employee or the administration). Whichever group initiated the rule, the other group attempted to evade it while the initiating group used punishment to enforce. Representative behavior was the classification of rule administration that was typified by the joint
initiation or modification of rules. Both parties (employees and administration) then supported the conformity of the rule and attempted to enforce the rule, through techniques of explanation and understanding. Mock rule behavior was the outright avoidance of rule enforcement by both parties. Their findings were that principals who exhibited high representative rule administration behavior were perceived by teachers to be high in executive professional leadership. Whereas, principals who exhibited high punishment-centered rule administration were low in perceived leadership. Also, the study found that mock rule administration usually results in little conflict between management and employees and generates little if any tension. This effect of mock rule behavior supported representative principals, but led to a "wait and see" attitude on the part of teachers in schools with punishment centered principals. It was also discovered that no administrator operated without some punishment centered behavior.

Based on the results of the New York study; the necessity of goal integrative behavior for school administrators; and the increasing demands from teachers to participate in educational decision-making through collective bargaining and that hostility might take the form of increased teacher militancy, Spaulding (1973) and
McDannel (1973) undertook studies to investigate the relationships between the manner in which a principal administers rules and the teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership, and staff militancy. Spaulding (1973) investigated the relationship between the manner in which a senior high school principal administers rules and the teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership, and staff militancy while McDannel (1973) dealt with the elementary principal's rule administration on staff militancy and leadership. They each developed a number of hypotheses and listed them in the rule form. Results on two of the hypotheses indicate no relationship between teacher militancy and either representative or punishment centered rule administration. Results on two other hypotheses leave little doubt, however, that principals who are perceived by teachers as being representative centered in their rule administration, were also perceived as having high leadership as defined by the Executive Professional Leadership EPL instrument; and likewise, that when they are perceived as being punishment-centered they are also perceived as having low leadership behavior. Leadership being defined as demonstrating the ability to influence others to accomplish established goals while maintaining and sustaining employee morale, self-esteem and productivity. Results on another hypotheses confirmed that
teacher militancy declines as the perceived leadership of the principal increases.

Both McDannel (1973) and Spaulding (1973) recommended that the rule administration behavior of the district superintendents, as perceived by building principals, be investigated as to the leadership qualities of the district superintendent. Further, the rule administration behavior of the district superintendent should be compared with the rule administration of the principals to determine if the building principal utilizes the same or different style of rule administration as that of the district superintendent. In other words, if principals are exposed to a district superintendent who behaves predominantly in one pattern, does this influence the principal to behave in a similar manner.

The Hawaii Context

The Department of Education administers the statewide system of public schools. Additionally, the department is responsible for administering state laws regarding regulation of private school operations through a program of inspection and licensing; and the professional certification of all teachers for every academic and non-college type of school. Federal grants received to support public school programs are administered by the department on a statewide basis.
The governance of the Department of Education is by a Board of Education. The Board is an executive board consisting of thirteen (13) elected members and a public high school student who is selected by the Hawaii State Student Council and serves as a non-voting member. The Board of Education is empowered by law to formulate policy and to exercise control over the public school system through its appointed executive officer, the Superintendent of Education.

Four (4) major, division-level staff offices, headed by assistant superintendents, provide statewide professional and technical support services and programs to the public schools:

(1) The Office of Business Services provides administrative, fiscal, and logistical support services and programs.

(2) The Office of Personnel Services provides employment and personnel management services and programs, including the certification of public and private school teachers.

(3) The Office of Instructional Services provides curriculum and instructional support services and programs.

(4) The Office of Information and Telecommunication Services provides computerized informational and
The public schools are aligned under seven (7) geographic District Offices: Honolulu, Central Oahu, Leeward Oahu, Windward Oahu, Hawaii, Maui (including Lanai and Molokai), and Kauai (including Niihau). Line management of the public schools is exercised through the District Superintendents who are directly responsible to the Superintendent of Education for the administration of all public schools within a district. District superintendents occupy exempt positions, and according to HRS 297-6, the superintendent of education, with the approval of the Board of Education, shall appoint in the several counties district superintendents for schools. They are responsible for directing a staff of school principals and other professional and clerical personnel and perform other related duties as required. Direction and guidance provided by district superintendents are generally in the form of departmental policies, rules, regulations, union contracts, directives and federal and state laws and legal requirements. Significant authority is vested at this level in exercising administrative and technical direction over district staff.

Presently, the Department of Education is involved in a decentralization movement known as school/community-based
management (SCBM). SCBM is a community-based, grassroots approach to creating an effective learning environment in the public schools. It was approved by the State Legislature in 1989 at the request of the Board of Education. The concept:

(1) promotes greater decision-making independence at the school level;

(2) relies on the district superintendents to provide leadership not only by modeling shared decision-making, collaboration and teaming, but encouraging principals and support staff through collaborative means to support the concept;

(3) relies on collaboration of the school's principal, teachers, support staff, parents, students, and citizens of the community in making those decisions;

(4) asserts that better educational results can be achieved when people responsible for implementing decisions are directly involved; and

(5) recognizes the importance of a community of people to restructure schooling in ways that will lead to effective teaching and improved student performance.

Although SCBM centers on changes that need to be initiated by each school, it is in fact a call to change the entire school system. Schools and their communities
may not be able to pursue more creative and effective approaches to student learning if all of the decision-making authority and controls of a centralized, bureaucratic system remain in place. In summary the State of Hawaii Department of Education's existing organizational structure is clearly a bureaucracy, but management is being asked to decentralize educational decision-making and to incorporate the empowering concepts of shared decision-making, networking, collaboration and teaming into their everyday leadership and management functions.

Collective Bargaining

At this point, some discussion is required relative to the area of collective bargaining in the Hawaii Department of Education (DOE). The Hawaii State Department of Education is somewhat unique in that it is one of a small number of school systems across the nation in which school principals are included in bargaining for wages, hours and conditions of employment.

This practice became effective on July 1, 1970 when the Hawaii Public Employment Relations Act (PERA) became state law. The Hawaii State Legislature passed it and Governor John A. Burns signed it into law in the spring of 1970.

The Hawaii Public Employment Relations Act (PERA) provided for the following:
1. Recognized the right of public employees, including supervisors, to organize for the purpose of collective bargaining;

2. Required the public employer to negotiate with and enter into written agreement with the exclusive representative on matters of wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment, and at the same time;

3. Maintained the merit principle and the principle of equal pay for equal work among state and county employees as provided for by law; and

4. Created the Hawaii Public Employment Relations Board to administer the provisions of the law.

The PERA provided for a number of other provisions such as: the scope of negotiations; written agreements, appropriations for implementation, enforcement; resolutions of disputes, grievances, impasses; strikes, rights and prohibitions; prohibited practices and evidence of bad faith.

Coupled with the aforementioned provisions, thirteen bargaining units were specifically designated. Among them was Unit 06--Educational Officers and other personnel of the Department of Education under the same salary schedule. Principals were included in Unit 06 because they were educational officers on the same salary schedule with other personnel of the Department of Education.
In the DOE organizational structure, district superintendents are deeply involved in the cyclical phases of collective bargaining. These phases are: negotiations preparation, face-to-face bargaining, impasse procedures, settlement and contract administration. While district superintendents are responsible for administering and maintaining the integrity of the collective bargaining contract the State of Hawaii, Board of Education has entered into with principals, they also serve on the BOE's negotiating team, they posture and communicate managements' positions to DOE employees (i.e., principals, teachers, support staff, etc.), they protect management rights as provided for by statute (HRS Chapter 89, Hawaii Public Employment Relations Act-PERA), and they implement BOE policy and departmental directives and guidelines developed to carry out negotiated provisions among other things.

The work culture and relationships in existence between district superintendents and principals are to some extent governed by and are deeply embedded as a result of: 1) the negotiated agreements hammered out over the years between management and principals, and 2) the rule administration behavior used by district superintendents in implementation and administration of the negotiated contract provisions. For example the negotiated agreements have been hammered out through the traditional competitive,
positional bargaining approaches involving high demands, threats and refusing to make concessions. Positional bargaining is a relatively adversarial process emphasizing the development and use of positions (opening, fall back, bottom line). This traditional style of negotiating goes by a number of different terms such as positional, adversarial, win-lose, power negotiating, hardball and hard bargaining. The present work culture appears to be permeated by a "them against us" attitude and relationship and seems to have fostered an adversarial polarization of principals who are members of collective bargaining unit 06 and management (district superintendents).

The essential point here is that collective bargaining by virtue of its cyclical nature is clearly an integral part of the district superintendents' every day operations, and may strongly influence the work culture and relationship between district superintendents and principals such that principals may evidence different levels of militancy.

Need for the Study

The district superintendents are the formal heads of the seven administrative districts that have been created as part of the Department of Education's bureaucratic organization structure. They are the individuals who are likely to exert the greatest influence on their respective principals and lead efforts to facilitate the achievement
of organizational objectives through influencing their principals.

According to Parkay and Currie (1991) principals receive support from nine major sources in their efforts to achieve organizational objectives: district, peers, faculty and staff, administrative team, parents, community, students and others. The source mentioned most often was the district (e.g., superintendent). Parkay and Currie (1991) went on to say that principals received support from the district in two significant ways: they were reassured about their professional competence and they were given technical help to solve the problems they encountered. Moreover, they emphasized it is important that principals believe superintendents are supportive; even to the point of being nonjudgemental. Lastly principals said it was important that superintendents "back them up" in controversial matters and provide assistance quickly in technical areas. The superintendent of the 1990's is confronted with the challenge of making an effort to have school principals restructure the schools they are leading to insure that the children being served will be able to pursue their dreams, their future, prepared fully with the range and depth of knowledge and skills necessary to insure success in world of the future. In order to accomplish this formidable
challenge, Mojkowski (1991) contends that superintendents will have to influence the principals they are leading to:

- shift their mission from mandates and control to facilitation and technical assistance; redirect resources to support school staff;
- emphasize staff development and leadership supervision over performance evaluation; manage people, not procedures, appraise performance as a problem-solving and professional growth strategy;
- develop interlocking district and professional strategic plans; reward professional development that contributes to the school and district, as well as to the individual;
- espouse (through action) values of achievement and excellence in concert with change, risk taking, enablement, collaboration, communication, recognition, and reward; and
- create teams of central office and school staffs, community, and board members to work together on instructional leadership, restructuring, staff development, and other key issues.

Frase and Larick (1992) in addressing the question: Can school leaders transform to face the future? point out that the significance of district level leadership to fundamental school restructuring has escaped all but a few of today's researchers, reformers, state policymakers,
board members, and, alas, superintendents themselves. Frase and Larick (1992) believe the fate of public education will depend, as never before, on superintendent's ability to anticipate and envision a totally new system of education. They identify a number of themes concerning the role of the superintendent in the 1990s as follows:

- Superintendents must work towards providing the proper environment and resources, and eliminate obstacles that threaten principals' and teachers' abilities to perform their job.
- Superintendents take on the responsibility to advocate the freedom to do the job. They must ask for freedom and give freedom throughout the system.
- The superintendent must include attention to "the leader as a person."
- Superintendents must love the people who do the work of the organization.

In light of the aforementioned information it seems clear that district superintendents in the Hawaii Department of Education need to have the ability to conceptualize and develop a plan for their particular district, and above all have a basic attitude of respect for the worth and dignity of others. The human skills concerning this function have to do with the development
and maintenance of morale, and the technical ones with handling specifics of personnel policy.

District superintendents fulfill a leadership role in the Hawaii Department of Education because they have certain rights and responsibilities which have been defined for them by the bureaucracy. Their role includes certain expectations regarding experiences of attitudes and values, styles of leadership, modes of dress, and all other aspects of the observable behavior of persons occupying the position of district superintendent. In brief a role is a set of expectations about how any occupant of a given position in an institution will behave.

It is also recognized that principals who are directly responsible to the district superintendents hold preconceptions (expectations) of the district superintendents regarding how they should behave.

This study also acknowledges the Hawaii State Department of Education as a bureaucracy that is bounded in both efficiency and rationality and stands firmly on a legal foundation. The organization is characterized by the features of a legal bureaucracy. Some of these features are: hierarchy of offices, rules and regulations, specialization of tasks, impersonality, written records, salaried personnel, and organizational control of resources. Further, within the Department of Education bureaucracy the district superintendents occupy positions
of social dominance. The district superintendents while in the position of social dominance can apply different types of leadership behavior to achieve this dominance, including representative-centered, mock-centered, or punishment-centered rule administration behavior. While the district superintendents may have achieved social dominance through one of the aforementioned leadership behavior styles, it is conceivable that principals' perceptions of the district superintendent's leadership behavior style may range on a predetermined leadership scale from low to high, depending on the type of leadership style used.

Also of interest is the fact that principals are included in collective bargaining, and have over the years increased their demands on matters of wages, other terms and conditions of work, and for participation in educational decision-making. Not all of their demands have been achieved, the possible by-product being increased principal militancy. Moreover, the Hawaii State Department of Education is currently experiencing some major initiatives, including School Community Based Management (SCBM). SCBM fosters site-based, collaborative decision-making by schools and promulgates that decisions regarding educational needs of the schools can best be made by those closest to the point of implementation. In view of this SCBM may be more likely to succeed if district
superintendents come from a social dominance position that fosters participation, collaboration and involvement (representative-centered leadership behavior). Thus, if district superintendents are perceived as high in leadership by their principals, and if their principals evidence a low level of militancy as a consequence, the district superintendents' subordinates (principals) may be more receptive to change.

It seems appropriate at this time to investigate certain aspects of school organization as represented specifically by perceptions of the principals of the district superintendents, who are the principals' normal contact with upper level management. Therefore, examination will be made of the district superintendents in the Hawaii public school system, in relation to their administrative role with principals, in an effort to see if there are significant differences among their rule administration behavior, and leadership behavior as perceived by their respective principals. Also whether a difference exists in level of militancy among the district superintendents as perceived by their respective principals.

Theoretical Constructs

This investigation is grounded in the theory of bureaucracy that was described by emanate sociologist Max Weber (1947). However, in presenting information about his
theory, the investigator is not exploring the full range of perspectives that scholars have brought to bear on Weber's theory of bureaucracy. Rather, an effort is made to focus upon certain aspects of his theory which provided the theoretic underpinning for this study as well as to examine some of the criticisms which have been raised by contemporary theorists and researchers.

Weber's Theory of Bureaucracy

Today we live in a time of rationality and efficiency. Employees are expected to have sound reasons for their actions. Management assumes goals, objectives, purposes, or motives for the things employees do. Furthermore, management expects subordinates to approach their goals by the most direct and least expensive means available. At the same time these values are reflected in the institutions and organizations that make up our society.

At the present time in Hawaii State Department of Education (1990), as Weber posits (1947), these values are most appropriately represented in a bureaucratic form of organization.

Max Weber was concerned with the issue of social dominance, that is with how a small number of individuals, particularly in government and industry achieve dominance over large numbers of subordinates. He believed that leaders exercised their social dominance through three
types of authority, 1) charismatic authority, 2) traditional authority, and 3) legal authority. Charismatic authority is social dominance in which the leader's personal aura and attractiveness draws masses of followers. Traditional authority is a form of dominance inherent in a position that is passed to individuals from one generation to the next. Legal authority is a form of dominance created by legislation and upheld by the full legal machinery of the society. Weber specified seven features of bureaucracies that both individually and in interaction, maximize organizational rationality and efficiency.

1. Hierarchy of Offices - Each administrative function is assigned an office, a position entailing a specified set of rights and responsibilities.

2. Rules and Regulations - There are routine procedures for dealing with recurring situations that affect each office in the organization, and there are standards of behavior for all participants.

3. Specialization of Tasks - All the work performed in an organization is divided among offices, and each office is associated with a particular type of work.
4. Written Records - Transactions both within the organization and with clients, are recorded on documents that are filed or in a computer information base.

5. Salaried Personnel - The supervisory and administrative officers are full time, salaried employees who depend on the organization for income. Their job is their major interest, their primary source of income, their means of career advancement, and their locus for practicing the work for which they were specifically trained.

6. Control of Resources - Although the organization must acquire its resources from the external environment, the resources once obtained, are controlled and allocated by the organization's officers.

As noted earlier the characteristics are bounded by the principles of rationality and efficiency. Weber (1963, 1964) believed each characteristic of the bureaucracy enhances the rationality and efficiency of the organization. According to Silver (1983):

Rationality refers to the goal-directedness of the organization. For example the idea that an action is best for the students or in the child's educational interest is
frequently invoked to support the rationality of a particular action.

**Efficiency** refers to the cost-effectiveness of the organization, where cost is the expenditure in relation to students educational attainments. This also includes the costs for time, energy, and all other resources that are expended in addition to dollars.

Although the complex theory articulated by Weber serves as the foundation for this study a condensed summary of his conception of bureaucracy has been written by Merton (1949) and is used in this discussion.

"As Weber indicates, bureaucracy involves a clear-cut division of integrated activities which are regarded as duties inherent in the office. A system of differentiated controls and sanctions is stated in the regulations. The assignment of roles occurs on the basis of technical qualifications which are ascertained through formalized, impersonal procedures (e.g., examinations). Within the structure of hierarchically arranged authority, the activities of trained and salaried experts are governed by general, abstract, clearly defined rules which preclude the necessity for the issuance of specific instructions in each specific case. The generality of the rules requires the constant use of categorization, whereby individual problems and cases are classified on the
basis of designated criteria and are treated accordingly. The pure type of bureaucratic official is appointed, either by a superior or through the exercise of impersonal competition; he is not elected. A measure of flexibility in the bureaucracy is attained by electing higher functionaries who presumably express the will of the electorate (e.g., a body of citizens or a board of directors).

To Weber, bureaucracy was one of the characteristic and ubiquitous forms of administration in modern society, and he felt it to be the most efficient form of organization for public organizations.

It is of importance to note that there are some salient criticisms of the theory itself and of bureaucratic organizations. Blau (1970) notes that Weber has been criticized for his preoccupation with the functional aspects of bureaucratic characteristics without recognition of the non-functional aspects of those same features. For example, although rules contribute to the organization's efficiency and rationality by lessening uncertainty and precluding individualistic actions that might be inappropriate, they also detract from efficiency and rationality by rendering the organization less responsive to unique circumstances and less able to benefit from the expertise of individual employees. Another criticism that
Blau (1970) related was Weber's disregard for the informal dimension of organizations and the fact that unofficial pattern of interaction always arise within organizations that influence individuals' behaviors as strongly as do official rules and directives. Moreover, according to Silva (1983) the bureaucratic form of organization has been criticized for its harmful effects on the people employed within bureaucracies and on the people served by them.

Weber also failed to weigh the possibility that effectiveness of a bureaucracy, or other of its characteristics might vary by manner that the norms and rules are initiated and established, whether by imposition or bilateral agreement. Implicitly, he seems to have assumed in the rational organization the cultural setting would be neutral toward the different methods of initiating norms and rules. However, if norms and rules tend to be imposed in an autocratic, punishment-centered fashion rather than the rational, agreed-upon, representative-centered mode, then these two will be difficult to merge without clouding the dynamics of the bureaucratic organization. In summary the bureaucratic organization is not ideal, nor does Weber's theory account for the full scope of organizational reality. No theory does. However, this theory does provide an analytic framework for thinking about the DOE organization and a conceptual basis for studying it empirically.
Rationale of the Study

While Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy serves as the foundation for this study, an examination of Weber's definition of a bureaucracy which is presented in Alvin Gouldner's (1954) book entitled, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy provides the basic rationale for this study.

Gouldner (1954) reported in his books Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy and Wildcat Strike, there is definite and clear support for Davis' (1972) contention that the foreman is a key factor in an organization. Davis studied the position of foreman in industry and determined that the individual occupying this position is one of a kind in management for a number of reasons. First the foreman is a key person because he represents management to the workers. Second the workers judge management as they view the foreman; and thirdly the foreman is the only manager who reports to higher management as well as having workers directly responsible to him. This then affords the foreman the opportunity to sit astride the channels of communication and the lines of authority and he/she is able to control or block the flow, either up or down, within the hierarchy.

In a school system the district superintendent, like the foreman, is a key because he/she also represent management to principals. Likewise the principals in the
school system judge management as they view the district superintendent and the district superintendent, like the foreman, is the only manager who reports to higher management (State Superintendent of Education) as well as having workers (principals) report directly to him/her. Consequently, the district superintendent, like the foreman sits astride the channels of communication and the lines of authority and is able to control or block the flow, either up or down, within the hierarchy.

Since the State of Hawaii public school system district superintendents may be perceived as residing in a position analogous to that of foreman in industry, this study centers on the district superintendents' interactions with principals.

Gouldner advances a study of plant managers that can be looked upon as akin to district superintendents. He commences by thoroughly examining Weber's definition of a bureaucracy which is presented in his book Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (1954). The context of Gouldner's work dealt with the behavior patterns and interactions occurring between supervisors and the plant manager. It is clear that Gouldner upon completing his examination concluded that Weber was steadfastly portraying not one but two types of bureaucracy rather than the one type that Weber was justifying. Therefore, Gouldner (1954) stated:
One of these may be termed the "representative" form of bureaucracy, based on rules established by agreement, rules which are technically justified and administered by specially qualified personnel, and to which consent is given voluntarily. A second pattern, which may be called the "punishment-centered" bureaucracy, is based on the imposition of rules, and on obedience for its own sake.

Gouldner (1954) using Max Weber's theory as a basis for his study looked very thoroughly at the method in which rules are enforced or administered by management in a bureaucratic organization and presented them in his Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy. His examination revealed three distinct types of administration and he took careful pains to discuss each. Prior to explaining each type it is of significance to note that Lutz, Kleinman, and Evans (1967) made an effort to determine whether industrial theory might be applicable to educational organizations in solving problems:

When the hypotheses and theory related to the industrial organization are based on general social science theory and the concepts are descriptive of global human organizational behavior rather than specific behavior, then
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the theory can be conceptualized in terms of the educational enterprise, thus providing reasonable and useful predictors for educational administration and organization.

Bearing this statement in mind, Gouldner's concept of bureaucratic rule administration seems to parallel such a theory. In his model he identifies three types of rule administration: 1) representative, 2) mock, and 3) punishment-centered.

Gouldner discusses mock rule administration first and describes it as rules that are neither enforced by management nor obeyed by subordinates. Also they are characterized by little or no tension between management, supervisors and job holders.

As a general rule, mock rules are frequently made outside the realm of the principal and district superintendent. Often times the rules are ignored by the principal and district superintendent except for specific cases. Regarding mock rules, Lutz and Azzarelli (1966) reported that:

It is not unusual to see mock-centered rules in operation in school systems. These are rules legislated by the board, or perhaps by a union, without the participation of teachers or administrators (at least at the building level) and by these rules teachers' and admin-
Not infrequently both teachers and administrators agree to ignore mock-centered rules.

The second group of rules according to Gouldner are classified as being representative rules. Such rules caused some tension but little, if any noticeable conflict. These type of rules were originated by both management and subordinates and both observed these rules as their own. Generally, both categories could sanction the rules in terms of their own values. Further, the enforcement of representative rules is accomplished through cooperative efforts rather than by taking punitive actions. This is corroborated by Lutz and Evans (1968) in a field study they conducted in New York City schools.

Usually the attempt to enforce representative rules came about through explanation, notification, and cooperative efforts, rather than through the use of threat or punishment on the part of either the union or the administration.

Punishment-centered rules, the third category of rule administration, were those which were strictly enforced by management and where each rule was treated as an end in itself. A large amount of stress, tension, and conflict results between subordinates and management in a situation where punishment-centered rule representation is the
primary mode of managing a company (Gouldner, 1954). In other words when there was confirmation that a willful effort to ignore or circumvent the rule was made, the subsequent action was in the form of punishment. According to Gouldner (1954) this pattern is affiliated with considerable tension and conflict. Also a number of researchers have expressed thoughts about the use of punishment-centered rule administration. Among them are: Homans (1950) who commented that "the leader should be less concerned with inflicting punishment than with creating the conditions in which the group will discipline itself" and Thompson (1969) who pointed out that punishment "appeals to immature and regressive tendencies in people, to fear, dependency, refusal to assume responsibility, escapism, etc."

Further Hammel (1970) conducted a study in an educational setting which supports Gouldner's concepts. Upon completion of his study he argued that it is not bureaucracy itself that causes internal tension, but rather identifiable characteristics of rule direction and patterns of rule enforcement which affect an individual employee in a specific situation.

To summarize, Gouldner singles out three distinct kinds of rule administration which can be used to determine the manner in which a district superintendent administers rules in his/her district. The three patterns of rule
administration as they are applied in the bureaucracy produce specific reactions: (1) Mock: The rules generally result in little conflict between management and employees. (2) Punishment-centered: The rules generally result in relatively immense tension and conflict. (3) Representative: The rules created some tensions but little noticeable conflict between management and employees.

Moreover, it was pointed out, each pattern of rule administration creates dissimilar reactions within the bureaucracy relative to conflict and tensions and that the subsequent tension and conflict, or absence of it, may be reflected in leadership perception and militancy.

The Research Questions

The primary focus of this research is to determine if there are differences in the manner in which district superintendents administer rules, as perceived by the principals in that district. Also whether differences in rule administration behavior have a systematic effect on the perceptions of the district superintendent's leadership. Further, to determine if a difference can be detected in the militancy of principals among the various district superintendents. Lastly to learn whether or not there are differences in perceptions of rule administration
and leadership behavior by age, length of service, and sex among principals. The research questions are:

1. Is there a difference among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents' rule administration behavior as perceived by the principals in their districts?
2. Is there a difference among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents' leadership behavior as perceived by the principals in their districts?
3. Is there a difference in level of militancy among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents as perceived by the principals in their districts?
4. Are there differences in perceptions of district superintendent's rule administration and leadership behavior by age, length of service, and sex among principals?

Hypotheses to be Tested

The hypotheses to be tested by this investigation are as follows:

1. There is no significant difference in rule administration behavior among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents as perceived by the principals in their districts.
2. There is no significant difference in leadership behavior among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents as perceived by the principals in their districts.

3. No significant difference exists in level of militancy among the principals in the seven Hawaii State Department of Education districts.

4. There are no significant differences in perceptions of district superintendent's rule administration and leadership behavior by sex, length of service as a principal, and age among principals.

Also an ancillary question will be examined as follows:

(1) Are there significant amounts of variance in the leadership scores of the seven district superintendents which are related to the perception of three subscales of their rule administration behavior, principal militancy, and the personal and demographic variables among principals?

Definition of Terms

The most commonly used terms and concepts utilized in this investigation are presented in this section.
Rule administration is defined as the way in which a district superintendent brings to pass rules. These rules may be clauses or provisions in a negotiated union contract, board of education policies, state level administrative directives, guidelines and procedures or rules developed at the district level.

Alvin Gouldner (1954) in his topology of bureaucratic rule administration, showed three types of rule administration.

1. Representative rule administration is characterized by joint support for and/or modification of rules. The rules are enforced by management and obeyed by workers. In sum there is joint participation in the rule acceptance.

2. Mock rule administration is when the rules are neither obeyed by the staff nor enforced by management. It is the outright avoidance of rule enforcement by both non-management and management employees of external rules. Mock rules are neither enforced by management nor obeyed by the workers.

3. Punishment-centered rule administration is characterized by disaccord between the rule enforcer and the employee affected by the rule: that is, rules enforced by the district superintendent that are evaded or accepted as
punishment by the principal. Punishment-centered rules are enforced by management and evaded by employees. There is a clear conflict in rule acceptance.

Each of the three patterns of rule administration behavior will be analyzed for systematic differences based upon the subscales of the rule administration questionnaire.

Principal militancy shall be recognized for the purpose of this study as advocation of organized collective action by (1) negotiations, (2) sanctions, and (3) strikes to bring about desired changes in a school system. Principal militancy shall be determined by means of a Carlton's militancy score.

District superintendents leadership is that score ascertained by district superintendents after administration of Gross and Herriot's Executive Professional Leadership instrument to a sample of principals serving within each of the seven districts.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

1. This study is to be limited to an investigation of the implications found in the differences between the variables of staff militancy, principals' perceptions of district superintendents' leadership, and principals' perceptions of
district superintendents rule administration behavior as measured by research instruments in the State of Hawaii.

2. The data was based upon the self-reported attitudes and perceptions of the respondents.

Summary

In Chapter One, information is presented touching upon research studies dealing with rule administration, leadership, collective bargaining and militancy.

Information was also shared about: 1) the way in which rules have been administered in organizations, including a description of the patterns of rule administration behavior (representative, mock, punishment) carried out in bureaucratic organizations; 2) the importance of the perceived leadership demonstrated by management; and 3) militancy exhibited by members. These matters have been of concern to behavioral scientists, students of educational administration, as well as the management personnel in the Hawaii State Department of Education.

Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy served as the theoretical basis for this study. Weber's model is supported by Alvin Gouldner's topology which classifies administrative behavior according to the following classifications: 1) representative-centered; 2) mock-centered; and 3) punishment-centered. The basic research
questions attempt to determine if there are differences among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents as perceived by their respective principals in 1) rule administration; 2) leadership; and 3) militancy. Also if various personal demographic variables exhibited by principals cause differences in principals perceptions of their respective district superintendents.

The generalizations of this study are limited to principals and district superintendents in the Hawaii State Department of Education. Results cannot be inferentially applied to principals or district superintendents outside the state of Hawaii or private schools within the state.
Chapter Two will review research related to the proposed study. The study of motivation, behavior and leadership in bureaucratic organizations such as the Hawaii State Department of Education is a search for answers to puzzling questions about the nature of humans. This study recognizes the significance of the human element in bureaucratic organizations and that they are "living systems." Therefore, the need to conduct a review of the literature so policy makers, managers and leaders working in school systems patterned after Weber's bureaucratic model can come to better understand human behavior and its effects on bureaucratic organizations.

The Nature of Organizations

First it must be pointed out that organizations have been defined in many ways. The American Heritage Dictionary of The English Language (1969) offers a number of definitions for the term organization. Among them are the following: 1.) Something that has been organized or made into an ordered whole. 2.) Something comprising elements with varied functions that contribute to the whole and to collective functions; an organism. 3.) A number of persons or groups having specific responsibilities and united for some purpose or work.
Parsons (1951) reported that organizations are social units deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek specific goals. Stinchcombe (1965) concluded that an organization is by definition a set of stable social relations deliberately created with the explicit intention of continuously accomplishing some specific goals or purposes. Interestingly, in their book, The Second Handbook of Organization Development in Schools, Schmuck, Runkel, Arends and Arends (1977) point out that schools as organizations should begin by regarding themselves not as clusters of individuals working at separate tasks but as systems of people working interdependently at particular tasks and moving into coordination with other sets of people as they move from task to task. They go on to state that the system nature of a school organization lies in this coordinated interdependence of sets of persons who together carry out particular tasks. Campbell, Bridges and Nystrand (1979) refer to an organization as the relationships of people as they work to achieve a common goal.

Also, Roark and Davis (1981) believe the organization has as its major focus that of helping members of schools (faculties, administrators, community members) to develop communities which effectively solve problems, initiate needed changes, and provide support for their members. Margulies and Raia (1984) contend organizations exist to
encourage collaboration and participation that "enfranchise" participants. Moreover, Drucker (1988) expects organizations of the future to have half as many levels of management as are typical today. He contends they will be knowledge-based and essentially self-directing. In short, these organizations will have little resemblance to the organizations of today. According to Savage (1990), Peter Drucker suggests that departments will serve as bases of resources, technical and human, and as providers of standards. Moreover, instead of working sequentially, the various functions will work together in synchrony, with teams taking projects from inception to market. The emerging organization will go beyond a matrix, thus requiring greater self-support discipline and individual responsibility. The organization will be held together by clear, simple common objectives and coordinate like a symphony orchestra, but without a score. It will have to write its own music as it goes.

Davis (1987) expects a shift in focus from hierarchical organizations to network ones, although networks will not replace or supplement hierarchies; rather, the two will be encompassed within a broader conception that embraces both. Like Drucker, Davis sees a shift from working sequentially to using multiple functions simultaneously.
Hersey and Blanchard (1988) believe that an organization is a unique and living organism whose basic component is the individual and this individual is our fundamental unit of study. Thus their focus is on the interaction of people, motivation, and leadership.

Nolan (1988) suggests that the bureaucratic hierarchy form of organization used by most companies today is obsolete. He implies that the organizational structure of the twenty-first century will have to take the form of a network in order to compete. Finally, Savage (1990) states that the new emerging information-based organizations form is known, but it is likely that we will need to learn how to structure organizations around multiple overlapping networks of teams, instead of simply spinning off ad hoc teams as needed.

No doubt organizations have been defined in numerous ways and this is clearly pointed out above. However, the majority of definitions connote relationships between and among people who work together so that they achieve a common goal or produce something.

Hersey and Blanchard (1988) have taken a look back at the transformation of American society since the turn of the century and find that we have progressed from a basically agrarian society to a dynamic industrial society with a higher level of education and standard of living than was ever thought possible. In addition, they note
that our scientific and technical advancement staggers the imagination.

Unfortunately this progress has not been without its unpleasant side. Hersey and Blanchard (1988) further indicate that at a time when we should be rejoicing in a golden age of plenty, we find ourselves wallowing in conflict—conflict between nations, conflict between races, conflict between management and workers, even conflict between neighbors. What surfaces here is that the aforementioned problems cannot be solved only through scientific and technical skill and by independent individuals but rather they will require the need to work together (interdependence) to achieve a common goal. It is through organizations, be they industrial, medical, military, educational or etc., that have a balance between technical, scientific and social skills where common goals are most effectively achieved. Mayo (1945) so appropriately recognized this problem when he stated that "the consequences for society of the unbalance between the development of technical and of social skills have been disastrous."

In closing out this discussion on the significance of organizations, it is probably safe to state as Dubin (1968) did in his book, Human Relations in Administration, that the working force spends more than a third of its waking
hours in the organizations by which it is employed. Further, fact-finding has shown that human behavior, as a consequence of organizational life, evidences striking likenesses as one changes one's abode from banking, to construction, to school, to military, and to retailing. Conflict occurs in school districts in the same fashion and probably likewise with the same regularity as it does in the banking, construction, and retailing industrial organizations as well as in the military. Given this assumption it is evident that district superintendents should be well grounded in the history of mangement and how leadership styles have evolved in organizations over time. Further, they should be very concerned with improving their administrative and leadership skills by gaining a better understanding of leadership theory and techniques utilized in all organizations including school systems.

A Historical View of the Development of Management Theory

Reviewing the evolution of management theory and practices should help district superintendents understand theory and practices as they are today. It may also assist them to envision how present management concepts have evolved over time. Current management concepts are the result of continual development, testing, modification, retesting, recycling, and so on. In sum, this section will enlighten readers to the genesis of many contemporary management concepts and reason upon how they have evolved
to mirror the changing needs of organizations and society as a whole.

The first half of the twentieth century was a period of variance in management thought. Scientific management promoted production efficiencies by searching for the most appropriate way to do each assignment and looked at the field from the viewpoint of how to improve employee productivity. The general administrative theorists sought principles of management that applied to the entire organization. The human resources approach centered on the management of people. The quantitative approach used mathematical and statistical techniques to improve resource allocation decisions.

Fredrick Taylor (1911) known as the father of scientific management sought to create a mental revolution among both the workers and management by defining clear guidelines for improving production efficiency. He proposed four principles of management: 1) developing a science for each element of an individual's work, 2) scientifically selecting and training workers, 3) management-worker cooperation, and 4) allocating responsibility to both management and workers.

Like Taylor, Henry Fayol played down the role and effect of the human factor in an organization. He
determined that the definition of administration was to do the following: (1) to plan, (2) to organize, (3) to command, (4) to coordinate, and (5) to control. Massey (1965) reported that Fayol defined the term organize as follows: "To organize is to define and set up the general structure of the enterprise with reference to its objective, its means of operation and its future course as determined by planning." Two additional proponents of administrative and organizational efficiency were Gulick and Urwick. They joined efforts to espouse the organizational principles identified under the acronym POSDCORB: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. Like Taylor and Fayol, primary emphasis was given to the organizational structure with little consideration given to the human part of the organization.

Max Weber (1947) defined the ideal bureaucracy as having division of labor, a clearly defined hierarchy, detailed rules and regulations, and impersonal relationships. Weber believed his ideal bureaucracy was the foundation for theorizing about work and how work could be done in large groups. Today almost all large organizations have many of the features of his ideal bureaucratic structure (i.e., division of labor, authority of hierarchy, rules and regulations, impersonality, etc.).
No doubt a number of our present practices in management of organizations can be attributed to the contributions of the general administrative theorists noted above. One can recognize in many of today's organizations the use of Fayol's universal truths of management and see that Weber's bureaucracy has become the most accepted model around which large organizations are designed. A number of early researchers such as Owen (1825), Munsterberg (1913), Follet (1918), and Barnard (1938) argued that in addition to identifying the best technological methods and structure to improve productivity in an organization, it was beneficial to management to look into human affairs. The Hawthorne studies (Mayo, 1945) dramatized that a worker was not a machine, and scientific management's "the one best way" approach had to be tempered to recognize the effects of group behavior. Scholars generally agree that the Hawthorne Studies had a startling impact on the direction of management thought. Mayo's conclusions were that behavior and sentiments were closely related, that group standards established individual worker output, and that money was less a factor in determining output than were group standards, group sentiments, and security. These conclusions led to a new emphasis on the human factor in the functioning of organizations.
and the attainment of their goals. Also they led to increased paternalism by management.


In the early 1960s concern with developing a unifying structure for management began in earnest. As is the usual case in most fields of study, management, moved toward integration as it matured. Koontz (1961), (1964) acknowledged that each of the variety of management approaches had something to offer management theory, but then proceeded to demonstrate that (1) the human resources and quantitative approaches were not equal to the field of management, but rather were tools to be used by managers, and (2) a process approach could encompass and synthesize the diversity of management thought of the day. The process approach was proposed as a means to synthesize the diversity. This approach sees management as a process
of getting things done through people and with people operating in organized groups. Managers are seen as demonstrating the four basic functions of planning, organizing, leading, and controlling. Interestingly, if you were to review most of the well known management textbooks you would find that they follow the process orientation which is clearly evidence that this approach continues to be a viable integrative framework.

To no one's surprise, the mid-1960s commenced a decade in which the idea that organizations could be analyzed in a systems framework gained a strong following. The systems approach was utilized to describe the organization as an entity that acquires inputs, engages in transformation processes, and generates outputs, and maintains stability and balance. Outputs are the ends, whereas acquisition of inputs and processing efficiencies are means. Advocates of the systems approach such as Mauch (1962), Churchman (1967), Buckley (1968), Kaufman (1972), Newman (1975) and Flamholtz (1979) stressed that the systems approach to organizational effectiveness centers on those factors that can and do affect survival. More specifically, the systems approach recognizes the interdependency of internal activities in the organization and between the organization and the external environment. De Greene (1973) points out that system advocates envision the organization as being
made up of interdependent factors, including individuals, groups, attitudes, motives, formal structure, interactions, goals, status and authority. Essentially it is the managers responsibility to ensure that all parts of the organization are coordinated internally so that the organization's goal can be achieved.

Most of the practitioners in the field of management recognize that management in and of itself is not based on simple principles. This is because organizations vary in size, objectives, tasks being done, degree of decentralization, organizational culture and the like. Thus it is not very likely to find that these would be universally applicable principles that would work in all situations. Hence, the emergence of the contingency approach.

Fry and Smith (1987) note that in recent years the contingency approach (also sometimes called the situational approach) has been used to replace simplistic principles of management and to integrate much of management theory. Advocates of the contingency management approach such as Fiedler (1967), House (1971), Barrow (1977), Hersey and Blanchard (1982), Vecchio (1987), and Fry and Smith (1987) acknowledge that the universal principles of management supported by the likes of Taylor, Fayol and Weber don't work in all situations and that this approach attempts to
deal with this reality by integrating management concepts into a situational framework.

Following is a summary of the various management approaches introduced thus far. The summary reflects when they begin, the particular period of time of their influence and the primary theme they conveyed.

- **Scientific Management:** (1910-1930) - Search for "the one best way" for performing any given task.
- **General Administrative Theorists:** (1918-1930) - What managers do and what constitutes good management.
- **Human Resource Management:** (1928 - 1990 and continuing) - Understanding behavior is the key to effective management.
- **Process:** (1965 - 1990 and continuing) - Managers perform discrete functions.
- **Systems:** (1965 - 1990 and continuing) - It's all interrelated.
- **Contingency:** (1970 - 1990 and continuing) - It all depends.

**Leadership In Organizations**

In this section leaders are generally described as individuals who are able to influence others but also hold managerial authority. Also an effort is made to define
leadership and to provide a brief historical perspective of the leadership theories that have evolved over the years.

The definition of leadership according to Koontz and O'Donnell (1959) is influencing people to follow in the achievement of a common goal. Tannenbaum, Weschler, and Massarik (1959) define it as interpersonal influence exercised in a situation and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specialized goal or goals. Tenny (1960) further defines it as the activity of influencing people to strive willingly for group objectives. A review of other authors reflects that most management authors concur that leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given situation.

Gier (1967) found there were three traits that kept group members from competing for a leadership role. These three traits were, in order of importance, the perception of being uniformed, of being nonparticipants, or of being very inflexible.

Peters and Waterman's (1982), found the most successful of America's corporations are men and women who can best be described as spirited leaders. They are people who love the business they are in and the people with whom they work. They love the product, and they are intimately familiar with all the steps that go into developing it.
Most importantly, they found that these leaders are able to imbue others with the excitement, the love of the product, the concern for others and for the core values of the company. They are people who "make meanings for people, as well as money." They believe deeply in the social value of what they do, and they are able to inspire others to do the same.

McCall and Lombardo (1983) examined differences between executives who made it to the top of their organization and those who were expected to make it to the pinnacle of their respective organizations, but were derailed just before reaching their goal. They found that the most frequent cause for derailment was insensitivity to others, but the one unforgivable sin was betrayal of trust --not following through on promises or double-dealing.

Bennis (1984) noted that leaders empower their organizations to create an environment where people feel significant, learning and competence matter, people are part of the community or team, and work is exciting. It is also an environment where quality matters and dedication to work energizes effort.

Marriot (1986) believes it is the leaders job to motivate people, train them, care about them and make winners out of them. He contends you have to treat people
in your organization as if they're your most important assets; because they are.

According to Posner and Randolph (1988) leaders are expected to be forward-looking, to have a sense of direction, and to be concerned about the future of the enterprise.

Batten (1989) suggests that leaders catalyze, stretch and enhance people. They pull and expect and are exhilarated by identifying and enhancing people's strengths. Also he concludes managing minds and spirits will be the name of the game and that we must release old habits and consign them to the past. The cold, hard, rigid drive is out.

Bandwich (1991) states that leaders need to provide three conditions in order for employees to feel involved: (1) challenge, (2) empowerment and (3) significance.

Horton (1992) believes in the notion that leaders know instinctively that success depends not so much on themselves as on others. One of their traits is to recognize the positive attributes of their people and then build upon their strengths.

Finally, Labich (1988) in an article he wrote for Fortune magazine claims that consultants, academics, and executives largely agree on seven guidelines that, in aggregate, produce effective leadership. These guidelines are: (1) trust your subordinates, (2) develop a vision,
(3) keep your cool, (4) encourage risk, (5) be an expert, (6) invite dissent and (7) simplify.

In the early stages of research dealing with leadership approaches, trait theories dominated the scene. Trait theories of leadership attempt to isolate characteristics that differentiate leaders from nonleaders. Such traits as intelligence, charisma, decisiveness, enthusiasm, integrity, strength, bravery and self-confidence were identified with outstanding leaders. Unfortunately research efforts at isolating these traits resulted in a number of dead ends.

These research efforts did not result in a set of traits that would consistently differentiate leaders from followers and good leaders from poor leaders.

Because the trait approach totally disregarded the needs of subordinates, snubbed the situational factors and did not do an adequate job of clarifying the relative importance of the various traits, researchers conducting leadership behavior studies became disenchanted and began to search for other possible theoretical approaches such as the behavior and contingency leadership theories. For the purposes of this investigation we shall review the three most popular behavioral studies (the Ohio State, Michigan and Blake and Mouton studies). Also three contingency theory models will be presented (Fiedler, Hersey-Blanchard,
and Path-Goal). The well known Ohio State University leadership studies initiated by the Bureau of Business Research in 1945 made an effort to identify various dimensions of leadership behavior. Some of the researchers who were involved in these studies were Hemphill and Coons (1950), Halpin and Winer (1957) and Stodgill (1963). These researchers initially defined leadership as the behavior of an individual when directing the activities of a group toward a goal attainment. However, from the data they gathered about leaders they eventually narrowed the description of leadership behavior to two basic dimensions: Initiating Structure and Consideration. Initiating Structure refers to 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. On the other hand, Consideration refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his/her staff.

In order to gather data about the behavior of leaders the staff of the Ohio State leadership studies developed two instruments: The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ). The first instrument was completed by leaders'
subordinate(s), superior(s), or associates (peers), but the latter was scored by the leaders themselves.

One significant vestige of the leadership research work done at the Ohio State University in the 1950's is a conceptual framework for thinking about leaders' behavior patterns systematically. Much like the social psychologists prior to them, the Ohio State researchers (Halpin, 1966; Stogdill and Coons (1957) and Brown (1967), found through many empirical studies, that there are two major categories of actions by which any leaders' behavior (district superintendents) can be described. These broad categories entail attending to the system and attending to the individual people (e.g., principals). In other words, any job related action in which a leader (e.g., district superintendent) engages can be classified in one of these broad categories, as either primarily system-oriented or primarily person-oriented.

To sum up, the Ohio State leadership studies researchers found that Initiating Structure and Consideration were separate and distinct dimensions. A high score on one dimension does not necessitate a low score on the other. The behavior of a leader could be described as any mix of both dimensions. Essentially, it was during these studies that leadership behavior was first plotted on two separate axes rather than on a single
continuum. Four quadrants were developed to reflect various combinations of Initiating Structure (task-behavior/system oriented) and Consideration (relationship-behavior/person oriented).

Leadership studies conducted at the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center, by Kahn and Katz (1960) also came up with two dimensions of leadership behavior that were labeled employee oriented and production oriented. Leaders identified as employee oriented were described as emphasizing interpersonal relations; they took a personal interest in the needs of their subordinates and accepted individual differences among members. The production-oriented leaders, in contrast, tended to emphasize the technical or task aspects of the job, were concerned primarily with accomplishing their group's tasks, and regarded group members as a means to that end. Basically they concluded that employee-oriented leaders were associated with higher group productivity and high job satisfaction, while production-oriented leaders were associated with low group productivity and lower worker satisfaction.

Blake and Mouton (1964, 1968 and 1984) developed a two-dimensional leadership style. They suggested a management grid based on the styles of concern for people and concern for production. They claim that people and production concerns are complementary, rather than mutually
exclusive, and that their integration in the management process would optimize both. In essence, an organization should find it profitable in a financial sense to be concerned for people. They developed a managerial grid to be used by managers to establish their respective positions on the two issues. One side of the grid assesses "concern for people" and the other side assesses "concern for production." In addition both Blake and Mouton uphold that a standing of high on one factor and low on the other indicates that a manager is not effective as he/she could be. The best situation, as they see it, is a rating of high concern for both. Albeit this is a rather utopian situation, they assert that managers should eventually closely resemble this position.

Unfortunately all three of these studies (Ohio State, Michigan, and Blake and Mouton) had very little success in identifying consistent relationships between patterns of leadership behavior and successful performance. No general statements could be made because results would vary over different ranges of circumstances. What appeared to be lacking was consideration of the situational factors that influence success or failure.

In view of the aforementioned information, it became clear to those involved in studying leadership behavior that predicting leadership success involved something more
complex than isolating a few traits or preferable behaviors. This then led to a new focus on situational influences.

It is of importance to point out that a number of approaches to isolating key situational variables have proven more successful than others, and, as a result, have gained wider recognition. As was pointed out earlier, for the purposes of this investigation we shall briefly consider four approaches.

Fred Fiedler (1967) developed the initial model for leadership in which he proposes that effective group performance depends upon the proper match between the leader's style of interacting with subordinates and the degree to which the situation gives control and influence to the leader. He goes well beyond trait approaches by isolating situations, relating an individual's personality to the situation, and then predicting leadership effectiveness as a function of the two.

Another leadership model that is widely followed is Hersey-Blanchard's (1974, 1982) situational leadership theory. Situational leadership is a contingency theory that centers on followers. Successful leadership is achieved by selecting the appropriate leadership style, which Hersey and Blanchard (1982) argue is dependent upon the level of the followers' maturity.
The definition of maturity according to Hersey and Blanchard (1982) is the capability and predisposition of individuals in an organization to assume responsibility for directing their very own behavior.

Situational leadership evidences the identical leadership dimensions used by Fiedler (1967): task and relationship behaviors. The major contrast is that the Hersey-Blanchard model makes an effort to go one degree further by considering each as either high or low and then combining them into four particular leadership styles: telling, selling, participating, and delegating. Basically Hersey and Blanchard argue that Fiedler's model emphasizes concern for production and people, which are attitudinal dimensions. On the other hand they say situational leadership, in contrast, emphasizes task and relationship behavior.

Insofar as the validity of the situational leadership theory, it has not received much attention from researchers. Only about a half a dozen investigations have been pursued to test its validity, and most of these were limited in scope (Hambleton and Gumpert, 1982; Graff, 1983 and Vecchio, 1987).

At the present time, one of the approaches to leadership that has achieved wide acceptance by the field is the path-goal theory (House, 1971, 1974, 1987). This is
also a contingency model of leadership. The key elements of the path-goal theory are derived from the Ohio State leadership research on initiating structure and consideration and the expectancy theory of motivation.

The fundamental theme of the theory is that it's the leader's responsibility to help his or her subordinates in achieving their goals and to give the required direction and/or assistance to ensure that their goals are congruent with the major objectives of the organization. The competent leader makes it very clear as to what the path is so their subordinates get from where they are to the accomplishment of their work goals and make the trip along the pathway much less difficult by reducing barriers. In sum, the essence of path-goal theory is that a leader's behavior is acceptable to subordinates insofar as they view it as a source of either immediate or future satisfaction and motivational to the extent that it makes subordinate need satisfaction dependent on effective performance and provides the support, guidance, coaching and rewards that are requisites for effective performance. House specifies four leadership behaviors: (1) the directive leader who lets subordinates know what is expected of them; (2) the supportive leader who is personable and friendly and demonstrates strong concern for subordinates; (3) the participative leader who involves subordinates by consulting and asking them for their suggestions before
making decisions; (4) the achievement-oriented leader who establishes challenging goals and expects subordinates to perform at their highest level. Further, House assumes that leaders are flexible and that the same leaders can evidence any or all of these behaviors, depending on the situation.

Vroom and Yelton (1973, 1988) advocated another contingency approach called the leader-participation model. It relates leadership behavior and participation to decision making and provides a progressive set of rules that are to be adhered to in determining the form and degree of participation in decision making, as determined by different situations. The model assumes that any of five behaviors may be appropriate in a given situation: (1) Autocratic I, (2) Autocratic II, (3) Consultative I, (4) Consultative II, and (5) Group II. Also the model makes available to the leader a specific way of breaking down problems by means of seven contingency questions. Essentially, by replying either yes or no to these questions, the leader can arrive at the preferred decision making behavior. In summary this is a leadership theory that provides a set of rules to determine the form and amount of participative decision making in different situations.
To sum up this section on leadership, one could generalize that it has been a topic of deep interest for the past two centuries and that it is an intrinsic and perhaps necessary feature of social interaction.

Social scientists have investigated leadership extensively and from various theoretical perspectives for the past several decades. Prior to 1960 most leadership research represented efforts to identify the key traits or personality characteristics of effective leaders. Because trait research failed to reveal a set of characteristics consistently associated with effectiveness, this approach was supplanted in the late 1950's by systematic analysis of behavior patterns of persons in positions of leadership. Numerous studies conducted in the 1960s and 1970s have used this behavioral approach. In recognition of the fact that leader's behavior patterns may change in accordance with situations in which leaders find themselves, however, scholars' attention has shifted most recently toward a situational or contingency approach to leadership research. The contingency perspective takes into consideration the interactive effects of a variety of factors, such as the leader's personality, his or her behaviors, the nature of the group, maturity of subordinates, the type of tasks performed and so on. Although numerous studies are still conducted in traitist and behavioral traditions, the
contingency approach has captured the interests of most contemporary researchers.

**Leadership Behavior In School Systems**

The superintendent sits in an important leadership position in the formal organization of the educational system. As the chief executive of the school board and as the educational leader of his/her professional employees he/she coordinates the interdependent activities of numerous individuals and groups in achieving a common objective - the education of children.

Since the purpose of this research is to determine if any differences exist between the manner in which district superintendents administer rules and the principal's perception of district superintendent's leadership, it seems appropriate to present some studies that have investigated educational leaders (i.e., district superintendents and principals) from the perspective of the leader behavior framework. Also it may provide a perspective of the superintendent's relationship with principals and give the readers of this study a glimpse of what a superintendent of the 1990s is likely to confront in day-to-day operations.

Some of the initial studies in education made a conscious effort to describe how educational leaders behave. Halpin (1957 and 1959) and Evenson (1959) found...
that educational administrators generally value consideration more highly than initiating structure. Also Halpin (1958) concluded in his study of school superintendents that:

The correlation between the two dimensions—consideration and initiating structure—shows that an effective leader can initiate structure without sacrificing consideration.

Moser (1957) who attempted to relate the perceived and professed leadership styles of principals and superintendents to the relationships that exist among them, found a number of significant points. Among them are the following:

1. Superintendents express less confidence in and give the lowest effectiveness ratings to principals whom they perceive as exhibiting idiographic behavior.

2. Superintendents express the highest confidence in and give the highest effectiveness ratings to principals who profess to be nomothetic.

3. Principals tend to emphasize idiographic behavior in dealing with teachers and nomothetic behavior in their relations with the superintendent. This indicates that the principal is subjected to different expectations from his/her superintendent than from his/her teachers and that the principal
behaves differently from his/her superiors than with his/her subordinates.

Thus Moser concluded that the principal reacts by changing his/her behavior dependent on which group he/she is with at a particular time. The principal stresses nomothetic behavior (centralized authority, goal achievement, and regulations) when with the superintendent. However, this is not so when with teachers, instead the principal stresses idiographic behavior (individual needs, minimum rules and decentralized authority).

Willower (1960) investigated the relationship between leadership styles and leaders' perceptions of subordinates. A major finding was that principals who tended to regard teachers as professionals used idiographic leadership style to a larger extent than principals who did not think of teachers as professionals.

Not long after Willower conducted his research, Lonsdale (1964) looked at the concern of integrating organizational goals with individual needs in two dimensions which he designated as task-achievement and need-satisfaction. Task-achievement referred to the accomplishment of stated organizational goals through participatory efforts; whereas, need-satisfaction referred to the arrangements made available for the satisfaction of the needs of individual workers. He voiced that in order
to effectively sustain the organization in dynamic equilibrium it is crucial to accomplish the tasks of the organization and the needs of the individual within the boundaries of the organization.

Getzels (1968) went on to state that the administrator is constantly confronted with the problem of knowing when to fortify organizational goals and when to moderate. Thus for the administrator it is necessary to exercise judgement and discretion in integrating organizational objectives and individual needs. Moreover Guba (1960), a close affiliate of Getzels, made a statement that mirrors the aforementioned statement of Getzels. He voiced:

The unique task of the administrator can now be understood as that of mediating between these two sets of behavior-eliciting forces, that is, the nomothetic and idiographic, so as to produce behavior which is at once organizational useful as well as individually satisfying. Action which will lead to such behavior on the part of personnel is the highest expression of the administrator's art.

Morsink (1969) found that educational administrators personal demographics have shown that principals' sex and conceptual complexity affect their behavior patterns. He learned that the female principals were found to achieve significantly higher representation, demand reconciliation,
predictive accuracy, integration, and superior orientation score, but lower tolerance of freedom scores than male principals. Additionally Silver (1975) and Burrus (1979) found that conceptually complex principals were perceived by their faculties to be more person oriented than their conceptually simpler counterparts.

Walcott (1973) and Sarason (1971) found the principalship heavily constrained by directives and rules from above, but nonetheless open to considerable flexibility in interpretation of what the system would allow.

Sally (1979) conducted a study of superintendents' job priorities and found that superintendents basically do the same things; they differ however as to the priority or importance assigned to these functions or dimensions due to the influences or interactions of circumstances which they perform. His findings suggest that the importance superintendents assign to their job activities is influenced by their operating circumstances. Superintendents must adjust to these circumstances and, in many instances, alter them to suit their leadership styles and sense of mission.

Pitner and Ogawa (1981) concluded that:

(1) superintending is communicating and that most of this
communication occurs in dyads. Further that it is characteristically brief and fragmented, and although it usually involves subordinates, members of boards of education or members of the community at large are often involved; and (2) superintendents are constrained by social and organizational structures. However, they still control a major part of their day-to-day work and exert an important organizational influence.

Pitner and Ogawa went on to say that superintendents maintained a complex network of relationships with individuals and groups in their school systems as well as in the environment. Also that superintendents spend almost half of their time with subordinates and that they exert a sizeable influence on the flow of information in their organizations, and they choreographed the activities of participants in the operation and governance of their school systems.

According to Crowson and Porter-Gehrie (1981) the principal is expected to be responsive to the interests and demands of the central office, but perhaps also to buttress the school from such demands. They convey that the principal must carefully balance "responsiveness" against expectations from central office administrative (e.g., superintendents), that an authoritative image will be maintained and that the principal will be in control of his or her school.
Duignan (1980) in a comprehensive descriptive study of the administrative behavior of school superintendents concluded that the superintendent's administrative behavior is not, generally, as planned and organized as is sometimes suggested in the literature. They found:

1. The superintendent works in a world of action where uninvited verbal encounters and externally imposed deadlines play havoc with his/her attempts to bring order to his/her work behavior.

2. The superintendent is a frustrated individual who is faced with an array of problems and crises of varied composition.

3. The superintendent is confronted with the myriad tasks and responsibilities of his/her job, and therefore rarely finds sufficient time to analyze his/her problems and plan his/her strategies.

Cunnigham and Hertges (1982) in a study of superintendents found that human relation skills and other conflict resolution skills are new skills superintendents need if they are to continue to be effective. In fact they concluded that superintendents need to have the ability to conceptualize and develop a plan for their school district, and above all have a basic attitude of respect for the worth and dignity of others.
According to Blumberg (1985) the genesis of the focal delima of superintendents as leaders is immediately isolated by the pressure to keep the school system organization running smoothly. Unfortunately this implies a reactive status. It suggests the need for a superintendent to be continually aware of potential problems in the schools or the community, so that the conflicts emanating from them may be managed with a minimum of disruption in the system. If the superintendent is successful in playing out this part of his/her role, he/she may indeed gain the reputation of being a manager who is able to keep things under control and who can keep the system out of trouble, or at least keep aggravating problems at a low level. This clearly is a stable state that school boards would undoubtedly applaud. Blumberg concludes that by focusing on management of conflict and becoming highly skilled at it, a superintendent will assure himself/herself a long tenure in his/her position, if he/she desires it.

Zigler, Kihoe and Reisman (1985) in a study of city managers and school superintendents regarding conflict found that superintendent relations with school principals create problems not felt by city managers. Whereas municipal departments develop strong relations with functional interest groups, principals may develop independent influence based upon geographical identity. Moreover, they determined that principals and teachers are in positions to
exacerbate conflict by simple manipulation of policy. Further they went on to say that the extent to which principals correctly interpret the values of their constituents and make incremental adjustment in policy will be an important variable in conflict resolution. Thus, they conclude that securing the loyalty of principals and allowing them the latitude to modify policy can be a valuable strategy for superintendents.

Interestingly, Goodlad (1987) voiced that the district office (e.g., superintendent) and the schools are governed by agreement, not directives. He believes if superintendents as leaders are going to be successful in decentralizing decision making to the school, as is presently the situation in the Hawaii public school system, superintendents must insure that the relations between the district office and the school are governed by agreements not directives.

Harrison and Peterson (1988) point out that superintendents place the heaviest emphasis on the general quality of instruction in the school when they evaluate principals, followed closely by teacher performance/morale and the atmosphere of the school. Principals, on the other hand, most often site public relations as a measure of effectiveness, followed by teacher performance/morale,
atmosphere at the school and general quality of instruction.

Interestingly, Hill, Wise and Shapiro (1989) found in a study conducted for the RAND Corporation that superintendents developed tactics for dealing with their central administrators, principals and teachers in pushing toward reforms. They found that they developed similar strategies in three areas.

1. Information - superintendents who want school change increase the flow of information. They manage the media to keep their priorities and accomplishments in the public eye and to reinforce the belief that the schools still need help.

2. Principals - superintendents manage schools by managing principals. They tried to remove organizational barriers between themselves and principals, in some cases by reorganizing the school system to remove an intervening administrative layer.

3. Professional Expectations - superintendents exemplified the tight-loose metaphor popularized in In Search of Excellence. They were explicit and controlling about values and priorities but gave subordinates room to create their own tactical solutions to problems.
Alpin (1984) and Hayden (1990) support the contention that administrators' beliefs are greatly affected by those of their superintendents.

Kasten and Asbaugh (1991) found that superintendents valued their subordinates "human" more than their technical and conceptual skills, and superintendents wanted principals to use their own judgement in dilemmas but at the same time did not want principals to defy district policy.

According to Thomas and Moran (1992) participative and team management is the new coinage of the day in school administration. They believe the new superintendent, whether place- or career-bound, will need to be schooled in effective leadership and community relations that forge consensus rather than divisions.

Marshall (1992) indicates that school administrators value use of persuasion and being open and honest and fair rather than top-down management. She went on to state that with such values guiding principal's decisions at the school site, we should expect increased equity, empowerment, and professional development coming from the superintendent.

Finally researchers Sammuel E. Krug and Frederic M. Wirt (1992) who work for the National Center for School Leadership polled 1,200 principals in six states -
Illinois, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Oregon, Mississippi and West Virginia and concluded that how effectively principals perform their jobs depends heavily on their dedication to their work and the support they receive from superintendents and staffs.

Based on the research presented above, initiating structure can be commensurate with concern for production or concern for fulfilling organizational goals. Consideration can be commensurate with concern for people or concern for employees need-satisfaction.

Without a doubt the literature reveals that the concern for production has been foremost in the minds of management. Clearly this concern is vital in order that an organization can proceed to survive. For over half of a century, many authors have been pointing out that concern for people, in conjunction with concern for production, may provide a more effective approach.

In addition the literature reveals the fact that if school systems are going to improve by leaps and bounds, then superintendents are going to have to demonstrate strong leadership, especially in this day and age. For example it was pointed out that effective superintendents:

1. back the career progress of subordinates and promote their personal growth, always with a vision toward improving the organization;
2. are comfortable with letting administrators participate in the management of an organization;
3. see decision making as a learning experience and shared responsibility;
4. develop in their people the capacity to change, even when it means taking risks by moving away from established norms; and
5. bring to their careers a strong people orientation and the realization that without change there will be no progam.

Summary
It is quite clear that a bureaucratic organization does not operate in a vacuum. The policy makers and leaders in such organizations, based on research that has been conducted over several decades on the nature of organizations, scientific management theory, the human relations movement, motivation theory, and leadership theory, now have the opportunity to select from this research the particular components that best fit their bureaucratic organizations. In so doing, their organizations are more likely to effectively and efficiently achieve established goals. The literature review indicates one of the primary tenets of participative-management is it cannot be superficial if it is to be effective in providing integration of
goals and needs. Blake and Mouton (1964) identified "team-management" as the optimal management style. Likert (1976) believes that the "Systems 4" style based on teamwork, mutual trust, involvement and confidence in others is the most optimal style. Both contended that concern for production and concern for people are complementary rather than mutually exclusive. According to Argyris (1964) without interpersonal competence or a psychologically safe environment, the organization is a breeding ground for mistrust, intergroup conflict, rigidity, and so on, which in turn lead to a decrease in organizational success in problem solving. Other researchers such as Carpenter (1971), Donnelly (1971), and Aram, Morgan and Esbeck (1971) are in consensus in their particular findings regarding integration of organizational goals and individual needs through active participation. Kanter (1983), expressed that organizations should share leadership in ways which recognize the obsolete model of the single person as leader and moreover the role of leaders should be changed from ordering to inspiring. Also, according to Thomas and Moran (1992) participative and team management is the new coinage of the day in school administration.

Getzels and Guba (1957) conveyed that such functions as the assignment of positions, the requirements of facilities, the organization of procedures, the regulation
of activity, and the evaluation of performance are the responsibility of the superordinate member (e.g., district superintendent) of the bureaucratic hierarchy, and that each function becomes effective only as it takes with the subordinate members (e.g., principals). This interpersonal relationship is the critical factor in administration of an organization.

Regarding leadership research conducted by such researchers as Halpin (1955, 1958, 1959), Stogdill and Coons (1957), Willower (1960), Guba (1960), Brown (1967), Getzels (1968), Sarason (1971), Wolcott (1973), Sally (1979) and Cartwright and Zander (1986) initiating structure can be commensurate with concern for production or concern for fulfilling organizational goals. Further, consideration can be commensurate with concern for employees need-satisfaction.

More recent studies investigating leadership in school systems such as Blumberg (1985), Goodlad (1987), Harrison and Peterson (1988), Sirotnik and Clark (1988), Hayden (1990), Kasten and Asbaugh (1991), Sergiovani (1992) and Marshall (1992) continue to point out that successful leaders balance realities and possibilities; the goal is kept in sight and the people kept in mind.

This study recognizes the significance of the research conducted over the years on leadership, motivation, nature
of organizations, and human behavior. The research has provided direction and guidance to the leaders and policy makers of bureaucratic organizations, including the Hawaii State Department of Education, and when properly used helped to improve quality and productivity.

This particular study acknowledges the Department of Education as a bureaucracy that is bounded by both efficiency and rationality and stands firmly on a legal foundation. However, the tenets of concern for people in conjunction with concern for production as reflected in the aforementioned literature review are of paramount importance within the organization. The study also recognizes the district superintendents occupy positions of social dominance and that they can apply different types of rule administration behavior patterns to achieve this dominance, including representative-centered, mock-centered, or punishment centered rule administration behavior. While the district superintendents may have achieved social dominance through one of the aforementioned behavior patterns, it is conceivable that principals' perceptions of the district superintendent's rule administration behavior pattern may range on a predetermined leadership scale from low to high, depending on the type of rule administration pattern used.

Given the facts that principals are included in collective bargaining which encourages joint decision-
making, that the Hawaii State Department of Education is currently experiencing some major initiatives, including School Community Based Management (SCBM) which fosters site-based, collaborative decision-making by schools and promulgates that decisions regarding educational needs of the schools can best be made by those closest to the point of implementation, and that the literature review seemsly supports this viewpoint, it seemed appropriate to investigate certain aspects of school organization as represented specifically by perceptions of the principals of the district superintendents, who are the principals' normal contact with upper level management.

Therefore, the review of the aforementioned literature provided the knowledge, expertise and insights needed by the investigator to properly give careful examination to the role of district superintendents in the Hawaii public school system, to their relations with their principals, in an effort to see if there are significant differences among the various district superintendents in rule administration behavior and leadership behavior as perceived by their respective principals. Also whether differences exist in level of militancy among the district superintendents as perceived by their respective principals.
Chapter Three provides information on the research methodology employed in this investigation and is described under the following general headings: The Population and Sample, The Instruments, The Collection of Data, and The Statistical Treatment.

The Population and Sample

The population to which this study was generalized is the 245 public school principals employed by the Department of Education.

The sample consisted of a total of one-hundred and fifty-five principals from the seven administrative districts (Honolulu, Central, Leeward, Windward, Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai Districts) in the State of Hawaii Public School System. The method used to determine the sample size was abstracted from Isaac's and Michael's book entitled, *Handbook in Research and Evaluation* (1990). They provided the following formula for estimating the sample size (S) needed relative to (a) population of a known size, (N), (b) a specified confidence level (e.g., .95) associated with a chi square statistic for one degree of freedom, and (c) the designated degree of accuracy as reflected by the amount of sampling error d that can be tolerated. The formula is as follow:
\[ S = \frac{X^2 NP (1 - P)}{d^2 (N - 1) + XP (1 - P)} \]

In which

- \( S \) = required sample size
- \( N \) = the given population size
- \( P \) = population proportion that for table construction has been assumed to be .50, as this magnitude yields the maximum possible sample size required
- \( d \) = the degree of accuracy as reflected by the amount of error that can be tolerated in the fluctuation of a sample proportion \( p \) about the population proportion \( P \)-the value for \( d \) being .05 in the calculations for entries in the table, a quantity equal to \( \pm 1.96 \frac{\sigma}{\hat{p}} \)
- \( X^2 \) = table value of chi square for one degree of freedom relative to the desired level of confidence, which was 3.841 for the .95 confidence level represented by entries in the table.

In sum, the needed size \( S \) for the randomly chosen sample used in this study is from a given finite population of \( N \) cases such that the sample proportion \( P \) will be within \( \pm .05 \) of the population proportion \( P \) with a 95\% level of confidence.
Principals were identified through the Hawaii State Department of Education (DOE) personnel rolls and the system used to determine the sample was based upon a procedure of random selection employing a table of random numbers (Tuckman, 1978).

This investigation deals exclusively with public schools in Hawaii. Elementary, intermediate and high school principals were involved in the investigation. Additionally, no differentiation was made in the selection of the sample regarding principals' age, sex, salary, ethnicity, highest level of education attained, years of professional service within the public school system of Hawaii as a principal, or size and type of school. However, it was expected that personal characteristics would approximate statewide norms due to the fact that all principals would have an equal opportunity to be selected in the investigation.

The Instrumentation

The data for this study was collected by means of a questionnaire which included three sections as follows: Section 1 - a Rule Administration Scale; Section 2 - an Executive Leadership Instrument; and, Section 3 - a Militancy Scale. A concise description of each of the instruments is provided.
The Rule Administration Scale

The Rule Administration Scale (See Appendix A) was developed by Spaulding (1973) and consists of three subscales: (1) Representative, (2) Mock, and (3) Punishment-centered. Each subscale provides an index of the perception of the principal about the rule behavior of the district superintendent in respect to that type of rule enforcement. In the development of the scale Spaulding started with an initial set of forty-five statements regarding rules that are generally found in school districts. These statements were divided into the classifications related to the three types of rule administration often found in schools. Fifteen statements specified representative rule behavior, fifteen statements indicated mock behavior, and fifteen statements pointed out punishment-centered rule administration.

The pilot questionnaire was administered in five different school districts and to selected graduate students. According to Edwards (1957) a total of 100 subjects completed the questionnaire satisfactorily which is the number recommended by Guttman as optional for scaling purposes. Further, the data were analyzed by the subprogram Guttman Scale of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. As a result the discriminating power of each question was ascertained and those specific questions with the best predictive power were retained. Following
subscales were developed for Representative, Mock, and Punishment-centered rule administration.

Coefficients of reproducibility are reported for each subscale. Guttman (1944) states that a coefficient higher than .90 is considered to be an indicator of a scale which has maximum scaleability. Also, he went on to report, that scales with coefficients of reproducibility less than .90 are generally acceptable in empirical studies.

Questions for the Rule Administration Scale are presented in three different manners. The Representative rule administration questions have phrases such as "assume you had a valid reason" or "believe you had a good reason" which served as indicators of this particular type of rule administration. These questions are to represent those rules that are both enforced by management and obeyed by the principals. These items are stated and coded in the following way:

The district superintendent would assume you had a good reason if you did not attend a scheduled principal's meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statements for Mock rule administration are put forward in such a way to indicate that the rules are
neither enforced by management nor obeyed by principals. Key words such as "ignore" or disregard" in the question distinguish Mock behavior from the other types of rule administration. These statements are presented and coded in the following manner:

The district superintendent would ignore it if you failed to appear for a teacher-principal conference.

Never (1) Rarely (2) Usually (3) Almost Always (4) Always (5)

Those questions which are indicative of rules which are enforced by district superintendents and evaded by the principals are considered to be of the Punishment-centered type of rule administration. Carefully selected words like "penalize" or "take action against" denote this type of rule administration. These statements are presented and coded in the following form:

If you left school early, the district superintendent has a method of checking and would penalize you.

Never (1) Rarely (2) Usually (3) Almost Always (4) Always (5)

A total of 19 questions makes up the Rule Administration Scale: (1) Representative--six questions: 2, 4, 8, 12, 15, 17, and (2) Mock--seven questions: 3, 6, 9,
11, 13, 16, 18, and (3) Punishment-centered--six questions: 1, 5, 7, 10, 14, 19.

In summary the Rule Administration Scale was developed by using a Guttman scaling technique which resulted in reproducibility coefficients of (1) .9033, (2) .9143, and (3) .9200 respectively for each subscale. The discriminating power of each question was determined and those questions with the best predictive power were retained. A final instrument of nineteen questions consisting of three subscales (Representative, Mock, and Punishment-centered) resulted.

**The Executive Professional Leadership Instrument (EPL)**

The Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) instrument was developed by Gross and Herriott (1965) in their national study concerning executive professional leadership and was modified to be applicable to the district superintendent by the investigator (See Appendix B). The primary interest of the Gross and Herriott study (1965) was the development of an instrument to examine the dimension of a principal's behavior which reflected conformity to a conception of his/her role as leader of his/her staff. In this particular research, the investigator used the same instrument but rather modified the questions to represent dimensions of a district superintendent's behavior which would reflect the degree of conformity to a conception of
his/her role as a leader of principals in the district. Thus, the use of this questionnaire focused on perceptions of the behavior exhibited by the "formally" designated executives of the organization (DOE), the district superintendents rather than principals.

A special distinction is also made because the executives (district superintendents) are primary leaders of the Hawaii State Department of Education.

Gross and Herriott utilized a form of Guttman scaling in the development of the Executive Professional Leadership (EPL) instrument. In order to develop a measure of EPL which would combine the responses of the participants to each question in a stable and unidimensional summary score, a form of Guttman scaling was used. This procedure takes into account the reliability of the questions and reduces the information from a series of items to a single score which can then be used as the definition of each subject's position on the dimension under consideration.

The procedure Gross and Herriott followed was to subject the responses of a random sample of one-fifth of the 1305 survey participants to the 18 EPL questions to an item analysis from which a 12-item H - technique Guttman Scale was derived (Stouffer, 1962). A highly satisfactory coefficient of reproducibility of .978 was obtained in the operational definition of the EPL scale.
It is important to note that the EPL Scale is a scale of relative positions. Guttman scaling, like most procedures in the social sciences, does not enable us to say how much EPL a given leader (e.g., district superintendent) exerts, nor how much more one district superintendent exhibits than another. It does, however, enable us to assign scores to district superintendents in the DOE on their EPL, and to determine whether systemic differences occur among them. The items of the scale are preceded by the following statement: To what extent does your district superintendent engage in the following kinds of behavior. The items are presented and coded in the following form:

Gives principals the feeling that their work is an "important" activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to Gross and Herriott (1965), Spaulding (1973) and McDannel (1973) used the EPL instrument to obtain perceptions of the leadership behavior of executives of professionally staffed organizations and their efforts to facilitate the achievement of organizational objectives through influencing subordinate members.
In summary, just as teachers in the DOE bureaucracy are exposed to principals who offer them strong or weak professional leadership, so, in turn, principals in the DOE bureaucracy may be given variable professional leadership by their district superintendents. For principals this means that although they are the chief leaders in their schools they are at the same time subordinate and accountable to a superior official (e.g., district superintendent) whom they look to for leadership.

The investigator used the EPL instrument to examine the executive professional leadership strength of the seven district superintendents in the DOE as perceived through the eyes of their principals, and to determine if differences exist among the seven various district superintendents.

The Militancy Scale

The Militancy Scale (Appendix C) which is a Likert-type scale consists of 14 items developed by Patrick Carlton (1967) in a study of North Carolina teachers (787) and principals (462) in regard to their position toward collective negotiations and sanctions. Basically, the scale was designed to measure organizational militancy and was developed on the following assumptions: 1) that attitudes are quantitatively identifiable and therefore can be assigned score values, 2) that attitudes lie along a continuum running from strong favor to equally strong
disfavor, 3) that an undecided or neutral attitude occupies a middle position on the aforementioned continuum, 4) that collective negotiation is made up of at least two complementary facets, (1) the negotiating process, and (2) sufficient coercive forces to cause near equality of the parties involved. These were assumed to be non-separable characteristics.

The scoring of the Militancy Scale ran from one through five, with the high score being assigned to those responses favorable to militancy. It should be pointed out that a number of items were so designed that strong disagreement indicated favorable attitude toward militancy or collective action. The items were designed in the above manner to prevent response set form occurring.

Initially 104 items were written expressing various opinions about militancy. These items were then submitted to a jury of 100 educators who responded to the items and wrote critical analyses of them. An item analysis was carried out to identify the items which discriminated at or beyond the .01 level for use in the final scale. The instrument was as previously mentioned devised to measure organizational militancy in the public school setting. Further the scale is a Likert-type scale developed on the basis of the following assumptions: 1) that attitudes are quantitively identifiable and therefore can be assigned
score values, (2) that attitudes lie along a continuum running from strong disfavor to equally strong favor, and (3) that an undecided or neutral attitude occupies a middle position on the aforementioned continuum. The scoring of the Scale runs from one through five, with the high score being arbitrarily assigned to those responses favorable to militancy. Items scores were summed to provide a single test score; the higher the test score the greater the militancy on the part of the respondent. The split-half reliability of the scale was found to be .84. Also the sample yielded a reliability coefficient of .9232. The questions are presented in the following fashion:

I feel that the good principal can always get the salary he/she needs without resorting to collective negotiations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Collection of Data

The investigator mailed a three-part questionnaire to a randomly selected listing of principals currently in-service with the Hawaii State Department of Education (See Appendix D). Also, in order that survey participants in the study would feel comfortable, total anonymity was assured. It was not possible to connect the names of the survey participants to the data and biographical materials
collected. Furthermore, all survey forms were held in strictest confidence. Information included in the study is in coded form only, and no names are used. Thus, complete anonymity is assured. Further, all participants received a self-addressed, stamped envelope for convenience in returning the data. After a time period of approximately one month, a second request for information was sent out strongly urging cooperation from those participants (non-respondents) who may not have completed and returned the questionnaire to please do so. In case the non-respondents misplaced the original materials, a new set of materials was enclosed along with another stamped, return-addressed envelope. A copy of the follow-up letter may be found in Appendix E.

The raw data was extracted from the instruments and coded, entered into the computer and verified. All statistical tests were performed with the computer program entitled, "STATSGRAPHICS".

The Statistical Treatment

To analyze the difference between the selected variables, a series of F values were generated. The F values revealed allowed the researcher to decide whether there were significant differences among the means of the groups being compared. The level of significance was set at the .05 level.
For the purpose of this study, analysis of variance is able to answer the question, Is the variability between groups large enough in comparison with variability within groups to justify the inference that the means of the populations from which different groups were sampled are not all the same? In other words if the variability between groups is large enough, we can conclude they probably come from different populations and that there is a statistically significant difference present in the data. The particular statistical test yielding the answer is the F-ratio:

\[
F = \frac{\text{Between Group Variance}}{\text{Within Group Variance}}
\]

While analysis of variance was the first step in the analysis of these data, it was a preliminary exploratory tool. If a significant F-ratio was obtained, the researcher would then know that somewhere in his/her data something other than chance was probably operating. The researcher must attempt to isolate the presence, nature, and extent of this non chance influence. In this study, the researcher proceeded to use a post hoc test (Scheffe) to determine who varies from whom. According to Huck, Cormier and Bounds (1974) of the five basic multiple comparison tests that are generally used for follow-up analyses to help a researcher find out exactly where the
significant differences lie after a significant F-ratio has been obtained the Scheffe's test is the most conservative.

Regarding the ancillary question to be examined multiple regression analysis was used. According to Isaac and Michael (1990) two important objectives that are accomplished using this statistical technique are: (a) to determine the degree of relationship given by an index number known as the multiple correlation coefficient between a customarily continuous criterion measure (dependent variable) and an optimally weighted combination of two or more predictors (independent variable) that are usually continuous and (b) to predict the standing of individuals in a sample on the criterion variable from scores earned in a weighted linear combination of predictor variables along with an indication of expected margin of error.

The following tables present the statistical treatment utilized to treat the hypotheses of the study. In all cases, the probability of making a Type I error was set at the .05 level of significance. The following table presents the statistical treatment utilized to treat the hypotheses of the study.
| Hypothesis 1 | No difference among 7 dist. sups. on each of three subscales of the Rule Admin. Behavior. | F-Test (ANOVA) (SCHEFFE) |
| Hypothesis 2 | No difference among 7 dist. sups. Leadership behavior. | F-Test (ANOVA) (SCHEFFE) |
| Hypothesis 3 | No difference among 7 dist. sups. in level of militancy as perceived by principals. | F-Test (ANOVA) (SCHEFFE) |
| Hypothesis 4 | No difference among 7 dist. sups. rule admin. and leadership behavior as perceived by principals based on the personal demographic variables of age, sex, or length of service as a principal. | F-Test (ANOVA) (SCHEFFE) |

In summary, four major theoretical hypotheses were tested to determine the probability that the null hypothesis for each may be rejected. In all cases, the .05 level of confidence was be required. For those hypotheses that were rejected a post hoc test (Scheffe) was be used to determine which districts (or superintendents) vary from each other. Also, the ancillary question was statistically examined using the technique of multiple regression analysis.

**Study Variables**

**Independent Variables:** There were two groups of independent variables: (1) The seven district
superintendents responsible for the management and leadership of the seven administrative school districts in the state of Hawaii and (2) the demographic variables of the principals in the sample which include: age, sex and length of service as a principal.

Dependent Variables: There were five dependent variables: (1) Scores of the principals on each of the three subscales of the Rule Administration Scale which was used to measure the type of rule administration exhibited by district superintendents; (2) scores of principals on the Executive Professional Leadership Scale which was used to measure the level of leadership demonstrated by district superintendents; and (3) scores of principals on the Carlton Militancy Scale which was used to measure the level of principal militancy.

Summary

The investigation entailed learning of possible differences among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents regarding: (1) the perceptions of principals of the type of rule administration each exhibits; (2) the level of leadership each demonstrates; and (3) level of principal militancy displayed in each district superintendent's jurisdiction.

In order to obtain the data needed to test out the hypotheses a three part questionnaire was mailed out to a
random sampling of Hawaii State Department of Education principals (155). The use of the three Rule Administration sub-scales, that is, Representative, Mock, and Punishment-centered, provided the investigator with the quantifications necessary to examine the possible differences among district superintendents regarding their particular rule administration style. The Executive Professional Leadership instrument was used for determining possible differences among district superintendents regarding their level of leadership, and the Carlton Militancy Scale was used to determine the level of principal militancy.

Four major theoretical hypotheses were tested in their null form. The F-Value was utilized in order to determine if the difference predicted is statistically different at a probability level which would allow generalization to the population (N=245). In all cases, the .05 level of confidence was required in order to reject the null hypotheses. The differences involved in the testing were obtained by using the computer program series called Statsgraphics.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS

Introduction

The study was designed to determine whether there were significant differences among district superintendent's rule administration behavior, leadership behavior and staff militancy as perceived by the principals in their districts, using the scores of the principals on three behaviorally based instruments and a number of demographic characteristics. One-way analysis of variance was employed for each of the three scales (Rule Administration, Leadership and Militancy) to determine whether there were significant differences in mean scores. Where significant differences appeared a post hoc test (Scheffe) was used to further isolate sources of variance.

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine which variables, if any, accounted for the variation in leadership behavior.

Descriptive Statistics

The principals in the study were asked to indicate their sex, age, number of years of service as a school principal, and in which district they were administratively located. Additionally, on a limited number of surveys, respondents elected not to indicate a particular demographic variable (i.e., sex, age, etc.). For these
situations the particular case was deleted from the statistical treatment for that demographic variable. It should be noted that the deletions did not reduce the N to a point where the results decreased the confidence level of the study to an unacceptable level.

The distribution of respondent sex and the approximate percentage comparisons with the statewide principal population are presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>% OF PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>STATEWIDE %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All participants reported their age in years. These data were then placed in appropriate age classifications which appear in the Table 3 below. Further, the age distribution of the respondents is shown. Also the mean age of all sample participants was 48 and they ranged in age from 34 to 65.
TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION BY AGE OF PRINCIPAL
SAMPLE PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34-43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN AGE = 48  
S.D. = 5.77465

Principals were also asked to indicate the number of years of experience served as a principal. The table below reveals the distribution of years of experience and what percent of the total each specific distribution range represents. The results are described in Table 4.

TABLE 4
DISTRIBUTION BY YEARS OF PRINCIPAL EXPERIENCE
OF PRINCIPAL SAMPLE PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YRS. OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>NO. OF PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>PERCENT OF PRINCIPALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEAN YRS. EXPERIENCE = 7  
S.D. = 6.06023

Further, it is of interest to note that the average years of experience served as a principal is seven (7) years, and the range of experience is from 1 - 27 years.
Table 5 presents data by the principals participating in the study in the specific district in which they served.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>NUMBER OF PRINCIPALS</th>
<th>PERCENT OF SAMPLE</th>
<th>PERCENT OF TOTAL PRINCIPALS STATEWIDE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT B</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT D</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT E</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT G</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table reflects the district assignment of 151 principals (64.5%) of all school level principals in the Hawaii State Department of Education who participated in the study. It also points out that District B had the largest number of participating principals while District D had the fewest.

The principals were asked to complete three instruments: a leadership scale, militancy scale and rule administration scale which contained three subscales (representative, mock and punishment). The mean, range, and standard deviation for each of the rule administration subscales is presented in the following table. Likewise, for the leadership and militancy scales.
### TABLE 6
RULE ADMINISTRATION LEADERSHIP, AND MILITANCY BEHAVIORAL SCALE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE DEVIATION</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SAMPLE RANGE MINIMUM/MAXIMUM</th>
<th>SAMPLE RANGE</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTATIVE RULE BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.739468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCK RULE BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.500927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUNISHMENT BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.605012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.01657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MILITANCY</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.587866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, descriptive data showing the mean score obtained by each district superintendent via the three measurement instruments completed by principals is presented in Table 7 below. The three instruments utilized were: a rule administration scale which consisted of three subscales (representative, mock and punishment), leadership scale and militancy scale.

### TABLE 7
MEAN SCORES FOR EACH DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT BY RULE ADMINISTRATION SUBSCALES, LEADERSHIP AND MILITANCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICTS</th>
<th>REP.</th>
<th>PUN.</th>
<th>MOCK</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>MILITANCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Results of the Statistical Treatment

As previously indicated four hypotheses were tested in the null form and the F value was employed in order to determine if the difference among groups was statistically significant. In all cases, the .05 level of confidence was required in order to reject the null hypotheses. Following are the results of the tests.

Test of Hypothesis I

This hypothesis investigated whether there was a difference between the three rule administration behavior subscales among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education District Superintendents as perceived by the principals in their districts. This analysis included the comparison of means to determine the probability that the difference among the means is a statistically significant difference rather than a difference which may be a function of chance.

Hypothesis I. There is no significant difference in each of the three rule administration behavior subscales among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents as perceived by the principals in their districts.
A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to determine whether significant differences existed in the subscale scores. Tables 8, 9 and 10 illustrate the data for Hypothesis I.

### TABLE 8

**ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS' REPRESENTATIVE RULE ADMINISTRATION BEHAVIOR, AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS, BY DISTRICTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>13.636434</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2727390</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>.0002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>68.895646</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>.4784420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>82.532079</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at p<.05

The results of the one-way analysis of variance revealed statistically significant differences in representative rule administration among district superintendents. The results were further analyzed through the use of the Scheffe Range Test. Significant difference was found between the following pairs of district superintendents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District B had significantly different and higher means than either district C or A. District F varied from district C but not from any of the other six districts. Thus it appears that four districts provided the means that were the major contributors to the significant difference in Representative Rule Behavior as perceived by the principals.

On the basis of the data provided the null hypothesis was rejected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>1.7503339</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.2917223</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>.3211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>35.649021</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>.2475626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>37.399355</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings of this test indicate that no significant difference exists between district superintendents relative to mock rule administration. The hypothesis was tested in the null form and the .05 level of confidence was set as the critical value, thus the null hypothesis could not be rejected.
TABLE 10
ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE
DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS' PUNISHMENT-CENTERED BEHAVIOR
AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS, BY DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>7.1345509</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1890918</td>
<td>3.636</td>
<td>.0022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>47.090453</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>.3270170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>54.225004</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p<.05

The results of the above statistical analysis demonstrated differences in punishment-centered rule administration among district superintendents. The significant F value was further analyzed through use of the Scheffe Range Test. Significant difference was found between the following pairs of district superintendents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>Districts</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again district C provided the major differentiating scores on punishment centered administration. The perception of principals in that district were that the district superintendent was more punishment centered while districts F and G were perceived as low in this form of administrative behavior.
Two out of three of the one-way analysis of variance tests employed above (Representative and Punishment) indicated significant differences in perceptions of principals toward district superintendents' rule administration behavior based on a comparison of the means of the representative, mock and punishment-centered subscales. Significant differences were found between pairs of superintendents in the representative and punishment subscales. Interestingly, District C showed up four times in different pairs, while District F appeared in two different pairs and District G in one pair. No significant difference was found between district superintendents in the mock rule administration subscale.

On the basis of two of the three subscales producing differences the null hypothesis for the first hypothesis was rejected.

Test of Hypothesis II

This study was also designed to test whether there was a difference among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents' leadership behavior as perceived by the principals in their districts. The second hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis II. There is no significance difference in leadership behavior among the seven Hawaii State Department of
Education district superintendents as perceived by the principals in their districts. To test this hypothesis, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed to determine whether there were significant differences among the means of principals in the seven districts. Table 11 presents the findings.

**TABLE 11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN GROUPS</td>
<td>39.21458</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5357633</td>
<td>8.050</td>
<td>.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUPS</td>
<td>116.09916</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>.8118822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>155.31374</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p<.05

This hypothesis was tested in the null form and the .05 level of confidence was required in order to reject the null hypothesis. The data collected demonstrated statistically significant differences in perceptions of the leadership behavior of district superintendents by the principals among the various districts. The significant F
value was further analyzed through use of the Scheffe Range Test. Significant difference was found between the following pairs of district superintendents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>vs</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>vs</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As is reflected in the above information two districts provided all of the significant difference, namely Districts B and D. Also the Scheffe shows that principals' perceptions of district superintendents' leadership behavior had higher mean scores in Districts B, E, F and G.

Based on the data presented the null hypothesis for the second hypothesis was rejected.

**Test of Hypothesis III**

An additional concern in the research study was an investigation of whether or not a significant difference existed in level of militancy among the principals in the seven Hawaii State Department of Education districts.

**Hypothesis III:** No significant difference exists in level of militancy among the principals in the seven Hawaii State Department of Education districts.

A one-way analysis of variance was calculated to find out whether or not a significant difference would be
derived and the data for Hypothesis III are reported in Table 12.

TABLE 12

RESULTS OF THE ONE-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SCORES OF THE LEVEL OF PRINCIPAL MILITANCY AMONG DISTRICTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN GROUPS</td>
<td>4.976161</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8293602</td>
<td>2.522</td>
<td>.0237*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN GROUPS</td>
<td>47.345988</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>.3287916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>52.322150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p<.05

Hypothesis III was also tested in the null form and the .05 level of confidence was required in order to reject the null hypothesis. The results of the calculation revealed statistically significant differences in level of militancy among principals by district. Additionally, the significant F values were analyzed through the use of the Scheffe Range Test. The only significant difference was found between Districts E and G. The mean scores of these districts indicate that District E principals had a higher mean score (3.83) on the militancy scale than the principals in District G (3.19). Further, District E has the highest level of militancy among principals by the various districts, while District G has the lowest level.
On the basis of the data calculated the null hypothesis for the third hypothesis was rejected.

**Test of Hypothesis IV**

The fourth hypothesis investigated whether there were significant differences in perceptions of district superintendent's rule administration and leadership behavior by age, by length of service as a principal, and by sex among principals.

**Hypothesis IV:** There are no significant differences in perceptions of district superintendent's rule administration subscales and leadership behavior by age, length of service as a principal and sex among principals.

As previously noted in Tables 8, 9, 10 and 11 significant differences were found via one-way analysis variance tests employed to determine if differences in perceptions of principals toward district superintendents rule administration behavior and leadership behavior existed. Differences were noted in the representative and punishment-centered subscales and in leadership. Hence, for this particular hypothesis an effort was made to individually test those district superintendents who differed on the rule administration behavior subscales and the leadership scale to see if the independent variables
(main effects) of age, experience and sex may have contributed to the differences. Differences were found among the following district superintendents:

Representative Subscale - Districts B, C, F, and A.

Punishment-Centered Subscale - Districts C, F, and G.

Leadership Scale - Districts B, E, F, G, A, and D.

| TABLE 13 |
| ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT B'S REPRESENTATIVE RULE ADMINISTRATION BEHAVIOR SUBSCALE AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS BY AGE, SEX AND EXPERIENCE |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>2.9155001</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7288750</td>
<td>1.497</td>
<td>.2358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>.3180666</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.1060222</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.8830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.0488777</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0488777</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.7575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>11.195713</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.4867701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14.377800</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of analyses indicate no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district B toward representative rule administration based on age, experience and sex.
TABLE 14
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT F'S REPRESENTATIVE RULE ADMINISTRATION BEHAVIOR SUBSCALE AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS BY AGE, SEX AND EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>2.2253647</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5563412</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>.4075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>.9497444</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3165815</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.6199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.9044253</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9044253</td>
<td>1.741</td>
<td>.2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>7.2732865</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.5195205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10.495748</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings reveal no significant differences in the perceptions of the principals in district F toward representative rule administration based on age, experience or sex.

TABLE 15
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT C'S REPRESENTATIVE RULE ADMINISTRATION BEHAVIOR SUBSCALE AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS BY AGE, SEX AND EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.8578805</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.2144701</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.8115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>5.7915768</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9305256</td>
<td>3.507</td>
<td>.0572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.0555208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0555208</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.7606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>5.5046901</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.5504690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12.012053</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The calculations provided do not reveal significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district C toward representative rule administration based on age, sex and experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>1.4786169</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4928723</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.6115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>4.4551477</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4850492</td>
<td>1.922</td>
<td>.2046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.0952136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0952136</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.7383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>6.1819970</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.7727496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10.957344</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district A toward representative rule administration based on age, sex and experience.

Thus in all four of the districts that had significant differences in the subscale of representative rule administration in Hypothesis I the demographics of age, experience and sex did not appear to be causally related to those differences. The null hypothesis for this aspect of Hypothesis IV could not be rejected.
TABLE 17
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT G'S PUNISHMENT-CENTERED RULE ADMINISTRATION BEHAVIOR SUBSCALE AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS BY AGE, SEX AND EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>1.7544087</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4386022</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>.3746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>2.9065400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9688467</td>
<td>2.592</td>
<td>.1055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.4968113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4968113</td>
<td>1.329</td>
<td>.2734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>4.1109812</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.3737256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7.3817750</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings indicate no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district G toward punishment-centered rule administration behavior based on age, experience and sex.

TABLE 18
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT C'S PUNISHMENT-CENTERED RULE ADMINISTRATION BEHAVIOR SUBSCALE AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS BY AGE, SEX AND EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>1.5840543</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3960136</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.6165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>1.4366578</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.478859</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.5062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.2521408</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2521408</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.5299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>5.7558623</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.575562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9.4360737</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analyses indicate there were no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district C towards punishment-centered rule administration behavior based on age, sex and experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.1726499</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0431625</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.9297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>.7997839</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2665946</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>.3182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.0000099</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0000099</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.9947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>2.9052107</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.2075150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4.3197913</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings reveal there were no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district F towards punishment-centered rule administration behavior based on age, experience and sex.

Therefore in all three of the districts that had significant differences on the subscale of punishment-centered rule administration in Hypothesis I the demographics of age, experience and sex did not appear to be casually related to those differences. The null hypothesis for this aspect of Hypothesis IV could not be rejected.
The results of this test indicate there were no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district B towards leadership based on age, sex and experience.

### TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT E'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS BY AGE, SEX AND EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>3.1570385</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7892596</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.6205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>1.2554665</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4184888</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.7835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.4845042</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4845042</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>.5379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>13.980682</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.1650569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18.621781</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings demonstrated there were no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district E towards leadership behavior based on age, experience and sex.

**TABLE 22**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT F'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS BY AGE, SEX AND EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.4881590</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.1220397</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.9797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>1.1462013</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.3820671</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.8099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.4685160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4685160</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.5469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>16.651046</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.1893604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19.334774</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of variance indicated there were no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district F towards leadership behavior based on age, experience and sex.
TABLE 23
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT G'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS BY AGE, SEX AND EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>4.6344198</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1586050</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>.3215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>1.9197033</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.6399011</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>.5551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.1061730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1061730</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.7380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>9.6375770</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.8761434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15.384420</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result indicated no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district G towards leadership behavior based on age, experience and sex.

TABLE 24
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT A'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS BY AGE, SEX AND EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>2.5866858</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8622286</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.6010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>3.5451785</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1817262</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.4822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.01067822</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.1067822</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.7857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>10.500031</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.3125038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>15.037775</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of variance indicated there were no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in
district A towards leadership behavior based on age, experience and sex.

TABLE 25
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT D'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR AS PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPALS BY AGE, SEX, AND EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF VARIATION</th>
<th>SUM OF SQUARES</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARE</th>
<th>F-RATIO</th>
<th>SIG. LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAIN EFFECTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>.4099644</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.1024911</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.8525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP.</td>
<td>.7102795</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.2367598</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.5820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>.2120980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2120980</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.4700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESIDUAL</td>
<td>1.2834308</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3208577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.5615231</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings revealed there were no significant differences in perceptions of the principals in district D towards leadership behavior based on age, experience and sex.

Thus in all six of the districts that had significant differences on the leadership scale in Hypothesis II the demographics of age, experience and sex did not appear to be causally related to those differences. The null hypothesis for this aspect of Hypothesis IV could not be rejected.

Ancillary Findings

Utilizing the descriptive data which was reported by the respondents in the study, additional analysis was
conducted to determine if there were amounts of variance in leadership scores of the seven district superintendents which are related to the perception of their rule administration behavior, and the personal and demographic variables among principals.

Statistics derived from stepwise regression analysis are noted in Table 26 below. This is a forward stepwise analysis which provided the R-squared statistic for the following perceptual and demographic variables: (1) representative rule administration behavior; (2) punishment-centered rule administration behavior; (3) mock rule administration behavior; (4) militancy; (5) age; (6) sex; and (7) experience. Although, each variable was entered into the equation one at a time, Table 26 includes only the variables which contributed to the variance at a probability level less than (p<.05). There were two perception-type variables of representative and punishment-centered rule administration behavior that met this standard. The other five variables are not reflected in this table because they did not contribute to explaining the variation in leadership. The R-squared statistic indicates the percent of variation in leadership was explained by the representative and punishment-centered variables.
Statistics derived for the stepwise regression analysis reveal an R2 of .26011, indicating 26.0% of the variation in leadership was explained by representative rule administration behavior and 3.4% is due to punishment-centered rule administration behavior.

In sum the stepwise regression analysis resulted in two variables, namely representative and punishment-centered rule administration accounting for nearly all of the variation (29.4%) in leadership. None of the other variables (mock, militancy, age, sex and experience) contributed to explaining the variation in leadership at or beyond the default level.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to determine whether there were significant differences among district superintendents' rule administration behavior, leadership behavior and staff militancy as perceived by principals in their districts, using the scores of the principals on three behaviorally based instruments and a number of demographic characteristics. The study was conducted in the context of the State of Hawaii public school system. The Department of Education administers the statewide system of public schools, financed primarily by the state legislature. The governance of the Department of Education is by a Board of Education. The Board is an executive board consisting of thirteen (13) elected members and a public high school student who is selected by the Hawaii State Student Council and serves as a non-voting member. The Board of Education is empowered by law to formulate policy and to exercise control over the public school system through its appointed executive officer, the Superintendent of Education.

Four (4) major, division-level staff offices, headed by assistant superintendents, provide statewide professional and technical support services and programs to the schools: (1) Office of Business Services, (2) Office of Personnel Services, (3) Offices of Instructional Services
and (4) Office of Information and Telecommunication Services.

The public schools are aligned under seven (7) geographic District Offices: Honolulu, Central Oahu, Leeward Oahu, Windward Oahu, Hawaii, Maui (including Lanai and Molokai), and Kauai (including Niihau). Line management of the public schools is exercised through the District Superintendents who are directly responsible to the Superintendent of Education for the administration of all public schools within a district.

District superintendents occupy positions exempt from membership in the administrator's bargaining unit and are appointed by the superintendent of education, with the approval of the Board of Education. They are responsible for directing a staff of school principals (who are in the administrator's bargaining unit) and other professional and clerical personnel and perform other related duties as required. Direction and guidance provided by district superintendents are generally in the form of departmental policies, rules, regulations, union contracts, directives and federal and state laws and legal requirements. Significant authority is vested at this level in exercising administrative and technical direction over district staff.

This investigation is grounded in the theory of bureaucracy that was described by eminent sociologist Max Weber (1963, 1964). Although Weber's theory serves as the
foundation of this study, Gouldner's (1954) investigation of patterns of industrial organizations provides the basic rational. Using Max Weber's theory as a basis for his study, Gouldner looked very thoroughly at the method in which rules are enforced and presented. His examination revealed three distinct types of rule administration (Representative, Mock and Punishment-centered rule administration behavior), the definitions of which are presented in Chapter I of this study. Also Lutz, Kleinman, and Evans (1967) efforts to determine if Gouldner's rule enforcement types might be applicable to educational organizations provided additional rationale.

The population to which this study was generalized is the 245 public school principals employed by the Hawaii State Department of Education.

The sample consisted of a total of 155 principals from the seven administrative districts (Honolulu, Central, Leeward, Windward, Hawaii, Maui and Kauai Districts) in the Hawaii Public School System.

The data for the study was collected by means of a questionnaire which included three instruments: the Rule Administration Scale consisting of three subscales; the Executive Leadership Instrument; and, the Militancy Scale.

One-way analysis of variance was employed for each of the three subscales in the rule administration instrument,
and the total scores on the leadership and militancy instruments to determine whether there were significant differences in mean scores. Where significant differences appeared a post hoc test (Scheffe) was used to further isolate sources of variance.

Stepwise regression analysis was conducted to determine which variables, if any, accounted for variations in leadership behavior.

Four hypotheses were tested in their null form. The F value was utilized to determine if the difference predicted was statistically different. In all cases the (p<.05) level of confidence was required in order to reject the null hypotheses. An analysis of the data provided for Hypothesis I confirmed that there were significant differences in two (Representative and Punishment) out of three rule administration behavior subscales among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education districts as perceived by the principals in their districts. However, the findings indicated no significant difference existed between district superintendents relative to mock rule administration behavior. One-way analysis of variance differences were found among district superintendents in representative and punishment-centered rule administration behavior and a further analysis provided by the Scheffe Range Test revealed that:
1. Significant differences (p<.05) existed among district superintendents in representative rule administration. It was determined that district B had significantly different and higher means than either C or A. Also district F varied from district C but not from the other six districts. Thus, four districts provided the means that were the major contributors to the significant differences in Representative Rule Administration Behavior.

2. Significant differences (p<.05) existed among district superintendents relative to punishment-centered rule administration behavior. The Scheffe Range Test showed that once again district C provided the major differentiating scores on punishment-centered rule administration. Further, the perception of principals in district C was that the district superintendent was more punishment-centered oriented, while the district superintendents located in districts F and G were perceived as low in this form of rule administration behavior by their principals.

On the basis of two of the three subscales producing differences the null hypothesis for the first hypothesis was rejected.
Hypothesis II evidenced there were significant differences (p<.05) in leadership among the seven Hawaii State Department of Education district superintendents as perceived by the principals in their districts. In order to determine which districts differed the significant F value was further analyzed through use of the Scheffe Range Test. It was learned that two districts, B and D, were significantly different than the other districts. Also the Scheffe shows that principals' perceptions of district superintendents' leadership behavior had higher mean scores in Districts B, E, F, and G. Based on the data analyzed the null hypothesis for the second hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis III test results, as measured by a one-way analysis of variance indicated there were significant differences (p<.05) in level of militancy among the principals in the seven Hawaii State Department of Education districts. Additionally, the significant F values were analyzed through the use of the Scheffe Range Test. The only significant difference was found between districts E and G. The mean scores of these districts indicate that district E principals had a higher mean score (3.83) on the militancy scale than principals in District G (3.19). Further, District E has the highest level of militancy among principals by the various districts.
Generally all of the district (A, B, C, D, E, F, G,) were perceived by their principals as relatively high in militancy since the mean score for all districts was (3.51) which was above the median of the scale for the instrument.

Hypothesis IV test results indicated there were no significant differences in perceptions of district superintendents three rule administration subscales and leadership behavior by age, sex and experience among the principals. Analysis of variance tests employed were done on the districts that differed in the Scheffe Range Test on each of the two subscales of the rule administration instrument and the districts which differed on the score of the leadership and militancy scales.

Regarding the ancillary question, the additional data reported by the respondents was analyzed to determine if there were amounts of variance in leadership scores of the seven district superintendents which are related to the perception of their rule administration behavior, and the perceptual and demographic variables.

Through stepwise regression analysis two variables, namely representative (26.0%) and punishment-centered (3.4%) rule administration accounted for nearly all of the variation (29.4%) in leadership. None of the other variables (mock, militancy, age, sex and experience) contributed significantly to explaining the variation in leadership. In summary, analysis of variance tests showed
that principals in several districts differed in their perceptions of district superintendents on each of the three instruments. Significant differences were confirmed among districts for Hypotheses I, II, and III, while Hypothesis IV did not reveal a significant difference. Regarding the ancillary question significant variation was found to be evident because the data revealed representative rule administration and punishment-centered rule administration behavior accounted for 29.4% of the variation in leadership, as perceived by principals.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the data collected and analyzed the following conclusions can be derived and stated for this study.

Two out of three of subscales of the Rule Administration instrument yielded significant differences in perceptions of principals toward district superintendents rule administration. The two subscales representative and punishment-centered both differed. However, no significant difference was found among district superintendents on the mock rule administration subscale. Thus it can be concluded that among the seven district superintendents there are differences in the manner in which they carry out their management responsibilities.
Even though there is only one school district with all of the district superintendents selected by a single board of education and all of them have been socialized in the same educational culture, as are the principals who rated their style of administration, there are still major differences among several of them (at least four districts) in how they operate.

This finding adds additional and unique knowledge to the concept of rule administration. Even though Hawaii is relatively isolated in the sense that all of the superintendents have spent nearly all of their professional careers in the Hawaii State Department of Education and all have had the same inservice training in management styles and practices yet they are perceived by principals as exhibiting rule administration styles that vary significantly.

The perception of the principals within each district are independent of their experience, age and sex. Thus one may conclude that if principals within a district rate a superintendent as high (or low) on representative or punishment-centered administration style it is not a function of demographic or personal differences among them. The high degree of unanimity in their selection, training and acculturation and the lack of variance in demographic and personal variables (none of them contributed to the
variance in leadership scores in the regression analysis) would seem to enhance the validity of the findings.

Since the district superintendents have reasonable tenure in their positions but some differ in their rule administration one might conclude that no particular management style has produced the "best" administration. That would tend to support administration theorists such as Fiedler (1967), House (1971), Vroom and Yetton (1973) and Hersey and Blanchard (1988) who have posited that style is situational rather than static.

Results of the analysis on leadership indicate that principals in various districts do perceive differing levels of this important ingredient in the mix of factors which comprise the aspects of management in educational administration. Not only did certain districts vary from the others (ANOVA), but a regression analysis found that approximately thirty percent of the variance was related to styles of administrative rule behavior. Higher leadership scores were linked positively to representative rule administration style as well as to punishment-centered rule style but at a much weaker strength of relationship. One can conclude that principals are sensitive to the manner in which district superintendents administer rules and that they perceive certain styles related positively to perception of leadership. However, a punishment-centered administrator may still be perceived as a viable leader.
This empiric finding tends to support the theory and research findings of other studies such as Halpin (1959), Herzberg (1959), Argyris (1964), Likert (1976), Blumberg (1985), Goodlad (1987) and Sergiovani (1992).

Bearing the aforementioned information in mind and considering it in total, it would seem the principals view district superintendents as being generally representative rule administration behavior oriented when enforcing the rules of the bureaucracy. Also they consider the representative rule administration behavior pattern as demonstrating greater leadership than punishment-centered or mock-centered behavior. This seems to support the notion expressed in the literature review that administrators (e.g., district superintendents) who administer rules in a representative manner would tend to have principals who would rate them high in leadership, and therefore, these principals would tend to have more positive attitudes toward the district superintendents.

Also analysis of variance tests revealed differences in levels of militancy among principals. However, the differences were limited to two districts. Regression analysis revealed that militancy did not contribute significantly to the variance in leadership among district superintendents. Since the perceptions of the principals vis a vis leadership are independent of their
militancy scores, one may conclude that if principals within a district rate themselves high (or low) on the militancy instrument that rating apparently does not influence the way they perceive the leadership of the district superintendents. Of interest is the fact that the descriptive data showed that principals in all of the districts perceived themselves as relatively high in militancy since the scores from all districts were well above the median of the scale for the instrument. In summary, the data indicate (1) that among the seven district superintendents there are differences in the manner in which they carry out the rules of the bureaucracy; (2) that the perceptions of the principals toward rule administration and leadership within each district are independent of their experience, age, and sex and thus, a district superintendent's rule administration style is not a function of demographic or personal differences among principals; and (3) that two variables (representative and punishment-centered rule administration) contributed to explaining the variation in the perception of leadership by the principals.

RECOMMENDATIONS

District superintendents are continuously confronted with the task of administering rules in respect to their principals. It is a known fact, some district
superintendents perceive some of these rules (i.e., superintendent directives, board policies, union contract provisions, state and federal laws and regulations) as intruding upon their areas of management and leadership. Regardless of these feelings, the district superintendents will, by necessity, not only have to dedicate a fair amount of time to administering internal and external rules, but also initiate and demonstrate the leadership qualities needed to insure that the principals working for them effectively implement these rules.

While the results of this study tend to indicate that principals generally perceive district superintendents as administering rules through a participatory, involvement style and their leadership as relatively high; there is still a need for additional research in this area.

Certainly a subject of such complexity, scope and potential can be the subject of further study. Among the additional research topics which could be beneficially investigated are the following, which by no means constitutes an comprehensive list:

(1) It is recommended the rule administration behavior of the district superintendent be compared with the rule administration of the principals to determine if the principal utilizes the same or different style of rule
administration as that of the district superintendent.

(2) It is recommended a study be conducted that addresses how organizational behavior relative to rule administration affects students.

(3) It is recommended that a study be designed to develop a prediction instrument that would identify from among the Department of Education school administrators potential district superintendents who would upon completion of the instrument indicate a strong representative rule administration pattern.

(4) It is recommended that a study be designed to compare and contrast the perceptions of principals in Hawaii with other states and other regions relative to rule administration by district superintendents.

(5) It is recommended that a study be conducted to determine if teachers have a principal who primarily uses one style of rule administration, does this cause teachers to use a comparable style in the classroom.

(6) It is recommended that a study be designed to determine what factors are causing principals to remain in a collective bargaining unit.
(7) It is recommended that a study of the legal background and implications of collective bargaining in the supervision and management of principals by district superintendents be conducted.

(8) It is recommended that a study be designed to compare and contrast the perceptions of principals assigned to School Community Based Management Schools (SCBM) with non-SCBM schools relative to rule administration by district superintendents.

There is a need for several additional studies into rule enforcement and other administrative responsibilities of administrators in the Hawaii State Department of Education. It is clear that no particular style of rule administration behavior predominates among the district superintendents and by presumption one could extend that statement to principals and other line officers as well. The studies suggested above would provide a set of baseline data which could be important in administrator selection, evaluation, and future inservice (and preservice) projects by the department.
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Appendix A
Rule Administration Scale

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

1. Please indicate your choice by placing a check (✓) in the appropriate space following each question.

2. The questions should be answered in light of your district superintendent and your feelings.

3. In each section, the number of responses and headings vary.

SECTION I

DIRECTIONS: It is recognized that a Principal would consult the District Superintendent to do some of the following before he/she took such action. For this Section, please assume that the District Superintendent was not available and that he/she later became aware of your action. If in some of the following areas your District Superintendent operates through an intermediary (Deputy District Superintendent, Personnel Specialist, etc.), respond as if his/her actions are taken with the knowledge of the District Superintendent. For example, a question may be interpreted as:

"If you failed to attend a districtwide principals' meeting, the District Superintendent (or his/her intermediary) has a method of checking and would penalize you."

1. If you left your school early, the district superintendent has a method of checking and would penalize you.

2. The district superintendent would assume you had a good reason if you failed to appear for an assigned duty, such as a PATH Cadre meeting, serving on an interview committee, or some other assigned activity.

3. If you failed to complete a particular form (enrollment report, attendance report, etc.) on time, he/she would ignore it.

   Never  Rarely  Usually  Almost  Always  Always

   1.  

   2.  

   3.  

   160
4. If you did not enforce building discipline regulations, the district superintendent would assume you had a good reason and ask you for it.

5. The district superintendent would know and take action against you if you failed to follow the proper procedures before, during, and after a field trip.

6. He/She would probably ignore it if you did not follow the proper emergency procedures established for a bomb threat.

7. If you left your school unattended for a short time, he/she has a method of checking and would penalize you.

8. He/She would assume you had a valid reason and ask you for it if you did not complete a particular form (enrollment report, attendance report, etc.) within the designated time.

9. The district superintendent would ignore it if you failed to appear for a scheduled IEP conference.

10. If you failed to follow the proper procedure for ordering or requesting supplies, the district superintendent would penalize you in some way.

11. If you did not appear for an assigned duty, such as a PATH Cadre meeting, serving on an interview committee, or some other assigned activity, the principal would ignore it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. The district superintendent would assume you had a good reason if you did not attend a scheduled principals' meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. He/She would disregard it if you failed to follow the proper procedures before, during, and after a Chapter 19 Hearing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. If you did not appear for a scheduled IEP conference, the district superintendent would take some type of action against you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. If you failed to follow the proper emergency procedures established for a bomb threat, he/she would believe you had a good reason and ask for it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. The district superintendent would disregard it if you did not attend a scheduled principals' meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. If you failed to follow the proper procedures before, during and after a Chapter 19 Hearing, he/she would assume you had a good reason for doing so.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. He/She would probably ignore it if you left your school early.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. The district superintendent can check and would penalize you if you did not follow the proper procedures established for a bomb threat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Executive Professional Leadership Scale

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

1. Please indicate your choice by placing a check (✓) in the appropriate space following each question.

2. The questions should be answered in light of your district superintendent and your feelings.

SECTION II

To what extent does your district superintendent engage in the following kinds of behavior?

1. Gives principals the feeling that their work is an "important" activity.

2. Gets principals to upgrade their performance standards in their schools.

3. Gives principals the feeling that they can make significant contributions to improving the performance of their students.

4. Makes principals' meetings a valuable educational activity.

5. Has constructive suggestions to offer principals in dealing with their major problems.

6. Takes a strong interest in my professional development.

7. Treats principals as professional workers.

8. Helps to eliminate weaknesses in his/her district office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Occa- sionally</th>
<th>Fre- quently</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Maximizes the different skills found in his/her staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Brings to the attention of principals educational literature that is of value to them in their jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Helps principals to understand the sources of important problems they are facing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Displays a strong interest in improving the quality of the educational program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C
Militancy Scale and Personal Data

GENERAL DIRECTIONS

Mark "Undecided" if you do not understand the item.

SECTION III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Principals should be able to withhold services when satisfactory agreement between their organizations and the school board cannot be reached.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Principals should not strike in order to enforce their demands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that the good principal can always get the salary he/she needs without resorting to collective negotiations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I believe that collective bargaining is beneath the dignity of the principal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I think that sanctions are a step forward in acceptance of principal responsibility for self-discipline and for insistence upon conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel that the principal cannot withhold his/her services without violating professional ethics and trust.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel that collective negotiations is chipping away by inches at local control and should be resisted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I think collective negotiations by principals organizations may lead to totalitarianism in education, a kind of dictatorship by the principal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. I believe that most of the leaders in the drive for collective negotiations are insincere power seekers who do not have the best interests of education at heart.

10. I think principals have a right to impose sanctions on school boards under certain circumstances.

11. I believe that strikes, sanctions, boycotts, mandated arbitration or mediation are improper procedures to be used by public school employees who are dissatisfied with their conditions of employment.

12. I feel that the traditional position that principals, as public employees, may not strike is the only defensible position for a sensible school district to take.

13. I believe sanctions are a means of improving educational opportunity and eliminating conditions detrimental to professional service.

14. I believe that any principal sanction or other coercive measure is completely unprofessional.
PERSONAL DATA

1. Age
   
2. Sex
   
3. Years of service as a principal
   
4. Type of School in which you currently serve: (Please circle appropriate letter)
   a. Elementary
   b. Secondary
   c. Elementary/Secondary

5. District you are assigned to: (Please circle appropriate letter)
   a. Honolulu
   b. Central
   c. Leeward
   d. Windward
   e. Hawaii
   f. Maui
   g. Kauai

THANK YOU for completing this questionnaire!
Please return it in the self-addressed envelope provided.
Dear Colleague:

As a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Hawaii, I am conducting a dissertation study designed to learn of possible differences among the types and level of leadership exhibited by top level leaders in the Hawaii public school system.

It is my belief that Hawaii's public school administrators are among the best in the nation and have a very strong sense of professionalism regarding keeping abreast of the latest research on leadership. Moreover, they are very supportive and responsive to requests made by their professional colleagues for research data. Thus, it is hoped that you will want to support this effort to add to current knowledge in this area. It goes without saying that as a professional colleague of yours, I will be forever grateful for your help.

The anonymous questionnaire enclosed will take approximately 10 minutes to complete. Also in order that participants in the study feel comfortable, data and biographical materials will be held in strictest confidence. Information included in the study will be in statistical form only, and I can assure you it is not possible to identify which survey questionnaire form you completed. Thus, complete anonymity is assured for all participants.

A self-addressed stamped envelope is provided for your convenience. It is hoped you will reply soon.

Sincerely,

Donald Nugent
Doctoral Student
Dear Colleague:

About a month ago a request for you to participate in a current doctoral study was sent to you. It is hoped that you received the survey questionnaire and have looked it over. You will note that the study is designed to learn of possible differences among the types and level of leadership exhibited by top level leaders in the Hawaii public school system.

As was explained in the previous letter, complete anonymity is assured you as a participant in the study.

It will be greatly appreciated if you will take a few minutes and complete the questionnaire sent to you. In case you have misplaced the original questionnaire, a new one is enclosed, along with another stamped, return-addressed envelope. Please return these at your earliest convenience. Thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Donald R. Nugent  
Doctoral Student