

8-5-2010

Frame Analysis of the Self-Perceived Leadership Orientations of Headmasters of the Independent Schools Association of the Southwest, Southern Association of Independent Schools, and the Association of Independent Schools of Greater Washington Member Schools

Troy Roddy
University of New Orleans

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td>

Recommended Citation

Roddy, Troy, "Frame Analysis of the Self-Perceived Leadership Orientations of Headmasters of the Independent Schools Association of the Southwest, Southern Association of Independent Schools, and the Association of Independent Schools of Greater Washington Member Schools" (2010). *University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations*. 1217.
<https://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/1217>

This Dissertation is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by ScholarWorks@UNO with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Dissertation in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Dissertation has been accepted for inclusion in University of New Orleans Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UNO. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uno.edu.

Frame Analysis of the Self-Perceived Leadership Orientations of Headmasters of the
Independent Schools Association of the Southwest, Southern Association of Independent
Schools, and the Association of Independent Schools of Greater Washington Member Schools

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
University of New Orleans
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
in
Educational Leadership and Administration

by

Troy Paul Roddy

B.A. Rhodes College, 1993
M.Ed. University of New Orleans, 2003
M.Ed. University of New Orleans, 2006

August, 2010

Copyright 2010, Troy Paul Roddy

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is no secret that finishing the doctoral degree process is not only a test of intellect and passion, but also one of tenacity and persistence. There are a great many things about my life that have changed since beginning this journey; including hurricanes, evacuations, the birth of my children, and having to move twice for professional opportunities. It would have been easy to make excuses and give up. For that reason, I am eternally grateful for the love and support of my wife, Meghan, who I still remember saying, “One day you will turn 40. You can be 40 with the doctorate or without. It is up to you, but don’t look back and regret a missed opportunity.”

I also want to recognize some other people without whom, I may not have even taken on this challenge. First, I want to thank my parents, who taught me to never give up and to do my best with sincerity and humbleness. Also, I want to recognize the many teachers and administrators who continue to inspire and support me.

Finally, on this journey, I have had the pleasure of meeting and working with a great many people who challenged my intellect and ignited my passions, and I am very grateful to all of them. I am particularly thankful for the many professors that have played a role in my development as an educator. Specifically, Dr. Causey for your time, wisdom, and encouragement; Dr. Haydel for your kindness and guidance; Dr. Thoreson for your assistance with polishing my methods; and Dr. Cambre for providing an appreciated voice during the final stages of completion.

I hope all of you are as proud of this work as I am. Please accept it as a reflection of your support, guidance, and love.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
CHAPTER I.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement.....	8
Definitions.....	9
Purpose of the Study.....	10
Research Questions	11
Design of the Study	11
Participants	12
Instrumentation	12
Data Collection	14
Significance of the Study	14
Limitations and Delimitations of the Study	15
Delimitations	15
Limitations.....	16
Organization of the Study	16
CHAPTER II	18
LITERATURE REVIEW	18
Historical Overview of Organizational Theory.....	18
Classical Theory	19
Human Resource Theory.....	22
Power and Politics Organizational Theory.....	23
Organizational Culture Theory	25
Conceptual Framework.....	26
Bolman and Deal's Multi-frame Perspective.....	28
The Structural Frame	29
The Human Resource Frame	30
The Political Frame.....	31
The Symbolic Frame	32

Bringing the Frames Together to Reframe	33
The Four-Frame Model and Schools	36
Research Using Bolman and Deal's Multi-frame Perspective.....	38
The Four Frames and Gender	42
Managers vs. Leaders.....	43
Summary	45
CHAPTER III	47
METHODS.....	47
Design of the Study	48
Sample	48
Instrumentation.....	51
Pilot Test	53
Design	53
Sample and Instrument.....	54
Data Collection	55
Data Analysis.....	56
Data Collection.....	57
Data Analysis	58
CHAPTER IV	62
FINDINGS.....	62
Demographic Information.....	64
Descriptive Analysis.....	65
Research Question One	65
Research Question Two	68
Research Question Three.....	74
Discussion of Findings and Demographics	77
Summary of Findings	85
CHAPTER V	87
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	87
Overview of Findings	87
Limitations	89

Discussion	90
How many frames do headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools employ?	91
Which frame(s) of Bolman and Deal’s (2003) four-frame leadership orientations do the headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools report as the most dominant frame(s)?.....	92
Are the leadership orientations reported by ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW headmasters related to their self-reported effectiveness as a manager and leader?	95
Demographics	97
Contributions to Bolman and Deal’s (2003) Leadership Orientations Research	100
Implications.....	101
Implications for Current Practice.....	101
Implications for Future Research.....	103
Summary	104
Appendix A.....	113
Letter for Recruitment and Consent	113
Appendix B.....	115
Letter for Permission to Use and Revise Survey Instrument	115
Appendix C.....	117
Correspondence Granting Permission to Use and Revise Survey Instrument	117
Appendix D.....	119
Leadership Orientations (Self) survey – Original Instrument.....	119
Appendix E	124
Revised Survey Instrument	124
Appendix F	130
IRB Approval	130
VITA	132

List of Tables

Table 1: Pilot Study Results - Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses for All Items by Frame.....	56
Table 2: Pilot Test Reliability Results by Frame	57
Table 3: Demographic Breakdown of Respondents	633
Table 4: Number of Frames Used by Headmasters	65
Table 5: Percentage of Frames Identified as Used Often or Always by the Number of Frames Used.....	67
Table 6: Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses to Structural Frame Items	70
Table 7: Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses to Human Resource Frame Items	70
Table 8: Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses to Political Frame Items	71
Table 9: Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses to Symbolic Frame Items	71
Table 10: Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses for All Items by Frame	72
Table 11: Frequency Distribution of the Means of Individual Responses and Percent of Responses by Frame	73
Table 12: Self-Ratings for Management and Leadership Effectiveness	75
Table 13: Correlations Between Frame Use and Self-reported Effectiveness as Manager and Leader	76
Table 14: Means and Standard Deviations by Gender.....	78
Table 15: Independent T-Test Comparison of Means by Gender	78
Table 16: Means and Standard Deviations by Teacher Certification	79
Table 17: Independent T-Test Comparison of Means by Teacher Certification	79
Table 18: Means and Standard Deviations by Administrator Certification	81
Table 19: Independent T-Test Comparison of Means by Administrator Certification	82
Table 20: One-Way ANOVA Comparison of Means by Highest Degree Earned	82
Table 21: One-Way ANOVA Comparison of Means by Years of Teaching Experience.....	84
Table 22: One-Way ANOVA Comparison of Means by Years of Administrative Experience....	85

ABSTRACT

This study examined the self-perceived leadership orientations of headmasters of independent schools. This research expanded the current body of work that supports Bolman and Deal's (2003) multi-frame explanation that leaders use different orientations (frames) to understand their roles, clarify organizational situations, and make decisions. Using the four-frame model (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic) by Bolman and Deal, this study sought to identify common leadership orientations employed by headmasters of Independent Schools Association of the Southwest (ISAS), Southern Association of Independent Schools (SAIS), and the Association of Independent Schools of Greater Washington (AISGW) member Schools. The study also identified how many frames headmasters use and to what extent the self-perceived orientations relate to the headmasters' self-perceived overall effectiveness as managers and leaders.

The *Leadership Orientations (Self)* survey developed by Bolman and Deal (1990) was revised, validated, and reliability was established before being sent to 272 headmasters of member schools of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW. Data were collected from 94 respondents. The ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW are non-profit, voluntary membership organizations of independent schools located mostly in the southeastern and southwestern United States, as well as the greater Washington, DC metro area. The ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW are also members of good standing of the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) Commission on Accreditation.

An analysis of the data revealed, through descriptive statistics, that all four frames are used by the headmasters and most headmasters report using more than one frame. Data analysis suggests that specific relationships exist between the headmasters' self-reported frame use and their perceived effectiveness as managers and as leaders. In addition, differences were observed

between frame usage and teacher certification and frame usage and years of administrative experience.

Keywords: leadership orientations, frame analysis, independent schools, headmasters, Bolman and Deal

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Making an impact is an important end in education (Fullan, 2001). As institutions of education, schools are charged with making impacts. These impacts are felt by the entire school community including: students, families, teachers, staff, and administration. Ultimately, the school leader is responsible for whether or not the school is indeed making an impact. This is not an easy task. The challenges presented in today's schools are more frequent, more challenging, and more intense; thus they demand "a new level of excellence" from their leaders (Green, 2005).

Independent schools have a record of delivering excellence to both students and teachers. According to the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) (2006), independent school students study core knowledge at advanced levels. The NAIS (2006) reported that 85% of students attending NAIS member schools study a foreign language before the eighth grade, compared to 24% of students overall. The NAIS (2006) also states that students at NAIS schools were more than twice as likely to complete algebra in eighth grade (70% of NAIS students, compared to 32% of all students polled who completed algebra after eighth grade). Similar findings were reported by the United States Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (2002):

Achievement tests in reading, mathematics, and science show higher average scores for private school students. In addition, private schools tend to require more years of core academic subjects for high school graduation than do public schools, with some variation across school types. Graduates of private high schools have on average completed more advanced courses than public school graduates in science, mathematics, and foreign language (p. 26).

Completing these courses early allows independent school students to take the most advanced courses during their final years of high school (NAIS, 2006). These more demanding

academic requirements for independent school students appear to pay off after high school graduation.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2007) published by the U. S. Department of Labor indicate that “the college enrollment rate of recent high school graduates has been trending upward” (p. 1). This government report revealed that 65.8% of 2006 high school graduates were enrolled in college in October 2006 (United States Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007). The statistics used for the report by the Department of Labor included graduates from all types of high schools (public, private, and independent) as well as enrollment figures from two and four year colleges and universities.

At first glance, an enrollment of 65.8% appears to indicate that school leaders from all types of schools are fairly successful, but further investigation reveals a much higher percentage of independent school graduates enrolled, especially in four year colleges. When public and independent schools are compared, not only do a much higher percentage of independent school students graduate from high school (99.3% compared to 88% in public school), but enrollment in four year colleges indicates independent schools appear to be more effective in helping students gain access to college (NAIS, 2006). Referencing the National Center for Education Statistics’ *Schools and Staffing Survey 1999-2000*, the National Association of Independent Schools (2006) reports “93 percent of NAIS students went on to a four-year college, compared to 35 percent of all public high school students in 1999-2000” (p. 1). These findings support previous reports indicating that private school students are more likely than public school students to engage in post-secondary studies and/or graduate with a bachelor’s degree or higher (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2002).

Once independent school graduates begin college, they continue to excel among their peers. A number of indicators concerning grade expectation, attitudes towards continuing education, and relationships with college faculty suggest additional indicators of future success may be present. Using survey data from the Higher Education Research Institute's Freshmen Survey, the NAIS (2005) notes that 67% of NAIS graduates expect to make a B average in college compared to 58% of all others, 86% of NAIS graduates plan to pursue a postgraduate degree compared to 74% of all others, 46% of NAIS graduates asked teachers' advice after class compared to 25% of all others, and 52% of NAIS graduates were likely to have been a guest in a teacher's home compared to 28% of all others (p. 3). These findings indicate that an independent school graduate is entering college with a skill set and outlook on their education that allows for the best possible chance at success while attending college.

In addition to enrollment statistics, college expectations, and attitudes towards teachers, graduation rates from four year colleges are overwhelmingly higher among independent school graduates. NAIS (2006) reports:

The "National Educational Longitudinal Study" showed that graduates of NAIS independent schools were nearly twice as likely as public school students to have completed a four-year degree or higher (76.3 percent of NAIS graduates and 38.1 percent of public school graduates). For students from the lowest socioeconomic bracket, the results were even more dramatic than for the group as a whole: Students in low socioeconomic brackets who attended private school in eighth grade were more than three times more likely to complete a bachelor's degree or higher by their mid-20s as public school students from the same economic bracket (24 percent private school students and 7 percent public) (p. 1).

Of the nearly 2,000 independent schools throughout the United States, 1,300 are members of the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS). The NAIS also recognizes various regional organizations through its Commission on Accreditation. Two such regional associations are the Independent Schools Association of the Southwest (ISAS) and the

Southern Association of Independent Schools (SAIS). The ISAS includes 84 member schools. The SAIS includes 319 member schools. ISAS and SAIS member schools are mostly located in the southeastern and southwestern United States. This study seeks to describe the leadership orientations of the headmasters of ISAS and SAIS member schools.

While schools, as organizations, are demanding excellence from their leaders, it is important for leaders to know what good leadership is in terms of creating schools which are highly productive. Two of the most widely accepted positions on leadership are that good leaders possess certain qualities essential to leadership (the right-stuff perspective) and that good leadership is also situational (Bolman & Deal, 2002). No final word exists on what defines good leadership, but there are qualities of leadership that have endured (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999). Using leadership traits and qualities to describe school leadership has been so common, that even the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers which has set forth a model of standards for school leaders, lists 14 traits from their standards that are used as a basis for the design of many school leadership preparation programs throughout the United States (Green, 2005).

Even the literature on school leadership has relied upon examining qualities, pointing out that the effective school leader is “a strong and visionary instructional leader” (Bolman & Deal, 2002, p. 339). While this may be true, the literature appears to provide an incomplete description of effective school leadership. Instructional leadership, as an approach to school leadership, assumes the critical focus of school leaders is the “behaviours of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students” (Leithwood et al. 1999, p. 8). Investigations of instructional leadership suggest that school leaders define school mission, manage instructional programs, and promote the school climate (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). Further

investigations also suggest that instructional leadership contributes to increased student achievement (Hallinger, 1992), but instructional leadership alone does not address the productivity, capacity, or continuous improvement of the school as an organization (Leithwood, et al, 1999). Productivity, increased capacity, and continuous improvement are outcomes more closely related to a transformational leadership approach; while a purely instructional leadership approach's outcomes are "increased student growth" (Leithwood, et al, 1999, p. 18). Focusing solely on instructional leadership provides an oversimplified and narrow view of school leadership, one which potentially produces oversimplified advice for school leaders (Bolman & Deal, 2002). An approach to understanding good school leadership requires more than just an examination of effective qualities. While a quality based approach can be a helpful beginning, these qualities are no more than a set of basic leadership skills unless there is an understanding of context (Leithwood et al. 1999). In other words, outstanding leadership is "sensitive to the context in which it is exercised" (Leithwood et al. 1999, p. 4).

A comprehensive view of leadership, one that includes qualities, context, and perspectives, is addressed by Bolman and Deal's (2003) four-frame model (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic). Bolman and Deal (2002) suggest that leadership needs to be "reframed" to account for differences in the leader and the circumstances he is facing. Reframing involves the ability of a leader to not only examine a situation through his natural frame of reference, but the ability to re-examine a situation from different frames. This use of multiple frames helps the leader make sense of the situation, clarify various responses, and make a productive decision (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Strong leadership by the school leader is likely to indicate an effective school (Barth, 1990), but successful organizations require leadership and management from their

administrators. Leadership and management are distinct aspects of behavior and should not be viewed as synonymous terms. Leadership, as defined by the actions of a leader, involves being “able to see all dimensions of social collectives – including often neglected political and symbolic levels of human behavior” (Bolman and Deal, 1984, p. 294). In contrast, management can be characterized by taking a more rational and humanistic approach, “sometimes resorting to politics as a last resort” (Bolman and Deal, 1984, p. 294).

By using multiple frames, a holistic picture of leadership possibilities emerges, one that focuses on both the management and leadership of an organization (Bolman & Deal, 2002). Bolman and Deal (2002) highlight this point when they state, “If an organization is overmanaged but underled, it eventually loses any sense of spirit or purpose. A poorly managed organization with a strong, charismatic leader may soar briefly only to crash shortly thereafter” (p. xvi). Therefore, the managerial and leadership skills of the head of school cannot be ignored as a factor in the success of the independent school as an organization. If researchers ignore the leaders of these schools, they are discounting a population that may shed additional light on the leadership orientations of school leaders of highly effective organizations.

In order for complex and ambiguous organizations such as schools to function effectively, the leader must draw upon skills that will clarify organizational reality in a way that promotes effective decision making. Bolman and Deal (1992a) state that more attention needs to be given to how leaders think. This shift to a more situational model is a departure from an examination of traits and styles. By examining how leaders “size up” a situation, we understand how leaders react within their organizations.

With regard to one becoming an effective school leader, Bolman and Deal (2002) believe that the essential ingredient is “to develop powerful habits of mind – profoundly practical ways

of thinking about schools and classrooms” (p. 2). These “habits of mind” allow leaders to make sense out of confusing and ambiguous situations. In any situation, Bolman and Deal (2002) state, that past experiences and previous learning are used to “define and frame reality” (p. 2). Once a leader understands what is happening, he can determine the options available to him. The assumption that reality is defined and framed based upon experiences is also held by Pitre and Sims (1987) who claim people will categorize experiences, objects, and other people based on previous experiences. Gioia (1986) says that categorizing experiences allows people to “process an overwhelming amount of incomplete, inaccurate, or ambiguous information, quickly, efficiently, with relatively little effort” (p. 12). Following this assumption, school leaders function within their organizations based on their ability to categorize organizational information.

Bolman and Deal (1984) explain the various points of view leaders use to categorize their experiences by referring to these categories as frames. Bolman and Deal (2003) present these frames as four distinct perspectives from which leaders categorize their experiences. The four frame concept set forth by Bolman and Deal (2003) provides a model by which organizational leadership can be examined in terms of comprehensiveness and context.

The following concepts were defined by Bolman and Deal (2002, 2003) and provide the theoretical framework for this study:

1. The structural frame is focused on the implementation and development of rules, roles, goals, policies, technology, and environment. It emphasizes productivity and suggests that classrooms and schools work best when goals and roles are clearly defined. Efforts of groups and individuals are coordinated through authority, policies, and rules. This

frame requires a rational approach which holds people accountable for their responsibilities by setting measurable standards.

2. The human resource frame is concerned with recognizing and fulfilling the needs, skills, and relationships of the people in the organization. In schools, this frame works best when needs are satisfied in a caring, trusting environment.
3. The political frame assumes that competition for scarce resources creates an emphasis on power, conflict, and organizational politics. In schools, individuals and groups position themselves for power. Bargaining and compromise, instead of rational analysis, are used to set goals.
4. The symbolic frame recognizes and values the culture, ritual, ceremony, and traditions that bring meaning to the activities of the organization while creating a shared sense of mission and identity. Schools create symbols to enhance commitment, hope, and loyalty.

Problem Statement

As stated earlier, strong leadership is likely to point towards an effective school (Barth, 1990). In terms of academics, matriculation, graduation, attitudes towards education, social development, civic responsibility, and teacher satisfaction, there is evidence that suggests independent schools are performing effectively (Bassett, 2002; NAIS, 2005, 2006; and United States Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2007). The United States Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (2002) also states that independent schools are likely to affect better achievement and more effective schools by "requiring students to tackle difficult course material, developing consistent commitment from staff to meet clearly communicated goals, and maintaining a school environment that extols learning" (p. 26).

Bolman and Deal indicate that a strong, effective school leader is not only able to provide instructional leadership (2002), but also to frame each situation according to his natural frame and then reframe each situation using additional lenses in order to clearly understand the situation (2003). Once the leader defines reality based upon multiple frames, he is in a better position to make productive organizational decisions. Based on the evidence of independent school effectiveness, it is likely that independent school headmasters are multi-frame leaders. However, research using Bolman and Deal's four frame model (2003) to examine organizational leadership through the frames used by school administrators has focused primarily on public schools. To date, this multi-frame model (Bolman & Deal, 2003) has not been used to examine the organizational leadership in independent schools or the leadership orientations of independent school leaders.

Each organization exists within its own unique environment. As a type of organization, independent schools present a complex set of variables that may have a profound effect on the leadership orientations, or frames (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 2002), of their headmasters. Evidence indicating the high degree of effectiveness by independent schools warrants an investigation into the organizational leadership of these schools by examining the leadership orientations of their leaders.

Definitions

The following terms are found throughout this dissertation and are used in the following manner:

1. Head of school (headmaster or head) is the independent school administrator who is directly accountable to a school's strategic governing body; usually called a "Board of Trustees." As the administrators are responsible for the entire operation of their school,

their position more closely resembles the role of the public school superintendent as described by the American Association of School Administrators who state, “the superintendency requires bold, creative, energetic, and visionary school leaders who can respond quickly to a myriad of issues” (p. 2).

2. Independent schools are schools that are primarily supported by three main sources of revenue: tuition, charitable contributions, and endowment income. These schools are also governed by a board of trustees, practice non-discriminatory policies, are accredited by a state or regional association, and hold non-profit, 501(c)(3) status (NAIS, 2005).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the organizational leadership of independent schools through an analysis of the self-perceived leadership orientations of headmasters of school using the four frame perspective developed by Bolman and Deal (2003). This study sought to identify any common orientations among these administrators and to explore any possible relationship between frame usage and self-reported leadership and managerial effectiveness. If a relationship between frame usage and self-reported effectiveness as leaders and managers is demonstrated, light may be shed on how to better understand how effective independent school headmasters orient their views of situations in order to make decisions that guide the school. Because school administrators carry the responsibility of creating the conditions under which school success is possible (Corcoran & Wilson, 1986), an investigation into the leadership orientations of headmasters is significant in describing the frames from which these headmasters view their organizations and make decisions that create conditions for school success. Exploring the possible relationship between frame usages and creating successful conditions is valuable if the headmasters believe they are being effective in their management

and leadership roles. Therefore, a study that attempts to find a possible correlation between frame usages and self-perceived leadership and managerial effectiveness is important. This investigation contributed to the research that Bolman and Deal and others have conducted by introducing new variables to the work already done. Specifically, this study sought to introduce a new population, independent school headmasters, into the body of research concerning the multi-frame model.

Research Questions

The following research questions have emerged from the literature. This study sought to answer these questions:

1. How many frames do headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools employ?
2. Which frame(s) of Bolman and Deal's (2003) four-frame leadership orientations do the headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools report as the most dominant frame(s)?
3. Are the leadership orientations reported by ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW headmasters related to their self-reported effectiveness as a manager and leader?

Design of the Study

The research design for this study involved a cross-sectional, quantitative survey to determine leadership orientations of headmasters of independent secondary schools. The study followed a non-experimental design. A non-experimental design is one in which no treatment groups are present in the study (Gay and Airasian, 2000). Surveys are typical examples of non-experimental designed studies. The criteria for an experimental or quasi-experimental design are not present in this study. Specifically, because there was no random assignment to groups, the sample to be surveyed was a purposive sample. Also, there were no control groups or multiple

measures. These factors ruled out a quasi-experimental design. The non-experimental design was appropriate because the nature of the data to be collected was mostly descriptive.

Participants

A purposive sample of 94 ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW participated in this study. The selection of these headmasters was based upon their school's membership in reputable independent school organizations. The decision to include ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools was also based upon their location, which was relatively close to the researcher. The researcher had also worked at and with schools that are members of these associations.

The ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW are non-profit voluntary membership organizations of independent schools located mostly in the southeastern and southwestern United States. These member schools include both single-gender and co-ed schools. Member schools also include day schools, boarding schools, and a combination of day and boarding schools. The ISAS and SAIS are also members of good standing of the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) Commission on Accreditation. The NAIS is the largest independent school member organization. Of the nearly 2,000 independent schools in the United States, about 1,300 are members of the NAIS; accounting for a population of over 500,000 students in grades pre-kindergarten (4 year olds) through twelfth grade (NAIS, 2007).

Instrumentation

This study used a revised version of the *Leadership Orientations (Self)* survey developed by Bolman and Deal (1990). The survey includes four sections. Section one consists of 32 rating statements using Likert type responses (1-Never, 2-Occasionally, 3-Sometimes, 4-Often, and 5-Always). These 32 items include eight-item frame measures (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic). Section one provides data used to identify which frames are most

dominant, which frames are used, and how many frames are used. Section two includes six forced choice items. Each item includes four attributes to be ranked by the participant. The rankings for each of these attributes range from 1 to 4, with 4 being the attribute that best describes the participant. Section two addresses sub-scales for management development and is not primarily used for research applications (Bolman, 2010). Section three includes two one-item measures. One item measures self-reported effectiveness as a manager and the other measures self-reported effectiveness as a leader. Each item asks the participant to rate themselves from 1-5, with 1 representing the bottom 20% and 5 representing the top 20%. Section three is designed to provide insight into how effective respondents felt they are performing as leaders and managers. The final section of the survey consists of background questions designed to collect demographic data. The survey was meant to collect data that could then be analyzed and reported in a manner that describes the self-perceived leadership orientations of these headmasters and determines if these leadership orientations are related to the headmasters' self-reported leadership and management effectiveness. Data from the surveys were also expected to examine any demographic differences among the headmasters, specifically for gender.

Reliability and validity for the instrument was also established. The internal reliability of the revised instrument was established through pilot testing. Using Cronbach's Alpha, internal reliability for the frame measures of the original, unrevised instrument ranged between .91 and .93 (Bolman & Deal, 1991b). Face validity for the revised instrument was established by a panel of experts. Validity for the original instrument was obtained through regression analysis (Bolman & Deal, 1991a, 1991b, 1992b). In terms of managerial and leadership effectiveness, the four frames acted as predictor variables by being "able to predict a minimum of 66% of the

variance in perceived managerial effectiveness and 74% in leadership effectiveness” (Bolman & Deal, 1991a, p. 9). The regression analysis also demonstrated that the independent variables associated with managerial effectiveness are almost “converse to those associated with effectiveness as a leader” (Bolman & Deal, 1991a, p. 9). For managerial effectiveness, the structural frame was the best predictor, but it was the worst predictor for leadership effectiveness. The reverse was true of the symbolic frame. This frame had consistently demonstrated that it was the best predictor of leadership effectiveness, but it was also the worst predictor of managerial effectiveness (Bolman & Deal, 1991a). The use of this particular survey was important because it allows for an insight into how the administrators think. Being able to study how these leaders think helps determine how they make sense of their organizations and take action.

Data Collection

Surveys were sent to 272 headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools. A letter of recruitment or permission (see Appendix A) accompanied each survey. Electronic communication was used, including email and links to the survey hosted by Zoomerang™. Participants were given a three-week period to take the survey. Follow up emails and phone calls were made within the first two weeks of the original request.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is found in the fact that it measures how independent school headmasters think. An examination focused on this particular population of school leaders has not yet been performed. According to Bolman and Deal (1992a), reality for the leaders and their constituents is often framed by how the leader thinks and the degree to which the leader draws upon past experience and learning (2002). This thinking has a direct impact on

how issues that arise are recognized, framed, and acted upon. Research by Bolman and Deal (2002) reveals that by recognizing this manner of thinking and framing, three points begin to emerge:

1. The frames are powerful, memorable tools.
2. The frames help people see things they once overlooked and come to grips with what is really going on.
3. When individuals reframe, they see new possibilities and become more versatile and effective in their responses. (p. 5)

This study attempted to expand the existing research on leadership by focusing on the leadership orientations of headmasters of independent schools, specifically those who are headmasters of ISAS and SAIS member schools. The results of this study can be used to improve current professional development programs for independent school leaders. These results may also be incorporated into educational programs designed to prepare all types of school leaders.

Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

Delimitations

The NAIS (2007) estimates that there are approximately 2,000 independent schools in the United States. These schools educate about 1% of the entire school population, or about 10% of the entire private school population (Bassett, n.d.). Given the number of schools, both public and private, in the United States, this study chose to focus on one specific type of private school. Even after choosing to focus on independent schools, the large number of those schools required further delimiting. As a result, a sample from regionally recognized independent schools was chosen.

Another delimitation was in the choice of which administrators to survey. There are many different types of administrators that may be leading independent schools. This may include division headmasters, business managers, admission directors, development directors, deans of students, etc. The one common administrator available at all identified independent schools is the headmaster who reports directly to the Board of Trustees. Therefore, the decision was made to only include headmasters in the study.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are a result of the design. Given the size of the population chosen, it is not possible to generalize the results of this survey to all independent schools. At the time of this study, there were approximately 2,000 independent schools in the United States (NAIS, 2007). With membership nearing 500 schools, the ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW schools do not constitute enough of a sample size to make a generalization about all independent schools.

While independent schools are also private schools, not all private schools are independent. For example, a religious based private school that is also part of a parochial or diocesan member school would not necessarily be an independent school. Independent schools are free of the governance of a body concerned with multiple schools. Independent schools are ultimately guided by their Boards of Trustees who hire the headmaster to lead and manage the operations of the school. Because of this difference that exists between independent schools and other private schools (who may not also be independent), the results of this study cannot be generalized to apply to non-independent private schools.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter One introduced the context of this study and the purpose of the research. Also included in Chapter One is the theoretical

perspective used in the study. Chapter Two is the review of relevant literature relating to leadership orientations. It begins with a thorough examination of the historical background from which Bolman and Deal's (2003) four-frame model emerged. In addition, Chapter Two describes the conceptual framework of Bolman and Deal's (2003) model and each of the four frames in greater detail. It concludes with a review of previous research using this multi-frame perspective. Chapter Three outlines the procedures used in this investigation. It includes a description of the population of the study as well as the instrumentation. This chapter discusses how data will be collected and the methods for descriptive, comparative, and summative analysis of the data. Chapter Four is the descriptive analysis of the responses to the survey. This chapter includes the descriptive statistics for the study. Chapter Four also analyzes the results of the study in terms of the research questions. Chapter Five summarizes and discusses the findings of this study in relation to the research questions. This chapter also includes implications for current practice and recommendations for future research. Following Chapter Five, appendices are included. The appendices include the revised *Leadership Orientations (Self)* survey (Bolman & Deal, 1990) used in this study, the cover letter sent to the participants, follow up letters, and requests for permission to use materials.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The literature review for this study is organized into two major sections. The first is a historical examination of organizational theories. This section provides an overview of the major theories that emerged over time that have led to the theoretical framework for this study. The second section is an in-depth review of the four-frame leadership orientations model put forth by Bolman and Deal (2003). Included in this section is an examination of each frame individually and a review of the research using Bolman and Deal's (2003) model.

Historical Overview of Organizational Theory

Just as the study of leadership has emerged from various perspectives, the framework put forth by Bolman and Deal (2003) draws upon many of the major schools of organizational theory. It has been demonstrated that American education has embraced and been affected by many of these theories during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries (Owens, 2004). These schools are:

1. classical theory
2. human resource theory
3. power and politics organizational theory
4. organizational culture theory

The historical overview of organizational theory included in this review draws much of its organization from the extraordinary collection of work in Shafritz, Ott, and Jang's *Classics of Organizational Theory* (2005). This collection presents an entire history of organizational theory in one concise volume of work.

Classical Theory

Shafritz, Ott, and Jang (2005) state, “most analysts of the origins of organizational theory view the beginnings of the factory system in Great Britain in the eighteenth century as the birthplace of complex economic organizations and, consequently, of the field of organizational theory” (27). This theory was not only the first theory of its kind, but continues to be the basis from which all other organizational theories have been built (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005). Organizational theory was dominated by the classical school into the 1930s, but remains highly influential today (Merkle, 1980).

While time has allowed the classical theory to develop further, four basic assumptions have never been adjusted. According to Shafritz, Ott, and Jang (2005)

1. Organizations exist to accomplish production-related and economic goals.
2. There is one best way to organize for production. This way can be found through systematic, scientific inquiry.
3. Production is maximized through specialization and division of labor.
4. People and organizations act in accordance with rational economic principles (p. 28).

We are able to trace roots of organizational theory back to ancient times. In one example, from the Book of Exodus, Chapter 18, verse 26, we see Moses employing a management style that would later be developed by Frederick Winslow Taylor as “management by exception” (Taylor, 1911). Another example from ancient times is found in Xenophon’s (1869), “Socrates Discovers Generic Management.” In this work, Socrates includes the duties of and similarities of all good presidents of public and private institutions. It is considered the “first known statement that organizations as entities are basically alike – and that a manager who could cope

well with one would be equally adept at coping with others – even though their purposes and functions might be widely disparate” (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005, p. 27).

In the twentieth century, three people emerged to become highly influential in classical theory. They are Frederick Winslow Taylor (1856-1915), Henri Fayol (1841-1925), and Max Weber (1864-1920). Taylor’s greatest contribution was his development of scientific management as outlined in his work, *The Principles of Scientific Management* (1911). Under the idea of scientific management, he explored the efficiency of physical production. Specifically, workers could become as efficient as machines once they were properly motivated and trained.

Like Taylor, Henri Fayol (1949) used a scientific approach to describing management. Fayol’s perspective relied upon five managerial functions that, once in place, an effective organization would emerge. These functions were planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling (Urwick, 1937).

Fayol’s work in *General and Industrial Management* (1949) established him as the first modern organizational theorist (Owens, 2004). Fayol is noted as having advanced three ideas of administrative thought; ideas that separate his work from that of Taylor:

1. Fayol’s attention is focused on the manager rather than the worker.
2. Fayol separates the administrative process from those of other organizational functions, such as production.
3. Fayol emphasizes the common elements of the administrative process in different organizations (Owens, 2004, p. 84).

By the time Max Weber published his analysis of bureaucracy in 1922, the Western world was already becoming an “organizational society” (Owens, 2004). By using an “ideal-type” approach, Weber is able to derive central features from the real world that are

characteristic of the “most fully developed bureaucratic form of organization” (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005, p. 33). Weber (1922) explains these features as he describes the six characteristics of bureaucracy:

1. The principle of fixed and official jurisdiction governed by rules, laws, or administrative regulations
2. The principles of office hierarchy which form an ordered system of supervision of lower offices by higher ones
3. Management of offices based upon written documents
4. Office management based upon thorough and expert training
5. A fully developed office demands full working capacity of the official
6. Management of the office follows a set of general rules that can be learned. (p. 196-197)

The scientific management era (1900 – 1930) also had an effect on educational administration as school leaders emphasized high efficiency and low per unit costs (Callahan, 1962). This move to higher efficiency was not the best of models for schools. Scientific management in schools relied on a unit of highly interdependent people to correct the system within the school while reaching and maintaining consensus on school goals and the means to achieve those goals. In addition, all school related problems, as well as the relevant solutions, must be predictable using scientific management (Sergiovanni, 1984).

Since schools are loosely structured, these principles of scientific management act to decrease effectiveness, confuse people, and hinder productivity. Therefore, the scientific management model may not be an appropriate model to use in a school setting (Weick, 1966).

Human Resource Theory

The basic assumptions about the relationship between organizations and people began to change when the human resource theory emerged (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005). According to Bolman and Deal (2003), human resource theory is built upon a body of research that holds to four assumptions:

1. Organizations exist to serve human needs.
2. People and organizations need each other.
3. A poor fit between organizations and the individual will result in one or both suffering by exploitation.
4. A good fit between organizations and individuals results in mutual benefit through satisfaction, talent, and energy. (p. 115)

This theory placed a great amount of value on humans as individuals and “emphasized the interdependence between people and organizations” (Durocher, 1996, p. 17). Thus, there is a great deal of openness and honesty that allows for the employee to make informed decisions with free will based upon large amounts of accurate information (Argyris, 1970). This idea of organizations as social systems is in stark contrast to the classical model and scientific management due to the attention given to the social and psychological dynamics of organizations (Owens, 1970).

The establishment of human resource theory leads to the conclusion that “the organization must be seen as the context from which behavior occurs” and that “the organization influences human behavior just as behavior shapes the organization” (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005, p. 146). Mary Parker Follett addresses this situational leadership approach in *The Giving of Orders* (1926). Follett argues for a participatory leadership style by which the employers and

employees cooperatively assess situations and decide on what actions to take given the situation. Follett asserts that this type of communication develops better attitudes because no one is under another person; instead the situation dictates the action to take (Follett, 1926).

One of the most pervasive themes of human resource theory is motivation (Ott, Parkes, & Simpson, 2003). As such, the work of Abraham Maslow (1943) is a common starting point for discussion. Maslow's hierarchy of needs begins with the principle that all people have needs and those needs provide a motivational structure. In addition, once certain needs are satisfied, those needs no longer provide the motivation they once did. Finally, as needs are addressed, higher-level needs become the motivators (Maslow, 1943).

Maslow's theory has often been attacked for its lack of empirical evidence, yet it continues to stand prominently with Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y (1960) in the study of motivation in organizations. Theory X holds that the manager's frame of reference about people would determine the responses of those people. Managers under this theory direct and control workers. These managers view their subordinates as "passive and lazy, have little ambition, prefer to be led, and resist change" (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 118).

After a challenge to McGregor's Theory X by behavioral scientists, McGregor (1960) formulated Theory Y based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs. Theory Y asserts that workers are inherently motivated and seek out responsibility. Management according to Theory Y is tasked with setting up two conditions in the organization that allow for people to achieve their own goals. These goals are best achieved when directed towards organizational rewards.

Power and Politics Organizational Theory

Shafritz, Ott, and Jang (2005) offer a definition of power: "Power is the ability to get things done the way one wants them done; it is the latent ability to influence people" (p. 284).

This definition is based on the definitions proposed by Gerald Salancik and Jeffrey Pfeffer (1977) and Robert Allen and Lyman Porter (1983). There are two basic benefits to understanding organizations through this definition. First, this definition emphasizes the relativity of power. Second, it reminds the reader that conflict and use of power are often not about outcomes, but rather methods, means, and approaches (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005). Therefore, organizations that control power, through the forming of alliances of people seeking organizational resources, determine the ability to achieve established organizational goals (Durocher, 1996).

The critical need to form alliances and establish external relations, then, becomes an increasingly important function of leadership. Thus, the direct involvement of top leaders in the political aspect of the organization takes on a new, more important role (Bennis, 1984). As a school of organizational theory, the power and politics theory rejects the previously held assumption that organizations are rational institutions whose purpose is to accomplish established goals. Instead, organizations are redefined as “complex systems of individuals and coalitions, each having its own interests, beliefs, values, preferences, perspectives, and perceptions” (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005, p. 283).

The political process involves two parties. One consists of recipients of influence and initiators of social control, and the other party is initiators of influence and recipients of social control (Gamson, 1968). The interactions of these two parties in the political process can be somewhat unclear. In schools, political activity is often found as a result of unclear goals and continuous activity (Campbell, Corbally, & Nystrand, 1983). As Sergiovanni (1984) writes, “The political perspective represents a recent and important development in the literature of educational administration” (p. 6).

Organizational Culture Theory

Much like the power and politics theories, organizational culture theory challenges the more rational perspectives found in other schools of thought (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005). Kilmann and others (1985) describe organizational culture as the social energy that impels people to take action. This is accomplished by providing a unified meaning and direction to the organization. Schein (1985) defines organizational culture as "...a pattern of basic assumptions ...that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel..." (p. 9). Often, these assumptions are "so completely accepted that no one thinks about or remembers them" (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2005, p. 353). By understanding organizational culture, leaders are able to not only figure out what is happening, but can also prioritize issues (Schein, 1985). It is within the organization's culture that its meaning is found. This meaning is not concerned with facts, but rather with understanding actions (Bates, 1980a).

In terms of educational organizations, Bates (1980b) suggests that culture represents a key resource of educational practice. Bates (1980a) also states that educational administration must concern itself with the "myths that guide the organizational life of schools" (p. 263). This feeling was echoed by Sergiovanni (1986) who described the cultural myth of schools as its metaphors and rituals that provide means through which individuals attempt to "manage the cultural realities of the school and shape it to fit their vision of the future" (p. 263). The idea of ritual in schools was again emphasized later by Deal and Peterson (1991). In their argument, the school principal is a symbol who affirms value through rituals and ceremonies (Deal & Peterson, 1991).

Organizational culture theory underlines the critical role for leaders in the creation of culture in the organization (Schein, 1985). Understanding the cultural issues enables one to not only see what is going on in the organization, but to identify the priorities of the leader and leadership structure of the organization (Schein, 1985). In other words, understanding the culture of an organization is necessary to analyze the leadership of the organization (Little, 1982).

Conceptual Framework

Leaders need to know what is happening and are obligated to think before they act (Bolman & Deal, 1993). Synthesizing vague information into an understandable diagnosis is a critical part of a leader's choice of action. These actions have far reaching implications because a leader's actions serve to not only define reality for themselves and their subordinates, but the leader's choice of action will determine "what their organization notices, what it does, and what it eventually becomes" (Bolman & Deal, 1993, p. 21).

Leaders' cognition, as a subject of research, focuses on how leaders evaluate their situation, solve problems, and make decisions (Bolman & Deal, 1993). Bolman and Deal (1993) also state that in order for theories pertaining to leaders' thinking to be adequate, theories must incorporate two fundamental elements:

1. The theory's view of cognition must include the rational and the meta-rational features of complex social environments.
2. The theory must focus directly on the cognitive maps that leaders need to make sense of their complex worlds. (p. 22)

Bolman and Deal (2003) provide a model with which one can examine these fundamental elements. This model is the result of a consolidation of the major schools of organizational theory (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Quality leadership ensures organizational well-being (Drucker, 1989). Unlike the time when individuals managed their own affairs, today's organizations need professional managers to effectively address the challenges of organizational satisfaction (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Even so, organizations can become frustrating and exploitive (Bolman & Deal, 2003) if not properly led.

Schools are examples of complex organizations that exist as a result of a collective human endeavor (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Effective school leadership requires the ability to address the frequent intense challenges of today's schools by clearly defining and framing reality (Bolman & Deal, 2002). This concept of following a mental map is also found in the work of Argyris and Schon (1974) who believe that these maps govern the planning, implementation, and reflection of actions taken. While few people are aware of the maps they use, the similarity between what a leader believes he or she does and the actual actions taken often result in effectiveness (Argyris, 1980). This role of espoused theory (Argyris and Schon, 1974) and its relation to the subsequent actions suggests a real benefit to self-recorded instruments to examine leadership orientations and effectiveness. More simply put, thinking before taking action is a critical component to school leadership (Bolman & Deal, 1992a).

Bolman and Deal (2002) also state that school administrators are most successful when they are able to "look at things from more than one angle" (p. 3). Thus, Bolman and Deal (1984, 2003) have taken the major schools of organizational theory and produced a multiple perspective framework. The term "frames" is used by Bolman and Deal to explain the various points of view

leaders use to categorize their situations (1984). These frames are (a) the structural frame, (b) the human resource frame, (c) the political frame, and (d) the symbolic frame (Bolman & Deal, 1984).

According to Bolman and Deal (2002), the use of multiple frames offers a different perspective on common challenges while presenting three advantages:

1. Each frame can be coherent, focused, and powerful.
2. The collection of frames can be more comprehensive than only single one.
3. Only after you have multiple frames can you *reframe*. Reframing is a conscious effort to size up a situation from multiple perspectives and then find a new way to address that situation. (p. 3)

Schools are complex organizations. As such, organizational experiences and information can be classified according to the cognitive orientations the leader is able to employ. Bolman and Deal's (2003) four frame model describes the orientations used to classify such information. Once classified, the leader is able to draw upon those experiences to choose which course of action is best suited to manage and lead the organization. These four frames provide the conceptual framework for this study.

Bolman and Deal's Multi-frame Perspective

Research about cognitive structures and processes has created an interest in how people think and organize their thoughts (Durocher, 1996). These cognitive structures have been explained using many labels (Durocher, 1996). Gregory (1983) and Kuhn (1970) refer to cognitive structures as cognitive sets and paradigms. Fiske and Dyer (1985) and Fielder (1982) use the term schemata. Lord and Foti (1986) speak of schema to write about cognitive structures; and Weick and Bougon (1986) employ speak of cognitive maps.

Bolman and Deal (1992) believe that attention needs to be given to how leaders think.

With regard to the labels used to refer to the various cognitive structures leaders employ, Bolman and Deal (1991) also add:

The different labels share an assumption that different individuals see the world in different ways because they are embedded in different world views. Because the world of human experience is so complex and ambiguous, frames of reference shape how situations are defined and determine what actions are taken (p. 511).

The frames of reference that leaders operate from will determine the interpretation of their experiences and guide their actions (Bolman & Deal, 1992). “This is the core of their [Bolman and Deal] multiple perspective framework which centered on understanding the cognitive orientations of leaders” (Durocher, 1996, p. 30).

The Structural Frame

Bolman and Deal (2003) provide two main intellectual roots for the structural frame. The first is the maximum efficiency work most prominently explored by Frederick Taylor (1911) using scientific management. The second root stems from the work describing bureaucracies by Max Weber (1922).

According to Bolman and Deal (2003), “...the structural perspective champions a pattern of well-thought out roles and relationships” (p. 45). Six core assumptions provide the basis for the structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 2003):

1. Organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives.
2. Organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization and a clear division of labor.
3. Appropriate forms of coordination and control ensure that diverse efforts of individuals and units mesh.

4. Organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal preferences and extraneous pressures.
5. Structures must be designed to fit an organization's circumstances (including its goals, technology, workforce, and environment).
6. Problems and performance gaps arise from structural deficiencies and can be remedied through analysis and restructuring. (p. 45)

By defining organizational goals, dividing people into specific roles, and developing policies, rules, and a chain of command; the structural frame can be traced to both the classical organizational theory with some influence from the organizational behavior perspective (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Durocher (1996) added that the structural frame depends on a belief that organizations operate rationally, with certainty, and predictably once the right structure is employed. Durocher (1996) also states that such predictability and rationality applies to the behavior of individuals in the organization. Bolman and Deal (2003) further described the structural leader as a sort of social architect whose basic challenge was to "attune structure to task, technology, environment" (p. 16).

The Human Resource Frame

The human resource frame is concerned with how characteristics of organizations and people influence what they do for one another (Bolman & Deal, 2003). This focus on needs can be traced to the human resource theory. Bolman and Deal (2003) cite both Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs and McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Theory Y as major influences on this frame.

Bolman and Deal (2003) list the following as core assumptions for the human resource frame:

1. Organizations exist to serve human needs rather than the reverse.
2. People and organizations need each other. Organizations need ideas, energy, and talent; people need careers, salaries, and opportunities.
3. When the fit between individual and system is poor, one or both suffer. Individuals are exploited or exploit the organization – or both become victims.
4. A good fit benefits both. Individuals find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the talent and energy they need to succeed. (p. 115)

The core assumptions that make up the foundation of the human resource frame point to the origins of the human resource theory. These assumptions clearly respect the nature of individual needs, how those needs serve to motivate, and the value of honoring individual needs to fit the organization. Human resource leaders lead through empowerment (Bolman & Deal, 2003). By doing so, these leaders attempt to “align organizational and human needs” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 16).

The Political Frame

The political frame is rooted in the power and politics organizational theory which describes organizations as places where power is exercised in the allocation of scarce resources (Durocher, 1996). The source of this power is found through authority, expertise, controlling rewards, and personal power or characteristics (such as charisma, intelligence, communications skills, etc.) (Bolman & Deal, 1984). The political frame operates based on five basic assumptions (Bolman & Deal, 2003):

1. Organizations are *coalitions* of diverse individuals and interest groups.
2. There are *enduring differences* among coalition members in values, beliefs, information, interests, and perceptions of reality.
3. Most important decisions involve allocating *scarce resources* – who gets what.
4. Scarce resources and enduring differences make *conflict* central to organizational dynamics and underlie *power* as the most important asset.
5. Goals and decisions emerge from *bargaining, negotiation, and jockeying for position* among competing stakeholders. (p. 186)

Bolman and Deal (2003) conclude, “Organizations are both arenas for internal politics and political agents with their own agendas, resources, and strategies” (p. 238). They also state that organizational effectiveness depends on political skill and the ability to determine when to consider an open and collaborative approach or to use a more adversarial strategy. Understanding the political realities of a situation calls for the leader to consider the potential for “collaboration, the importance of long-term relationships, and most important their own values and ethical principles” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 220).

The Symbolic Frame

The symbolic frame had its roots in the organizational culture theory. It focuses on how people “cope with confusion, uncertainty, and chaos” (Durocher, 1996, p. 35). The central themes for this frame are meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, belief, and faith (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

There are several core assumptions that define the symbolic frame (Bolman & Deal, 2003):

1. What is important is not what happens but what it means.
2. Activity and meaning are loosely coupled; events have multiple meanings because people interpret experience differently.
3. In the face of widespread uncertainty and ambiguity, people create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, find direction, and anchor hope and faith.
4. Many events and processes are more important for what is expressed than what is produced. They form a cultural tapestry of secular myths, heroes, and heroines, rituals, ceremonies, and stories that help people find purpose and passion in their personal and work lives.
5. Culture is the glue that holds an organization together and unites people around shared values and beliefs. (pp. 242-243)

The organizational culture theory is present in these assumptions. Specifically, the symbolic frame addresses the leader's need to create the culture of the organization (Schein, 1985). In addition, the leader who defines the culture becomes a symbol that provides value to the organization through ritual and ceremony (Deal and Peterson, 1991). The image of the symbolic leader is an inspirational one. In a world of uncertainty and chaos, the symbolic leader is challenged to create faith and meaning through the use of symbols (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Bringing the Frames Together to Reframe

Each of the four frames provides a view of the complex issues facing leaders and managers. In addition, each frame provides the leaders with a guide to navigate through the uncertainty and chaos that is present within organizations (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Leaders view their experiences through their own set of frames and have traditionally resisted the idea of

examining situations from different viewpoints (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 2003). Not being able to view situations from multiple angles has led to organizational cluelessness and, in some cases, management failure and organizational collapse (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

Reframing is the ability of leaders and managers to examine a situation and view it in terms of their own preconditioned frame as well as from a set of frames that they would have traditionally resisted (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Therefore, the ability to employ multiple frames can be a “defense against cluelessness” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 18). The use of a collection of frames to make sense out of complex organizational events is a powerful asset for leaders as they make sense of situations and solve problems (Bolman & Deal, 2003). It should be noted that using multiple frames may not necessarily constitute reframing. As clarified by Bolman and Deal (2003), the reframing process may involve more than a multi-frame condition but rather the use of frames that one would normally resist using. For example, if a leader is preconditioned to use the structural and human resource frame, this leader is multi-frame oriented. Once that leader makes the choice to also observe a situation from either the symbolic or political frame, frames that leader would normally resist using, reframing is possible. Because very few leaders are preconditioned to use all four frames, reframing is a possibility in almost all cases (Bolman and Deal, 2003).

Reframing can also aid in our understanding of successful leadership practice. When reframing is used, narrow and oversimplified views of leadership no longer exist. Structurally, the leader becomes an effective analyst and designer in place of a “tyrant who manages by detail and position” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 349). Among structural leaders, there are some characteristics (Bolman & Deal, 2003):

- Structural leaders do their homework.
- Structural leaders rethink the relationship of structure, strategy, and environment.
- Structural leaders focus on implementation.
- Effective structural leaders experiment, evaluate, and adapt. (pp. 352-353)

Using the human resource frame, leaders become a catalyst or servant who supports and empowers other members of the organization. This is not to be confused with leadership that is “weak and abdicates power” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 349). Good human resource leaders generally hold to a set of principles (Bolman & Deal, 2003):

- Human resource leaders believe in people and communicate their belief.
- Human resource leaders are visible and accessible.
- Effective human resource leaders empower others. (pp. 355-356)

When leaders reframe, they shed the ineffective political leadership impression of being a “con artist or thug who exercises power through manipulation and fraud” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 349). Instead, a new political leader emerges. This effective leader uses the political frame to become an advocate and negotiator who builds coalitions among the members of the organization (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 349). Just as with the structural and human resource leader, political leadership employs certain principles:

- Political leaders clarify what they want and what they can get.
- Political leaders assess the distribution of power and interests.
- Political leaders build linkage to key stakeholders.
- Political leaders persuade first, negotiate second, and coerce only if necessary. (Bolman & Deal, 2003, pp. 357-359)

The symbolic frame helps leaders move from “fanaticism and foolishness towards

becoming more of a prophet or poet” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 349). When a leader reframes in these terms, the use of “tricks or mirages is replaced with the more effective meaningful and inspirational experience” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 349). Leaders who effectively use the symbolic frame tend to follow the following guidelines:

- Symbolic leaders lead by example.
- Symbolic leaders use symbols to capture attention.
- Symbolic leaders frame experience.
- Symbolic leaders communicate a vision.
- Symbolic leaders tell stories.
- Symbolic leaders respect and use history. (Bolman & Deal, 2003, pp. 361-364)

Each frame, taken separately, provides a specific set of possibilities for the leadership of an organization, but each is incomplete in providing the holistic view necessary to make sense of organizational complexity and chaos (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Advocating the use of different frames, Bolman and Deal (1984) suggest a more comprehensive understanding of organizations emerges along with “a broader range of options for managerial action” (p. 4). Still, Bolman and Deal (2003) recognize that it is unrealistic to expect all leaders to employ all frames all the time. Instead, “wise leaders understand their own strengths, work to expand them, and build teams that can offer an organization leadership in all four modes: structural, political, human resource, and symbolic” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 366).

The Four-Frame Model and Schools

Schools are organizations with “ambiguous goals, problematic technologies, and environmental vulnerability” (Durocher, 1996, p. 37). The complex governance and multifaceted aspect of schools present a challenge when examining educational leadership

(Baldrige & Deal, 1983). This review of the empirical studies into leadership orientations follows an often used pattern, beginning with an examination of which frames are used by school leaders. Research using the multi-frame model also examines how many frames are used by school leaders, possible demographic differences in frame use, and possible relationships between frame use and effectiveness as a leader and manager.

Bolman and Deal (2002) suggest that educational leaders are most effective when they employ “practical ways of thinking about schools and classrooms” (p. 2). This type of thinking recognizes the challenge to make sense out of confusing circumstances in order to figure out what is going on and how to appropriately respond. These decisions are greatly influenced by our past experiences and learning which have shaped how to define and frame reality (Bolman & Deal, 2002). School leaders who can view situations from more than one angle are more successful (Bolman & Deal, 2002). Bolman and Deal (2002) go on to state:

The ability to use multiple frames has three advantages: (1) each can be coherent, focused, and powerful; (2) the collection can be more comprehensive than any single one; and (3) only when you have multiple frames can you *reframe*. Reframing is a conscious effort to size up a situation from multiple perspectives and then find a new way to handle it (p. 3).

The four-frame model presented by Bolman and Deal (2003) has been used as the basis for a variety of studies exploring leadership orientations. Empirical studies using this four-frame model have generally been limited to descriptive studies concerning frame usage and investigations into possible relationships between frame usage and other variables, including leadership and managerial effectiveness.

Research Using Bolman and Deal's Multi-frame Perspective

Research investigating the use of the four frames generally addresses three issues:

- Frames can be measured.
- Organizations possess parts of each frame, but often specific frames are central to its operation.
- Just as organizations do, individuals have dominant frames. (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 2003)

The multi-frame perspective has been applied in a variety of educational settings; including differing grade levels, states, regions, countries, and positions in schools. A review of the findings from about 24 different empirical studies establishes that, while no one set of findings is consistent in all studies, we can examine the findings to set a foundation of expectations for future investigations using a frame analysis of leadership orientations in schools.

The studies reviewed here are best understood if examined by determining the descriptions of frame usage in each study. These studies also provide insight into multi-frame usage and the combinations of frames used. The relationship between frame usage and gender as well as the relationship between frame usage and leadership and managerial effectiveness is also available in this review.

An examination of the available studies with schools revealed that all the current studies represent public schools. None of the studies concerning school administration represented private or independent schools.

Bolman and Deal (2002) state that “most educators rely primarily on the human resource or structural lenses” (p. 4). Investigations which led to this claim began when Bolman and Deal (1991b) used their *Leadership Orientations* survey (1990) to quantitatively investigate which

frames and how many frames were used by educational administrators in Singapore and the United States. They found that, in Singapore, administrators were highly structural while the United States administrators were dominant in using the human resource frame. In both situations, the political frame was the least used. The symbolic frame, while not the most used by either group, was rated higher in usage in Singapore than the United States.

Similar results were found in a study conducted by Redman (1991). This study compared administrators from the United States to Japanese administrators. Again using the *Leadership Orientations* (1990) survey, these administrators rated themselves as using the human resource frame most often followed by the structural and symbolic frames. Once again, the political frame was used the least.

Redman's (1991) findings are further strengthened by results of other researchers investigating public elementary and high schools. A study by Pavan and Reid (1991) found that three out of five Philadelphia elementary principals used the human resource frame, one used the structural, and one used a combination of all four (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic). Pavan and Reid (1991) also noted an extremely low use of the political frame. The dominant use of the structural and human resource frames by educators was also a consistent theme in a study conducted by Miro (1993) using the *Leadership Orientations* (1990) survey. Once again, this study of California public high school principals found the administrators used the structural and human resource frames more than the symbolic.

Three other studies (Strickland, 1992; Peasley, 1992; Meade, 1992) of public school administrators backed up suggestions that educational leaders mostly use the structural and human resource frames. The Strickland (1992) study investigated which frames and how many frames were used by Tennessee superintendents. The self-ratings on the *Leadership*

Orientations (1990) survey revealed the use of the human resource frame followed by the structural. These superintendents also rated the symbolic frame as the least used.

Peasley's (1992) study investigated California secondary school principals. Meade (1992) did a similar study using California elementary school principals. Both found the human resource frame to be dominant, while the symbolic frame was used the least. The human resource frame was also reported as the most used by secondary school principals in Pennsylvania (Davis, 1996).

A survey of nationally recognized school leaders by Durocher (1996) suggested that while the dominant frame, human resource, was consistent with previous research, a few differences were noticed. Among those surveyed, other frames were used at moderately high levels and that almost half used three or four frames consistently. Similar results of multiple frame use were reported by Rivers (1996). In a study of public school principals in Florida, more than half reported using multiple frames. The dominant leadership orientation continued to be the human resource frame followed by the use of the structural frame.

In 2002, another study of elementary school principals in Florida added to the previous research (Messer, 2002). In this study, principals again rated themselves as predominantly using the human resource frame. The structural frame was the next most frequently used frame. The political and symbolic were used the least. Also similar to the research findings of Rivers (1996) was the reporting of the use of multiple frames by 60% of the respondents.

Another study of high school principals in California, this time by Ulrich (2004), continued to demonstrate the growing perception of multi-frame use by effective principals. In this study, the leadership styles of principals at schools which have demonstrated sustained academic growth were evaluated based on stakeholder perceptions. What was discovered was

that stakeholders perceived their principals as using a combination of human resource and structural frames to sustain academic performance.

Multiple frame usage was also demonstrated in a variety of other settings. Bensimon (1989) interviewed 32 college presidents and used their responses to determine their frame usage. Of the 32 interviewed, 19 indicated consistent multi-frame thinking, with the human resource frame being most used and structural least used. Lawrence (1989) researched 249 presidents of boards of education that were nationally recognized for their excellence. Of these boards, 194 were public school districts, and 55 were from private schools. Lawrence found that the presidents perceived their boards as being able to examine issues from many perspectives, thus allowing them to understand the structural, political, symbolic, and human resource effects of their decisions.

Suzuki (1994) also demonstrated a contrasting view of the number of administrators using multiple frames. In a survey of 124 Asian-American principals, his research found almost half using multiple frames and over 10% of the half using all four frames.

It has been suggested that the use of the political frame in education varies. Much of the research suggests that most educational leaders do not typically employ the political frame nearly as much as the other frames (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 1991b, 2003; Bensimon, 1989; Pavan & Reid, 1991; Redman, 1991; Peasley, 1992; Meade, 1992; Strickland, 1992; Yerkes, Cuellar, & Cuellar, 1992; Miro, 1993; Rivers, 1996; and Ulrich, 2004). While a majority of the research suggests relatively less use of the political frame, a few researchers have suggested that the political frame may be used more often than expected in educational organizations (Wilkie, 1993; Harlow, 1994; Poniatowski, 2006; and Ross, 2006).

Wilkie (1993) used the four frame model to examine school improvement initiatives in New York. The key participants in these initiatives included business managers, school administrators, and school based management teams. Wilkie discovered that the most common source of conflict was created by the inability of those who viewed the process politically to implement the structural processes of the business managers. In this study, Wilkie contends that the structural approach of the business world needs to be merged with the political process of the school community in order to address the potential conflict created by improvement initiatives.

Harlow (1994) performed a frame analysis of educational leadership using twenty Washington state public school superintendents. This study revealed that while the human resource frame continued to be the most used frame, the superintendents rated the political frame as their second most used frame.

Similar results were found by Ross (2006) in a survey of secondary teachers in Florida. The teachers were surveyed to find out their perceptions of their principal's leadership styles. Ross found that while the human resources frame was the most prevalent, the political frame was the second most prevalent frame.

Greater political frame awareness is also cited as a factor in a principal's ability to perceive changing patterns in the school system (Poniatowski, 2006). This recognition may result in the ability to guide the school to make positive adjustments to ensure continued student success. Poniatowski goes so far as to suggest that student achievement may also benefit from increased training in the political and symbolic frames. The degree to which educational leaders use the political frame falls on each end of the spectrum. Either way, the political frame remains a core component of the reframing process put forth by Bolman and Deal (2003).

The Four Frames and Gender

A few studies have examined the role gender may play in frame usage. These studies explored the relationship between gender and frames used, but also possible relationships between numbers of frames used and gender. The results of such studies suggest conflicting messages about the relationship between gender and leadership orientations.

Bolman and Deal (1992b) have found that there is little relationship between gender the number of frames used or which frames are used. Ross (2006) also noted no differences based on gender and frame usage. In contrast, Davis (1996) found that women were more likely than men to report using the human resources, symbolic, and political frames. Suzuki (1994) found similar results with female Asian-American principals who demonstrated a significantly higher use of the human resource frame. Davis (1996) also points out that women were more likely to report using all four frames more often while men reported using only one or two frames frequently. Whether or not a relationship exists between gender and frame use has yet to be clearly established; but if one were to exist, the current research suggests that females may have a greater tendency to exhibit human resource frame orientation.

Managers vs. Leaders

Bolman and Deal (1984) describe the difference between managers and leaders in terms of how they view organizations:

Managers tend to think rationally and humanistically, sometimes resorting to politics as a last resort. Leaders, on the other hand, are able to see all dimensions of social collectives – including often neglected political and symbolic levels of human behavior (p. 294).

Bolman and Deal are not alone in their distinction between leadership and management. Bennis and Nanus (1985) state that “managers do things right, leaders do the right thing” (p. 21). Kotter (1988) also sees management in terms of the structural: planning, organizing, and

controlling. While leadership is seen as a process involving vision, networking, and relationship building. The contrast between management and leadership should be made with caution (Gardner, 1989). Even so, Gardner (1989) distinguishes leadership from management:

- Leaders look long-term as well as outside and inside.
- Leaders influence followers beyond their formal jurisdiction.
- Leaders emphasize vision and renewal.
- Leaders possess the political skills to adapt to the changing needs of multiple constituencies.

Bolman and Deal's (1991b) research has revealed some interesting suggestions concerning the differences between managers and leaders and the relationship between the four frames and effectiveness as a manager and a leader. In the course of examining school administrators and corporate managers from around the world, the structural frame was most often the best predictor of managerial effectiveness and was always the worst predictor of leadership effectiveness. The results of the survey revealed the opposite from the symbolic frame. Using the symbolic frame was the best predictor of leadership effectiveness, but the worst predictor of managerial effectiveness. The study of principals from Singapore and the United States demonstrated similar results (Bolman & Deal, 1991b). In Singapore, effective leadership was most often associated with symbolic and structural frames. In the United States, effective leadership was associated with use of the symbolic, political, and human resource frames.

Harlow (1994) had similar findings in terms of managerial effectiveness. The respondents in that survey indicated managerial effectiveness was associated with structural and political orientations. There was a difference, however, in terms of leadership effectiveness. In

Harlow's investigation, frame usage was not a predictor of leadership effectiveness. Durocher (1996) also suggested that structural and political orientations were closely related to managerial effectiveness. In contrast, Poniatowski (2006) found no difference in management or leadership effectiveness as opposed to leaders and managers working from different frames to achieve effectiveness.

Summary

Bolman and Deal (2002) suggest the key to effective educational administration is the development of mental models that help make sense out of ambiguous situations, figure out potential options, and make decisions that address the reality of that situation. This is not an easy task because it often requires the leader to rely on experience and training to consider circumstances from an angle that is not part of his usual point of view. Therefore, a variety of theories developed in an effort to explain how organizations function. Such theories include the classical, human resource, power and politics, and organizational culture. Each theory attempts to offer manageable concepts that will help the leader understand the events and issues he may be facing.

Four major schools of organizational theory (classical, human resource, power and politics, and organizational culture) were brought together by Bolman and Deal (1984, 2003) to form a coherent multi-frame model. This framework acts as both a window into the world of organizational leadership and as a map to direct leaders in the path of effective decision making (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Organizations have become more dominant in our society, thus becoming more difficult to understand, lead, and manage. According to Bolman and Deal (2002), the best leaders are those who use multiple viewpoints to not only examine what is happening, but to guide them in solving their most difficult challenges.

Research concerning the cognitive orientations of leaders is limited. Some studies indicate that only a limited number of frames are used by leaders (Bensimon, 1989; Bolman & Deal, 1991b, 1992b; Pavan & Reid, 1991; Redman, 1991; Peaslet, 1992; Meade, 1992; Yerkes, Cuellar, & Cuellar, 1992; Strickland, 1992; Wilke, 1993; Miro, 1993; Suzuki, 1994; Davis, 1996). A number of researchers have demonstrated the effectiveness of integrating multiple frames to lead and manage organizations (Lawrence, 1989; Bolman & Deal, 1991b, 1992b; Pavan & Reid, 1991; Durocher, 1996; Rivers, 1996; Messer, 2002; Ulrich, 2004; Poniatowski, 2006; Ross, 2006). While the body of research using the four frame model is growing, very few studies have included private school administrators (e.g. independent day schools, parochial schools, other faith based schools, boarding schools). None have investigated private independent school leaders. The results of my investigation will help add to the current body of evidence that supports Bolman and Deal's (2003) theory of reframing as a means to ensure effective organizational leadership in schools.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter outlines the procedures used to analyze the self-reported leadership orientations of independent school headmasters in relation to the multi-frame framework put forth by Bolman and Deal (2003). The purpose of this study was to investigate the organizational leadership of independent schools through an examination of the leadership orientations of headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools using the four frame perspective developed by Bolman and Deal (2003). This study sought to identify any common orientations among these administrators that may contribute to the management and leadership of their schools as educational organizations. Because school administrators carry the responsibility of creating the conditions under which school success is possible (Corcoran and Wilson, 1986), an investigation into the leadership orientations of headmasters was important for informing what is known about the organizational effectiveness of independent schools. This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. How many frames do headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools employ?
2. Which frame(s) of Bolman and Deal's (2003) four-frame leadership orientations do the headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools report as the most dominant frame(s)?
3. Are the leadership orientations reported by ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW headmasters related to their self-reported effectiveness as a manager and leader?

The remainder of this chapter is divided into six sections; design, sample, instrumentation, data collection, data analysis, and a summary.

Design of the Study

The research design for this study involved a cross-sectional, quantitative survey to determine leadership orientations of headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools. The cross-sectional design, as opposed to a longitudinal design, was chosen to gather data from the chosen population sample at one point in time. Since this study did not require the researcher to gather data over a period of time, a longitudinal design was not appropriate. The study followed a non-experimental design, which does not depend on the existence of a treatment group or control group. As such, the non-experimental design was appropriate because the nature of the data to be collected through surveys was mostly descriptive.

Sample

At the time of this study, there were 487 member schools in the ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW. AISGW member schools are located in and around the greater Washington D.C. area, including Northern Virginia and Maryland. The ISAS draws membership throughout the southwestern United States from Louisiana to New Mexico and Arizona. The region stretching from Louisiana throughout the southern United States into the Carolinas is the area from which the SAIS member schools are located. The ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW are nationally recognized regional independent school accreditation organizations whose criteria for membership and accreditation are consistent with the expectations of the National Organization of Independent Schools (NAIS). Because the population being studied was relatively small (487 headmasters), it was the intent of this study to survey all 487 headmasters. Limited budget and the timing of the survey led to the decision to use an electronic survey distribution. Sending the surveys via email required email addresses for the 487 headmasters. To obtain that information, each member school's website was searched for the headmaster's email address. There were a

number of schools that did not list this information on their websites or didn't have a website to search. In those situations, phone calls were made to ask for the information. The ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW were also asked if they could provide the necessary information. All three organizations could not release the information. The SAIS did acknowledge that a method for helping researchers obtain such information should be brought up to their governing board for consideration as results of studies, such as this, could be beneficial to their member schools. Eventually, a purposive sample of 272 (55.85% of total regional population) headmasters was sent the survey electronically. This number represents the number of valid email addresses obtained in the search.

The decision to survey headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools was intended to aid in the survey's rate of return. The researcher is familiar with independent schools in the region and has worked in member schools that either are members of or are located within the area from which all three organizations draw membership. The researcher currently is employed at an AISGW member school and previously worked at two ISAS member schools located in Louisiana. This familiarity with the schools in these regions was a possible advantage in being able to effectively communicate the intent of this study as well as aid in the rate of return, especially with follow-up requests.

All requests, including follow-up requests, yielded 94 surveys taken. This represents a 34.6% return rate. While this rate of return is within an expected return rate for descriptive studies (Gay and Airasian, 2000), the researcher intended and expected a higher rate of return. There are a number of reasons why this rate of return was lower than expected. The survey was originally sent early in the summer and between school sessions. Some headmasters were not available at the time of the survey to participate. In addition, some schools were going through a

leadership transition and did not yet have their new headmaster on site. This initial survey yielded 85 surveys that were completed and returned in either its entirety (65 surveys) or in part (20 surveys). This study requires surveys to be completed in their entirety in order for inclusion and analysis. The 65 surveys completed in their entirety were not enough to satisfy the minimum rate of return for descriptive studies. Therefore, a second round of surveys requests were sent in the spring of the following school year. This second round of requests asked possible respondents to refrain from completing the survey if they had indeed finished it in the spring. The second round of requests yielded an additional 29 respondents who completed the survey in its entirety. Thus, a total of 94 respondents are included in this study. The timeline chosen to collect data was based on the researcher's ability to devote the appropriate time to the methods for survey collection. At the time of the study, the researcher was a full time independent school administrator whose duties made it more reasonable to perform the data collection during a time of the year when school was not in session, thus allowing for the time needed to gather contact information, send surveys, and make follow up requests.

The ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW are non-profit voluntary membership organizations of independent schools. These member schools include both single-gender and co-ed schools. Member schools also include day, boarding, and a combination of day and boarding schools. The ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW are also members of good standing of the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) Commission on Accreditation. The NAIS is the largest independent school member organization. Of the nearly 2,000 independent schools in the United States, about 1,300 are members of the NAIS; therefore, NAIS member schools account for a population of over 500,000 students in grades pre-kindergarten (4 year olds) through twelfth grade (NAIS, 2007).

Instrumentation

In 1990, Bolman and Deal developed the *Leadership Orientations (Self)* survey. The instrument was based upon the assumption that a leader's behavior will follow his "internal cause maps" (Weick & Bougon, 1986) or "theories for action" (Argyris & Schon, 1974; Bolman & Deal, 1991b). The original instrument consisted of four sections. Section one contains 32 items. Each item describes a behavior which the respondent is asked to provide a rating using a Likert type scale. The scale asked respondents to rate themselves from 1-5 (1-Never, 2-Occasionally, 3-Sometimes, 4-Often, 5-Always). The items were also patterned in a consistent sequence: structural frame (items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29), human resource (2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30), political (3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31), and symbolic (4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32). Section one discusses which frames are used, which are most dominant, and how many frames are used. Section two contained six forced-choice items. Each option in the six items was arranged in the same sequence as section one. This section was designed to address sub-scales for management development and to allow the respondent to describe his/her leadership style. It is suggested that, for research applications, only the 8-item frame measures in section be used (Bolman, 2010). Of the four possible options under each item, respondents used a scale of 1-4 with "4" being the choice that best describes the respondent and "1" being the choice that least describes the respondent. Section three asked respondents to rate themselves relative to other people they know with comparable levels of experience. This section included two items. One item asked respondents to rate their overall effectiveness as a manager. The other item asked for a self-rating for overall leadership effectiveness. Both items were rated on a 5-point scale with "5" being a top 20% rating, "3" a middle 20% rating, and "1" a bottom 20% rating. Section three is designed to provide insight into how effective respondents felt they are performing as

leaders and managers. Section four asked for some background information from respondents. This section asked for gender, years in current job, and total years of experience as a manager.

Bolman and Deal (1991b) established internal reliability for the instrument. A very high Cronbach's alpha of between .91 and .93 for the frame measures was found through pilot testing. In addition, validity for the original instrument was obtained through regression analysis (Bolman & Deal, 1991a, 1991b, 1992b). In terms of managerial and leadership effectiveness, the four frames acted as predictor variables by being "able to predict a minimum of 66% of the variance in perceived managerial effectiveness and 74% in leadership effectiveness" (Bolman & Deal, 1991a, p. 9). The regression analysis also demonstrated that the independent variables associated with managerial effectiveness are almost "converse to those associated with effectiveness as a leader" (Bolman & Deal, 1991a, p. 9). For managerial effectiveness, the structural frame was the best predictor, but it was the worst predictor for leadership effectiveness. The reverse is true of the symbolic frame. This frame had consistently demonstrated that it was the best predictor of leadership effectiveness, but it was also the worst predictor of managerial effectiveness (Bolman & Deal, 1991a).

Permission to use and revise the instrument was requested of Dr. Lee G. Bolman in writing (See Appendix B). Typically, permission is granted based upon the following conditions:

1. The researcher agrees to provide Bolman and Deal with a copy of any reports, publications, papers or theses resulting from the research.
2. The researcher also promises to provide, if requested, a copy of the data file from the research.

Permission to use and revise the instrument was granted (See Appendix C). With permission granted, there were a few revisions made to the instrument. Specifically, revisions were made in sections one and four. Section one was revised to address the possibility of habituation of responses. In the original instrument, all 32 items were worded positively, which presents a danger for habituation from self-rated responses. The section was changed to include some negatively worded items. This change was made to encourage respondents to read each item carefully before rating themselves for that item. It should also be noted that for data analysis purposes, the negatively worded items were reverse coded. Negatively worded items reported as 5 were coded as 1, 4 as 2, 2 as 4, and 1 as 5. Section four, in the original instrument, included three items to collect background information from the respondent. The revision to section four was an expansion of the background information questions to gather additional demographic data. Once revisions were made, the revised instrument was pilot tested for reliability.

Pilot Test

The pilot test for the revised instrument was necessary to establish reliability. The pilot test used a similar method as would be used in the larger study. A panel of experts established face validity for the revised instrument.

Design

The research design for the pilot study involved a cross-sectional, quantitative survey to determine leadership orientations and evaluate these results for reliability using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for internal consistency. The cross-sectional design, as opposed to a longitudinal design, was chosen to gather data from the pilot study population sample at one point in time. The pilot study did not require the researcher to gather data over a period of time;

therefore a longitudinal design was not appropriate. The pilot study followed a non-experimental design, which does not depend on the existence of a treatment group or control group.

Sample and Instrument

The sample used for the pilot study consisted of independent school leaders (other than headmasters of school) from ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools. These leaders included lower, middle, and upper school division heads, deans of students, and department chairs. These types of leaders were chosen because while they are not the actual population being studied, their positions in independent schools require them to make managerial and leadership decisions based upon the context and situations associated with the challenges present in a private, independent school setting. A total of 56 revised surveys were sent electronically.

The revised survey consisted of changes designed to reduce the chance of habituation as well as the desire to gather additional demographic data that the original instrument does not address.

Section one of the revised instrument consists of 32 rating statements using Likert type responses (1-Never, 2-Occasionally, 3-Sometimes, 4-Often, and 5-Always). Revisions to section one addressed the need to make adjustments to avoid respondent habituation. These revisions included re-wording some items to include a 50:50 split between positive and negative wording. In the original survey, all 32 items were worded positively. In the revised survey, half of the items were reworded to include negative statements. The rating scales in section one are in consistent frame sequence: structural (items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, and 29), human resource (2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, and 30), political (3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, and 31), and symbolic (4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, and 32).

The original final section of the survey consisted of three background questions: the participant's gender, years in their current position, and total years as a manager. In the revised survey, "total years as a manager" was changed to "total years as an educational administrator." Also, this section was expanded to include the following items:

- Ethnicity
- Highest degree/credential earned
- Whether certified as a teacher
- Years of teaching experience
- Whether certified as an educational administrator
- Type of school at which you currently work (Co-ed, Single-gender, Day, Boarding, Non-denominational, Faith-based, or Secular)
- Student enrollment at current school
- Years at current job
- Total years of experience in senior leadership positions (both inside and outside of educational field)

Data Collection

Pilot studies were distributed electronically via email with an embedded link to the survey. The pilot study was hosted on the internet by Zoomerang™ (an online survey hosting service which allows surveys to be created, viewed, and taken on the internet). The body of the email was the cover letter which explained the purpose and importance of the pilot study. A follow up email was sent one week after the initial request to encourage respondents to complete the survey. A third request for respondents was sent 10 days after the follow up email. When

finished, 30 completed surveys were returned. This represents a 53.6% rate of return for the pilot study.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the pilot test were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Graduate Pack 14.0. An analysis of the descriptive statistics for the pilot study, using the revised instrument, indicated that the frames could be measured on the 5-point Likert scale and reported using descriptive statistics as would be needed in the actual study.

Respondents to the pilot study indicated use of two frames (structural and human resource) at or above the necessary mean score cut-off defining frame use in the actual study (4.0). Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics determined by the pilot study.

Table 1: Pilot Study Results - Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses for All Items by Frame

Frame	N	Mean	SD	Range
Structural	30	4.08	.55	2 - 5
Human Resource	30	4.27	.41	3 - 5
Political	30	3.45	.49	2 - 5
Symbolic	30	3.81	.49	2 - 5

The more critical analysis of data, the test for reliability, suggested that the revised instrument met the criteria for reliability. Using the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for internal consistency, section one as a whole as well as each set of the eight item frame measures was tested for reliability. For exploratory research, a common cutoff for reliability of .60 is generally accepted (Garson, 2009). Being that a pilot test is exploratory in nature; the cutoff of .60 was used as the minimum measure for reliability. When examined by eight item frame measures, the minimum level of reliability was reached in all four cases: structural (.80), human resource (.60),

political (.73), and symbolic (.75). In addition to the individual measures meeting the standard for reliability, section one as a whole (all 32 items) reported a Cronbach's alpha of .88. Thus, reliability for the revised section one was established both for the section as a whole and for the individual frames as calculated by the eight item measures. Table 2 represents the results of the pilot test reliability.

Table 2: Pilot Test Reliability Results by Frame

Frame	N	Survey Items	r
Structural	30	1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29	.80*
Human Resource	30	2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30	.60*
Political	30	3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31	.73*
Symbolic	30	4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32	.75*

Note: *Reliability established at or above .60

Feedback on the survey was limited to being cautious with the negative wording, as it caused many of the respondents to be careful in their survey taking. That such care was given to reading and responding to the items was the intention of the modification in an effort to reduce the chance for habituation. The results of the pilot study also suggested that the adjustments to section four should not present a problem with survey completion and feedback. All surveys returned from the pilot study included a completed section four. This would imply that the additional questions, as well as the rewording of the two items mentioned earlier in this section, are appropriate for the survey.

Data Collection

Surveys were distributed electronically via email with an embedded link to the survey. The survey was hosted on the internet by Zoomerang™. The body of the email was the cover letter which explained the purpose and importance of the researcher's study (see Appendix A).

A follow up email was sent one week after the initial request to encourage respondents to complete the survey using the web link included in the email. A third request for respondents was sent 10 days after the follow up email. One respondent was unable to complete the survey electronically and requested a hard copy attached to an email. An email with the attachment was sent, completed, and returned to the researcher. Three potential respondents indicated a desire not to be included in the study. Their requests were honored, and they were immediately removed from the list of potential respondents.

Data Analysis

The data analysis of the collected survey data was performed in two stages. The first was a descriptive analysis of the demographic information collected from section four of the survey instrument. The second part was a descriptive analysis of the data collected from the survey as it applies to the three research questions. SPSS was used to input and analyze data.

Research Question One: How many frames do headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools employ?

The answer to research question one revealed how many frames are used by the independent school headmasters. In order to answer this question, each respondent's mean score for each frame was computed from the data collected in section one of the survey. In order for the frame to count as being used, the respondent's mean score for that frame use needed to be at least 4.0 (*Often* on the Likert scale). The use of 4.0 was consistent with previous research using Bolman and Deal's (1990) *Leadership Orientations (Self)* survey.

Research Question Two: Which frame(s) of Bolman and Deal's (2003) four-frame leadership orientations do the headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools report as the most dominant frame(s)?

To answer this question, a mean score was obtained from a Likert type scale for each of the 32 items in section one of the survey. This was done by adding together all responses for each individual item and computing the mean score. Based on this data, each item's standard deviation and range was computed.

A mean score was also computed for each frame collectively. This was done by adding all the responses associated with each frame and computing a mean score. For example, the mean score for the structural frame was computed by adding together the data collected from items 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, and 29; then computing a mean score based on that data. From those mean scores, standard deviations and ranges were computed for each frame.

Research Question Three: Are the leadership orientations reported by ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW headmasters related to their self-reported effectiveness as managers and leaders?

The answer to question three began with a descriptive analysis of section three of the survey. This section asked the respondents to rate themselves for managerial and leadership effectiveness. The descriptive analysis revealed how often each response is recorded. A mean score for self-rated managerial effectiveness and self-rated leadership effectiveness is determined also. After having established the self-reported ratings, a bivariate correlation analysis using the Pearson correlation coefficient was performed. This analysis sought to determine any significant correlations between the self-ratings for managerial and leadership effectiveness and the rating for each of the four frames. Statistical analysis for this study was computed using SPSS.

Discussion of Findings and Demographics

A discussion of the findings, as they possibly relate to the demographic data collected, is included in this study. Demographic data examined include gender, teacher certification, administrator certification, and highest degree earned.

In order to investigate any possible significant differences of gender, teacher certification, and administrator certification on frame usage, independent samples t-tests were performed. Independent samples t-tests were chosen because they are used to “check for differences between two independent groups on the means of a continuous variable” (Cannon, 1999). In this study the continuous variable is each of the four frames.

Finally, an analysis of reported frame use and highest degree earned was performed using one way ANOVA. One way ANOVA was also used to explore possible differences in frame use based on years of teaching experience and years of administrative experience. Years of experience, both teaching and administrative, were examined in terms of groups of years (0-10, 11-20, 21-30, and 31 and more). The one way ANOVA test was chosen because there are multiple means to compare. When comparing multiple means, the one way ANOVA is the recommended in place of performing multiple t-tests (Brown, 2010). If any significant differences were found in the test (if we find that the means are not statistically equal), post hoc analysis using Tukey HSD would be performed to determine which means are not equal (Brown, 2010).

Summary

This study sought to describe the organizational leadership of independent schools through an investigation into the self-perceived leadership orientations of their headmasters. In order to perform this study, a purposive sample of headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW

member schools was chosen to participate. Participants were asked to complete a revised version of Bolman and Deal's (1990) *Leadership Orientations (Self)* survey. Data collected were subjected to descriptive and comparative analysis. The results of this analysis were used to address the research questions.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the organizational leadership of independent schools through an examination of the leadership orientations of headmasters of ISAS and SAIS member schools using the four frame perspective developed by Bolman and Deal (2003). This study sought to identify any common orientations among these administrators that may contribute to the management and leadership of their schools as educational organizations. Additional purposes of this study include an analysis of which frames and how many frames are used by these school leaders. A final purpose of the study was to analyze the extent to which these leadership orientations are related to the headmasters' self-reported managerial and leadership effectiveness. This chapter answers the research questions presented in Chapter 1. The methods for analyzing the data were described in Chapter 3.

Two hundred seventy two surveys were sent via email using Zoomerang™ to headmasters of SAIS, ISAS, and AIGSW member schools. Two additional messages with the link to the survey were sent as follow-ups. These requests yielded only 65 completed surveys. Due to the low return, a second round of requests was performed. After the second round of requests (which included the same follow up procedures as the first round of requests), 94 completed surveys were collected. Three potential participants asked to be removed from the survey and were not sent additional messages.

Table 3: Demographic Breakdown of Respondents (N=94)

Variable	n	Percentage of Total
Gender		
Male	73	77.7%
Female	21	22.3%
Ethnicity		
White	93	98.9%
African-American	1	1.1%
Highest Degree Earned		
Bachelors	2	2.1%
Masters	59	62.8%
Doctorate	31	33%
Other	2	2.1%
Certified Teacher		
Yes	46	48.9%
No	48	51.1%
Certified Administrator		
Yes	40	42.6%
No	54	57.4%
Type of School		
Co-Ed	50	78%
Single-Gender	9	14%
Day	53	83%
Boarding	4	6%
Non-Denominational	27	42%
Faith-Based	20	31%
Secular	13	20%

Demographic Information

The survey collected demographic information from 94 respondents. Table 3 shows the breakdown of demographics. Data were reported concerning gender, ethnicity, highest degree earned, whether the respondent was a certified teacher, years of teaching experience, whether the respondent was a certified educational administrator, years of educational administration, type of school they work, student enrollment at current school, years in current position, and total years in senior leadership positions.

Of the 94 respondents who completed the demographic section, 73 (77.7%) were male and 21 (22.3%) were female. Data on ethnicity revealed that 93 (98.9%) were white and 1 (1.1%) was African-American. As for education; a Bachelor's degree was the highest degree earned by 2 (2.1%), a Master's by 59 (62.8%), a Ph. D by 31 (33%), an Ed. D by 1 (1%), and 1 (1%) indicated an ABD (all but dissertation) status from a Ph. D. Forty six (48.9%) of the 94 respondents were certified teachers. Forty (42.6%) were certified educational administrators. The most common types of schools listed were day school by 53 (80%) of the respondents and coed school by 50 (78%) of respondents. The survey item designed to collect data on type of school allowed respondents to choose more than one item. For example, if a respondent worked at a co-ed, secular, day school, that respondent may have chosen three items for this survey question. For this reason, the responses for type of school are greater than the 94 responses collected for each of the other items.

Descriptive Analysis

The descriptive analysis responds to the three research questions. There is also a discussion of the findings as they relate to gender. Following the descriptive analysis, a summary of findings is included.

Research Question One

Research question one asked: How many frames do headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools employ?

To answer this question, each respondent's mean score for each frame was computed. Frames with mean scores greater than or equal to 4.0 (using *often* or *always*) were considered consistently used by the respondent. The number of frames a headmaster used was determined by adding up the number of frames with mean scores greater than or equal to 4.0.

There were 94 respondents. Of the 94 respondents, 32 (34.0%) headmasters reported using all four frames. Use of three frames was reported by 25 (26.6%) headmasters, two frames by 21 (22.3%), one frame by 9 (9.6%), and 7 (7.5%) respondents reported use of no frames at the 4.0 or higher rating. Therefore, 78 (83.0%) out of a possible 94 respondents indicated multiple frame use. Table 4 represents the findings.

Table 4: Number of Frames Used by Headmasters (N=94)

Number of Frames Used	n	Percentage
No Frames	7	7.5%
One Frame	9	9.6%
Two Frames	21	22.3%
Three Frames	25	26.6%
Four Frames	32	34.0%

Nine headmasters reported using only one frame. Of those nine, 4 (44.4%) reported using the human resource frame. Three of the other three headmasters reported using the structural frame (33.3%). One respondent reported a political frame orientation and the other respondent reported using the symbolic frame.

Twenty-one headmasters reported the use of two frames. The structural frame was the most frequently used (16 out of the 21, 76.2%) with the human resource frame almost matching the structural with 15 out of 21 (71.4%). The remaining respondents indicated the use of the symbolic frame 11 (52.4%) times. None of the two-frame oriented respondents reported use of the political frame. This would also suggest that the most likely combination of frames used by headmasters reporting a two-frame orientation would be a structural and human resource combination. This finding supports previous suggestions by Bolman and Deal (2002), who reported that “most educators rely primarily on the human resource or structural lenses” (p. 4).

Using three frames was reported by 25 headmasters. In 22 (88.0%) of the cases, the symbolic frame was one of the three used. The next most reported frame used by headmasters reporting the use of three frames was the human resource frame which was included as one of the three by 21 (84.0%) respondents. The least used frames were the structural (17 out of 25, 68.0%) and the political (15 out of 25, 60.0%). These results present a departure from the one and two-frame orientations in that the three-frame oriented headmasters report a much higher use of the symbolic frame. With three frames reported being used, the symbolic frame emerges as the most used frame just ahead of the human resource frame. For headmasters reporting one and two-frame use, the symbolic frame was either the least or second least used frame. It is likely that three-frame oriented headmasters are often viewing situations from the symbolic, human resource, and either the political or structural frame.

The use of all four frames was reported by 32 (34.0%) of the headmasters. This finding suggests that more headmasters report using all four frames than any other combination of frame use. Table 5 summarizes these findings.

Table 5: Percentage of Frames Identified as Used Often or Always by the Number of Frames Used

Number of Frames Used	Total	Percentage
No Frames (n=7)	7	100.0%
One Frame (n=9)		
Structural	3	33.3%
Human Resource	4	44.4%
Political	1	11.1%
Symbolic	1	11.1%
Two Frames (n=21)		
Structural	16	76.2%
Human Resource	15	71.4%
Political	0	0%
Symbolic	11	52.4%
Three Frames (n=25)		
Structural	17	68.0%
Human Resource	21	84.0%
Political	15	60.0%
Symbolic	22	88.0%
Four Frames (n=32)		
Structural	32	100.0%
Human Resource	32	100.0%
Political	32	100.0%
Symbolic	32	100.0%

Summary of findings related to research question one:

Data collected by the surveys revealed important information to address the question concerning the number of frames used by the ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member school headmasters. A frame was considered used if its mean score was at least 4.0. Multiple frame usage (more than one frame) was reported by 78 (83.0%) of respondents. Three or four frame

usage was reported by 57 (60.6%) of respondents. The most likely combination of frames used were the structural and human resource (two frame use) or symbolic, human resource, and either structural or political (three frame use). While there were a few respondents reporting one or two frame usage, only seven (7.5%) of respondents indicated they did not use any frame at or above the 4.0 mean score. Using all four frames was the most reported individual combination of use by the headmasters with 32 (34.0%) self-reporting use of the structural, human resource, political, and symbolic frames at or above the 4.0 level.

Research Question Two

Question two asked: Which frame(s) of Bolman and Deal's (2003) four-frame leadership orientations do the headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools report as the most dominant frame(s)?

Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9 provide the means, standard deviations, and range of responses for each item in the questionnaire based on their respective frame. Each item has been grouped according to Bolman and Deal's (2003) four frame model. Question 28 in the symbolic frame had the highest average rating, 4.70, for any one question. This question asked respondents to rate their ability to generate loyalty and enthusiasm. The high mean score for that item suggests that a feeling of loyalty and enthusiasm was generated more than *often* (4.0) and slightly less than *always* (5.0) as reported by the self-ratings provided by the headmasters surveyed. As this item is related to the symbolic frame, the high mean score for this item also indicates that the headmasters believe very strongly that they most often act as a leader who inspires loyalty and enthusiasm.

In the political frame, question 7 had the lowest average rating of any one question, 3.32. This item asked respondents to rate their ability as negotiators. The mean score (3.32) suggests

that respondents to this question rated themselves as being very skillful and shrewd negotiators a little more than *occasionally* (3.0). Political leadership involves advocacy and coalition building (Bolman and Deal, 2003). Therefore, the low score for this item would indicate that the headmasters believe they are less adept at negotiating than any of the other skills described in the survey.

While none of the frames measured at least an average rating of 4.0 for each question, three out of the four frames were very close to accomplishing that with the fourth frame measuring a 4.0 average response for only one of its items. The structural, human resource, and symbolic frames each had one or two items that rated below 4.0. The political frame only had one item to rate above the 4.0 level.

Results of the structural frame items indicated that six out of the eight structural frame questions scored at or above the 4.0 level. The two items that scored below 4.0 (item 5: *careful planning and time lines* and item 25: *attention to detail*) did, however, score a rating very close to 4.0. These two items scored 3.96 and 3.99 respectively. The human resource frame had one item score below 4.0. Question 2 scored a rating of 3.45. That question asked headmasters to rate themselves for support and concern for others. Similar to the human resource frame, the symbolic frame also had only one item score below 4.0. That item was question 8, which asked headmasters to rate themselves in terms their degree of charisma. This examination of the individual survey items associated with each frame indicate that there is a fairly strong and consistent perception by these headmasters that they are most often oriented towards their structural, human resource, and symbolic leadership roles.

The political frame scored only one item above the 4.0 level, though a few other items were very close to making the 4.0 standard. Questions 3 (3.97), 19 (3.95), and 27 (3.94) all rated

extremely near to the 4.0 level. Only question 31 (*Succeed in the Face of Conflict and Opposition*) scored above 4.0 (4.33). All items for the political frame did score at least 3.0 (Sometimes), but the findings suggest that this frame was the least used frame.

Table 6: Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses to Structural Frame Items

Item	Description	N	Mean	SD	Range
1	Think Clearly and Logically	94	4.11	.77	1 - 5
5	Emphasize Careful Planning and Time Lines	94	3.96	.73	2 - 5
9	Logical Analysis and Careful Planning	94	4.26	.67	2 - 5
13	Implement Clear, Logical Policies and Procedures	94	4.02	.66	1 - 5
17	Approach problems With Facts and Logic	94	4.25	.63	2 - 5
21	Set Specific and Measurable Goals and Hold People Accountable	94	4.49	.95	1 - 5
25	Attention to Detail	94	3.99	.78	2 - 5
29	Clear Structure and Chain of Command	94	4.08	.91	2 - 5

Table 7: Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses to Human Resource Frame Items

Item	Description	N	Mean	SD	Range
2	Support and Concern For Others	94	3.45	1.30	1 - 5
6	Build Trust Through Open and Collaborative Relationships	94	4.42	.68	2 - 5
10	Sensitivity and Concern For Others' Needs and Feelings	94	4.44	.67	2 - 5
14	Foster Participation and Involvement in Decisions	94	4.06	.88	1 - 5
18	Helpful and Responsive To Others	94	4.31	.55	3 - 5
22	Listen To and Receptive To Others Ideas and Input	94	4.46	.68	2 - 5
26	Give Recognition For Work Done Well	94	4.15	.73	2 - 5
30	Highly Participative Manager	94	4.34	.71	2 - 5

Table 8: Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses to Political Frame Items

Item	Description	N	Mean	SD	Range
3	Mobilize People and Resources	94	3.97	.61	2 - 5
7	Skillful and Shrewd Negotiator	94	3.32	.91	1 - 5
11	Unusually Persuasive and Influential	94	3.87	.77	2 - 5
15	Deal Adroitly With Organizational Conflict	94	3.71	.68	2 - 5
19	Getting Support From People With Influence and Power	94	3.95	.75	1 - 5
23	Politically Sensitive and Skillful	94	3.76	.90	1 - 5
27	Develop Alliances and Build Strong Base of Support	94	3.94	.69	2 - 5
31	Succeed in the Face of Conflict and Opposition	94	4.33	.65	3 - 5

Table 9: Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses to Symbolic Frame Items

Item	Description	N	Mean	SD	Range
4	Inspire Others To Do Their Best	94	4.03	.50	3 - 5
8	Highly Charismatic	94	3.42	.96	1 - 5
12	Inspiration to Others	94	4.10	.75	2 - 5
16	Imaginative and Creative	94	4.01	.90	1 - 5
20	Communicate Strong/Challenging Sense of Vision and Mission	94	4.23	.75	2 - 5
24	Generate Exciting New Opportunities	94	4.10	.80	2 - 5
28	Generate Loyalty and Enthusiasm	94	4.70	.55	2 - 5
32	Model of Organizational Aspirations and Values	94	4.14	.70	1 - 5

Table 10 reports the means, standard deviations, and range for all items in a frame. The frame with the highest mean was the human resource frame (4.20). The human resource frame, along with the structural frame, also had the lowest standard deviation (.40). This would suggest

that respondents felt strongest about their self-reported use of the human resource frame than any other frame. The lowest mean score belonged to the political frame (3.86). The symbolic frame had the highest standard deviation (.48). The mean score for the political frame items suggests that, of all the frames, the headmasters were least likely to use the political frame. The score (3.86) is just below the 4.0 cut-off for *often* use, but it does indicate that the headmasters are more likely to use this frame more often than *sometimes* (3.0 on the 5-point scale). The symbolic frame's higher standard deviation indicates that the responses by the headmasters for this frame have the most variability of all the frames. This would suggest that within the items measuring use of the symbolic frame the headmasters are likely to have the least homogenous opinions and ratings. Thus the scores on these items will be the most likely to avoid clustering near the mean score (4.09).

Table 10: Means, Standard Deviations, and Range of Responses for All Items by Frame

Frame	N	Mean	SD	Range
Structural	94	4.14	.40	1 - 5
Human Resource	94	4.20	.40	1 - 5
Political	94	3.86	.46	1 - 5
Symbolic	94	4.09	.48	1 - 5

The frequency distribution of the means of individual responses and percent of responses by frame are indicated in Table 11. In the *often* and *always* categories (4 and 5 on the Likert type scale used in the survey), the human resource frame had the greatest number with a mean rating of 75.5% (71). The structural and symbolic frames were similar in the *often* and *always* categories with mean scores of 71.3% (67) and 69.2% (65) respectively. The political frame was

a distant 50% (47). The political frame did, though, have the greatest mean score in terms of the *sometimes* category with 46.8% (44).

Table 11: Frequency Distribution of the Means of Individual Responses and Percent of Responses by Frame

Frame	N	Scale				
		1 – 1.99 Never	2 – 2.99 Occasionally	3 – 3.99 Sometimes	4 – 4.99 Often	5 Always
Structural	94	0	0	27	65	2
		0%	0%	28.7%	69.2%	2.1%
Human Resource	94	0	0	23	70	1
		0%	0%	24.5%	74.4%	1.1%
Political	94	0	3	44	47	0
		0%	3.2%	46.8%	50.0%	0%
Symbolic	94	0	1	28	65	0
		0%	1.1%	29.8%	69.2%	0%

Summary of findings related to research question two:

The data collected from the surveys are relevant to research question one. Specifically, the data helps answer the question of which frame(s) of Bolman and Deal's (2003) four-frame leadership orientations do the headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools report as the most dominant frame(s)? The highest mean score of all the frames was attributed to the human resource frame. The structural and symbolic frames followed the human resource frame in terms of mean scores. A mean score of no less than 4.0 was necessary for a frame to be considered used *often*. The political frame scored a mean value of just below the 4.0 threshold with a mean of 3.86, suggesting its use was on the *often* side of *sometimes*. In addition to having the highest mean score, the human resource frame was also used *often* or *always* by 75.5% (71)

of respondents. This was followed by the structural (71.3%, 67) and symbolic (69.2%, 65) frames. The political frame was not used *often* or *always* nearly as much (50%, 47), but did manage to have the greatest *sometimes* use (46.8%, 44).

Research Question Three

Research question 3 asked: Are the leadership orientations reported by ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW headmasters related to their self-reported effectiveness as a manager and leader?

Table 12 represents the self-ratings collected for effectiveness as managers and as leaders. The headmasters gave themselves high ratings for both leadership and managerial effectiveness. For managerial effectiveness, 91.5% (86) rated themselves above the middle 20% when comparing themselves to other headmasters as managers with 56.4% (53) reported in the top 20%. The mean rating for managerial effectiveness was 4.48 (5 representing a top 20% rating).

Leadership effectiveness was even higher, with 69.1% (65) of the respondents describing themselves as being in the top 20% when compared to other headmasters in leadership effectiveness. An additional 27.7% (26) of the respondents rated themselves above the middle 20% when comparing themselves to other headmasters. Leadership effectiveness scored a mean rating of 4.66, with “5” representing a top 20% rating.

A bivariate correlation analysis using the Pearson correlation coefficient was performed between both the self-perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness ratings and the self-perceived ratings for each of the four frames. Pearson correlation was chosen because it is the most common measure used for bivariate relationship measures (Garson, 2008). The correlation analysis indicated a significant relationship existed between self-perceived managerial effectiveness and the use of the structural frame, $r(92) = .291, p < 0.01$.

Table 12: Self-Ratings for Management and Leadership Effectiveness (N=94)

Variable	Rating*	n	Percentage	Mean
Management Effectiveness	1	0	0%	4.48
	2	0	0%	
	3	8	8.5%	
	4	33	35.1%	
	5	53	56.4%	
Leadership Effectiveness	1	0	0%	4.66
	2	0	0%	
	3	3	3.2%	
	4	26	27.7%	
	5	65	69.1%	

Note: *The scale for ratings indicated

1 = Bottom 20%, 3 = Middle 20%, 5 = Top 20%.

No significant correlations were found to exist between self-perceived managerial effectiveness and the use of the human resource, political, and symbolic frames. In addition, the data revealed that a slightly negative relationship existed between self-perceived managerial effectiveness and the use of the human resource, $r = -.004$ or symbolic frames, $r = -.015$. These findings suggest that headmasters' self-perceived managerial effectiveness was negatively affected by using the human resource or symbolic frames.

The analysis of the ratings for self-perceived leadership effectiveness and any correlations to the four frames suggests an additional relationship. A significant correlation was found to exist between self-perceived leadership effectiveness and the use of the political frame, $r = .222, p < 0.05$.

No significant correlation was found to exist between the self-perceived leadership effectiveness ratings and the structural frame, human resource frame, or symbolic frame. These findings partially support previous research by Bolman and Deal (1991b) which suggested the political, symbolic, and human resource frames are predictors of leadership effectiveness. Table 13 summarizes the correlations findings.

Table 13: Correlations Between Frame Use and Self-reported Effectiveness as Manager and Leader (N=94)

Frame	Manager	Leader
Structural	.291**	.114
Human Resource	-.004	.161
Political	.082	.222*
Symbolic	-.015	.132

Note: **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05

Summary of findings related to research question three:

Survey data provided information needed to answer the research question inquiring into a possible correlation between leadership orientations (frame usage) and self-rated effectiveness as a leader and a manager. These self-ratings placed the headmasters very high on the effectiveness scale, almost in the top 20% of their peers, in both leadership and managerial effectiveness. A significant correlation was found to exist between self-perceived managerial effectiveness and the use of the structural frame. The use of the political frame had a significant correlation to self-perceived leadership effectiveness. In addition, a negative correlation was shown to exist between self-perceived managerial effectiveness and use of the human resource or symbolic frames.

Discussion of Findings and Demographics

The findings of the study, with regard to demographic data, are most useful in terms of examining the data concerning gender, teacher certification, administrator certification, and highest degree earned. Ethnicity is not explored due to the fact that with one exception, all the respondents are white (the lone non-white respondent is African-American). Previous findings have limited their reporting to possible gender differences, and have either suggested no difference in frame usage (Bolman and Deal, 1991b and Ross 2006) or higher use of the human resource frame in females (Suzuki, 1994 and Davis, 1996).

With regards to gender, this study revealed that both males and females reported using the human resource frame the most. In addition, both males and females reported being three frame users. The human resource frame scored 4.19 for males and 4.25 for females. The 4.25 reported by females for the human resource frame was the highest mean score reported for any frame by gender. As for the number of frames used, both males and females scored at least 4.0 for the structural, human resource, and symbolic frames. For both males (3.84) and females (3.92), the political frame did not qualify as used, though the mean scores were very close to making the necessary minimum to qualify as used. Table 14 summarizes these findings.

In order to investigate any possible significant differences of gender on frame usage, independent samples t-tests were used to examine gender and frame use. The results of this examination suggest that there were no significant differences for gender and use of any of the four frames; structural: $t(92) = -1.16, p = .25$, human resource: $t(92) = -.76, p = .45$, political: $t(92) = -.70, p = .49$, and symbolic: $t(92) = -1.03, p = .31$. While the analysis indicates no difference for gender on frame use, this lack of difference could also be attributed to a Type II error; meaning that gender does make a difference on frame use, but such differences could not

be measured using the methods in this study (such as sample size, population variety, and alpha level). These findings are summarized in Table 15.

Table 14: Means and Standard Deviations by Gender

Frame	Gender	n	Mean	SD
Structural	Male	73	4.12	.38
	Female	21	4.23	.46
Human Resource	Male	73	4.19	.42
	Female	21	4.25	.30
Political	Male	73	3.84	.46
	Female	21	3.92	.46
Symbolic	Male	73	4.06	.45
	Female	21	4.19	.55

Table 15: Independent T-Test Comparison of Means by Gender ($\alpha = .05$)

Frame	df	t	p
Structural	92	-1.16	.25
Human Resource	92	-.76	.45
Political	92	-.70	.49
Symbolic	92	-1.03	.31

Demographic data also allow for an examination of reported frame use and any possible differences by a headmaster also being a certified teacher. Mean scores and standard deviations by whether or not the headmaster is also a certified teacher is represented in Table 16. T-tests

were also used to explore any possible differences by certification on frame use. Table 17 summarizes that examination.

Table 16: Means and Standard Deviations by Teacher Certification

Frame	Certified Teacher	n	Mean	SD
Structural	Yes	46	4.29	.37
	No	48	4.01	.39
Human Resource	Yes	46	4.35	.37
	No	48	4.06	.37
Political	Yes	46	4.04	.35
	No	48	3.68	.48
Symbolic	Yes	46	4.29	.36
	No	48	3.90	.50

Table 17: Independent T-Test Comparison of Means by Teacher Certification ($\alpha = .05$)

Frame	df	t	p
Structural	92	3.58	.001*
Human Resource	92	3.86	.000**
Political	92	4.28	.000**
Symbolic	92	4.44	.000**

Note: ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$

No other study has examined frame use and any possible difference of teacher certification. As with gender, the human resource frame emerged as the most used frame for both headmasters with teacher certification (4.35) and headmasters without teacher certification

(4.06). Also similar to gender, the political frame was the least used frame by headmasters with teacher certification (4.04) and without teacher certification (3.68).

Headmasters with teacher certification reported use of all four frames at or above the 4.0 level. In addition, data analysis indicates a significant difference for teacher certification for each of the four frames; structural: $t(92) = 3.58, p < .05$, human resource: $t(92) = 3.86, p < .001$, political: $t(92) = 4.28, p < .001$, and symbolic: $t(92) = 4.44, p < .001$. Therefore, the data suggest that a headmaster with teacher certification is more likely to report using all four frames than headmasters without teacher certification, though this suggestion could also be the result of a Type I error. In this case, the Type I error would be that the difference of teacher certification on frame use measured in this study was actually false; though with $\alpha = .05$, the chances of such a false measurement was equal to 5 out of 100.

Headmasters without teacher certification only rated the structural (4.01) and human resource (4.06) frames above 4.0. Therefore, this study revealed that headmasters with teacher certification reported using all four frames while headmasters without teacher certification reported the use of only two frames. This finding might suggest that there is an element of teacher certification that may relate to the eventual use of the political and symbolic frames.

The headmasters in this survey also shared information regarding whether or not they held administrative certification. Table 18 presents the means and standard deviations for the headmasters' frame use by administrative certification. Once again, the human resource frame was used most by both headmasters with administrative certification (4.28) and those headmasters without that certification (4.15). The political frame was the least used frame, again. Headmasters with administrator certification reported the political frame at 3.85. Headmasters without administrator certification rated the political frame at 3.86. The number of

frames used, based on administrator certification, was similar to the results for gender. For headmasters with and without administrator certification, three frames were reported at or above the 4.0 level. These frames were the structural, human resource, and symbolic. Only the political frame did not qualify as used because the mean score for both the administrator certified and uncertified headmasters was below 4.0.

Table 18: Means and Standard Deviations by Administrator Certification

Frame	Certified Teacher	n	Mean	SD
Structural	Yes	40	4.21	.41
	No	54	4.09	.40
Human Resource	Yes	40	4.28	.40
	No	54	4.15	.39
Political	Yes	40	3.85	.53
	No	54	3.86	.40
Symbolic	Yes	40	4.15	.53
	No	54	4.05	.43

The difference for administrator certification on frame use was analyzed using t-tests. The results of these tests are summarized in Table 19. As with teacher certification, this study was the first to analyze any possible differences of administrator certification on self-reported frame use. Unlike teacher certification, the results of the t-tests on administrator certification did not suggest any difference on self-reported structural frame use ($t = 1.47$, $df = 92$, $p = .15$), human resource frame use ($t = 1.54$, $df = 92$, $p = .13$), political frame use ($t = -.04$, $df = 92$, $p = .97$), or symbolic frame use ($t = .99$, $df = 92$, $p = .33$) though this may have been a result of a

Type II error; meaning administrator certification does actually have an effect on frame use that this study was unable to determine.

Table 19: Independent T-Test Comparison of Means by Administrator Certification ($\alpha = .05$)

Frame	df	t	p
Structural	92	1.47	.15
Human Resource	92	1.54	.13
Political	92	-.04	.97
Symbolic	92	.99	.33

Table 20: One-Way ANOVA Comparison of Means by Highest Degree Earned ($\alpha = .05$)

Frame	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Structural	Between Groups	.13	3	.04	.25	.86
	Within Groups	14.93	90	.17		
	Total	15.05	93			
Human Resource	Between Groups	.40	3	.14	.85	.47
	Within Groups	14.35	90	.16		
	Total	14.75	93			
Political	Between Groups	.16	3	.05	.25	.86
	Within Groups	19.32	90	.22		
	Total	19.48	93			
Symbolic	Between Groups	.34	3	.11	.49	.69
	Within Groups	20.71	90	.23		
	Total	21.04	93			

An analysis of reported frame use and highest degree earned was performed using one way ANOVA. The results of the test are summarized in Table 20. These results indicate that there were no significant differences for highest degree earned (Bachelors, Masters, or Doctorate) and reported frame use (structural frame: $F(3, 90) = .25, p = .86$, human resource frame: $F(3, 90) = .85, p = .47$, political frame: $F(3, 90) = .25, p = .86$, symbolic frame: $F(3, 90) = .49, p = .69$).

Because no significant differences were found to exist between reported frame use and highest degree earned, post hoc Tukey HSD tests to determine any differences within the highest degree earned groups was not necessary and not performed. Therefore, it was suggested by this study that frame use was not affected by the level of education of the headmasters.

One way ANOVA was also used to examine possible differences on frame use and years of teaching experience. The results were similar to the analysis of administrator certification. No significant difference was found. Results of this analysis are represented in Table 21.

The final analysis was performed to examine any possible differences for years of administrative experience and frame use (see Table 22). This analysis revealed a difference on years of administrative experience and use of the human resource frame ($F(3, 90) = 4.18, p < .05$). Post hoc comparisons were conducted using the Tukey HSD method to identify differences among specific groups of years as an administrator. Tukey's HSD revealed that headmasters with 21-30 years of administrative experience are significantly more likely to choose the human resource frame than headmasters with 11-20 years experience in administration ($p < .05$).

Table 21: One-Way ANOVA Comparison of Means by Years of Teaching Experience ($\alpha = .05$)

Frame	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Structural	Between Groups	.80	3	.67	1.69	.18
	Within Groups	14.75	90	.16		
	Total	15.05	93			
Human Resource	Between Groups	.40	3	.13	.83	.48
	Within Groups	14.36	90	.16		
	Total	14.75	93			
Political	Between Groups	.47	3	.16	.75	.53
	Within Groups	19.01	90	.21		
	Total	19.48	93			
Symbolic	Between Groups	.52	3	.17	.75	.52
	Within Groups	20.53	90	.23		
	Total	21.04	93			

Table 22: One-Way ANOVA Comparison of Means by Years of Administrative Experience ($\alpha = .05$)

Frame	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Structural	Between Groups	.81	3	.27	1.71	.17
	Within Groups	14.24	90	.16		
	Total	15.05	93			
Human Resource	Between Groups	1.81	3	.60	4.18	.01*
	Within Groups	12.95	90	.14		
	Total	14.75	93			
Political	Between Groups	.48	3	.16	.75	.52
	Within Groups	19.0	90	.21		
	Total	19.48	93			
Symbolic	Between Groups	.50	3	.17	.73	.54
	Within Groups	20.54	90	.23		
	Total	21.04	93			

Note: * $p < 0.05$

Summary of Findings

This survey of headmasters from ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools was completed predominantly by a sample of white, male headmasters who have earned at least a Master's degree and who serve at coed day schools. An analysis of the data revealed that, as a whole, all four frames were used by these headmasters to some degree. There was no frame that was not used at least occasionally.

Multiple frame use was reported by 83% (78) of the respondents. All four frames were used by 34% (32) of respondents. Three frames were used by 26.6% (25) and two frames by

22.3% (21). The frame with the highest overall mean score was the human resource frame (4.20) followed by the structural (4.14) and the symbolic (4.09). The only frame that did not score a mean rating of at least 4.0 was the political (3.86).

The headmasters had a very high self-rating in both managerial (4.48 on a 5 point scale) and leadership (4.66 on a 5 point scale) effectiveness. A significant correlation was shown to exist between self-perceived managerial effectiveness and the use of the structural frame. Self-perceived leadership effectiveness was shown to have a significant correlation with the use of the political frame.

Findings related to demographics suggested that there were no differences for gender, certification as an administrator, and highest degree earned on the self-reported frame use. Whether or not the headmaster was also a certified teacher did suggest a significant difference on self-reported frame use. There was also a significant difference on frame use and years of administrative experience. Specifically, headmasters with 21-30 years of administrative experience were significantly more likely to choose the human resource frame than headmasters with 11-20 years experience. Ethnicity was not analyzed for difference due to the lack of non-white respondents. Out of the 94 headmasters who responded, only one was non-white.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This final chapter offers a brief summary of the research problem and findings. Also included are possible limitations and a discussion of the results. The chapter concludes with implications for current practice and recommendations for future research.

Overview of Findings

The purpose of this study was to investigate the organizational leadership of independent schools through an examination of the self-perceived leadership orientations of headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools using the four frame perspective developed by Bolman and Deal (2003). This study sought to identify any common orientations among these administrators that may contribute to the management and leadership of their schools as educational organizations. Because school administrators carry the responsibility of creating the conditions under which school success is possible (Corcoran and Wilson, 1986), an investigation into the leadership orientations of headmasters was significant in determining the organizational effectiveness of independent schools. The leadership of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW schools differs from the school leadership previously studied (mainly public school leadership) in that the operation of independent schools is based on each school's specific mission as outlined by their Boards of Trustees. Independent schools, while often members of associations with general accreditation standards, are not subject to the standards and procedures associated with public school systems. In contrast to public schools that are subject to political issues and a governing body that are district wide, not necessarily school based, independent schools are susceptible to forces more closely related to their specific market niche and the free choice of families to enroll their children. Independent schools are also financially independent, meaning they rely on

tuition, fund raising, and gifts to finance their operational budgets. Being responsible to a Board of Trustees and operating a school that is almost entirely dependent on tuition based revenue presents a different environment than public school leaders may encounter. The nature of maintaining positive relationships with enrolled families, while seeking to attract new families to the school, as well as potential financial donors, is different than leading and managing a school whose student body is determined by location and budgets set through public funding. This study addressed these differences by focusing solely on independent school headmasters. This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. How many frames do headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools employ?
2. Which frame(s) of Bolman and Deal's (2003) four-frame leadership orientations do the headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools report as the most dominant frame(s)?
3. Are the leadership orientations reported by ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW headmasters related to their self-reported effectiveness as a manager and leader?

Bolman and Deal's (1990) *Leadership Orientations (Self)* survey was used to collect data for this study. Permission to revise and use the instrument was obtained, and a pilot study was performed on the revised instrument before it was used. The data collected from this survey were used to answer the three research questions. The survey also included a section to collect demographic data. Of the 272 surveys sent to headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools, there were 94 (34.6%) completed surveys returned. A rate of return of between 30% and 50% is not uncommon for descriptive studies (Gay and Airasian, 2000).

Descriptive statistics were used to describe the leadership orientations of the headmasters, and simple correlations were used to examine any possible relationships between the leadership

orientations and self-perceived managerial and leadership effectiveness. Overall, the results of the surveys suggest that the respondents believe they use all four frames to some degree in their decision making. A high percentage of respondents also indicate that they are multi-frame users (those who reported using more than one frame). The data also suggest that there is some connection between the use of certain frames and self-perceived effectiveness as managers and leaders.

Limitations

The limitations of this study are a result of the design. At the time of this study, there were approximately 2,000 independent schools in the United States (NAIS, 2007). The size of the sample chosen for this study is not large enough to make generalizations concerning all independent schools. The ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW have nearly 500 member schools do not constitute enough of a sample size to make a generalization about all independent schools.

For purposes of this study, independent schools are private schools, but not all private schools are independent. Independent schools are free of the governance of a body concerned with multiple schools. Independent schools are ultimately guided by their Boards of Trustees who hire the headmaster to lead and manage the operations of the school. Because of this difference that exists between independent schools and other private schools (who may not also be independent), the results of this study cannot be generalized to apply to non-independent private schools.

Limitations were also noted in the difficulty encountered in gaining access to information, a lack of unbiased research, and the survey sample size. Contact information for sending the surveys electronically was gathered by first obtaining a list of member schools from the SAIS, ISAS, and AISGW websites, then visiting each website to search for the email address

for each school's headmaster. If a school did not have that email address listed, the school was called and the email address was requested. Most of the schools asked the nature of the request and, once told, would not give the information. Each association was also called to ask about an email list for the headmasters. This request was also denied for similar reasons as the schools - to avoid solicitation.

There was also a lack of unbiased research reported regarding independent schools. The majority of research reported was found through the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS). Significant time was spent searching for research concerning private, independent schools reported in peer reviewed journals or other publications not published by the NAIS or other independent school organizations. The results of that search suggest that private, independent schools have not been a subject of independent research and, thus, reliance on research reported by NAIS was left as one of very few options in reporting data concerning private, independent schools.

Finally, the sample size used in this study presented another limitation. After two separate attempts, this study was able to collect 94 completed surveys. These 94 completed surveys represent a 34.6% return rate of the 272 survey requests. While within an acceptable margin of return for descriptive studies (Gay and Airasian, 2000), a larger sample size was expected and would have provided additional data and insight in to the leadership orientations of these headmasters.

Discussion

This investigation was performed using the context provided by Bolman and Deal's (2003) four-frame concept, and data were collected by using a revised version of Bolman and

Deal's (1990) *Leadership Orientations (Self)* survey. The results of this study are discussed in relation to the research questions and an analysis of the demographics reported in this study.

How many frames do headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools employ?

Bolman and Deal (2003) state that the ability to use multiple frames allows leaders to make sense of situations, clarify various responses, and make productive decisions. Independent school headmasters responding to this survey believe they are multi-frame users, as indicated by the survey data. Seventy eight (83%) of the respondents reported the use of multiple frames *often* or *always*. This high percentage of multiple frame usage is greater than previous research by Messer (2002), Rivers (1996), Ulrich (2004), Bensimon (1989), and Suzuki (1994) which indicated multi-frame use by educational leaders in the 50 – 60% range. Examined further, 57 (60.6%) respondents reported 3 or 4 frame use. These results support Bolman and Deal's (1991b) theory that more effective leaders use more frames to understand a situation and make decisions to solve organizational challenges.

These findings suggest that the headmasters face situations that require a multi-framed orientation. Blase and Blase (2001) write that successful principals empower teachers. This view is highly human resource oriented as one of the elements of a human resource approach is empowerment (Bolman and Deal, 2003). While this study identified the human resource frame as the most used, the headmasters also indicated that they use more than that one frame to be successful and uphold their responsibilities. This may suggest that the headmaster's responsibilities may present situations in which headmasters need to employ a multi-frame orientation when making decisions. In other words, the nature of the headmaster's job goes beyond the role of instructional leader, involving the need to navigate through other issues beyond student performance, such as being accountable to a Board of Trustees, fund raising,

faculty and student recruitment, financial budgeting, marketing, and public relations. Many of these activities are less instructional leadership and more akin to the role of a Chief Executive Officer, who would formulate policies and direct the overall operations of the school (Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, 2009). Thus, the ability to be multi-frame oriented and reframe a situation is likely an important key to a successful headmastership.

It should be noted, though, that not all headmasters reported frame usage at or above the 4.0 level. Seven (7.5%) respondents indicated no frame use at or above that level, suggesting no dominant frame for those respondents. This finding is unusual in that previous studies have not reported situations in which respondents have not demonstrated at least one frame orientation. There are a number of reasons why this may have occurred in this study. It is possible that, in an effort to self-report accurately, these four headmasters may have been overly critical of their own orientations. It is also conceivable that the respondents may have misread some of the survey items, leading them to misrepresent themselves.

Another possible way to explain the headmasters who reported no frame orientation may be that these headmasters were indicating a more balanced leadership orientation than those with measurable multi-frame approaches. While for the sake of this study frame use required at least a 4.0 mean score for that frame, the seven headmasters all had mean scores between 3.0 (occasional use) and 4.0 (often used) for each of the four frames. This suggests that while no one frame was used often; all four frames were used at least sometimes by these seven headmasters. *Which frame(s) of Bolman and Deal's (2003) four-frame leadership orientations do the headmasters of ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW member schools report as the most dominant frame(s)?*

In this study, a frame was considered used if the mean score for that frame was at least 4.0 on the 5-point scale used in the survey. Three frames achieved a mean score of at least 4.0.

These frames are the structural, human resource, and symbolic. The political frame did not qualify under the conditions of the study, but it did just miss the cut-off with a mean score of 3.86. These results indicate that the headmasters use the human resource, structural, and symbolic frames. The political frame, while it did not technically qualify to be considered used, was very close to qualifying. This is not to say that the political frame should be ignored. The mean score, while not quite 4.0, does indicate that the political frame is closer to being used often (4.0) than sometimes (3.0).

The frame with the highest usage was the human resource frame (4.20). In addition, the human resource frame was also the most indicated frame for often (4.0) or always (5.0) usage in the survey, with 71 (75.5%) of respondents self-reporting often or always for human resource frame survey items. These results imply that these headmasters were characteristically supportive and concerned with the feelings of others. These headmasters are also connecting those individual needs to the goals of the school, thus motivating others based on a set of personal needs and organizational goals. Being more oriented towards the human resource frame supports the findings of others who found that educational administrators are dominant in the human resource frame (Bensimon, 1989; Bolman & Deal, 1991b; Pavan & Reid, 1991; Redman, 1991; Meade, 1992; Peasley, 1992; Strickland, 1992; Miro, 1993; Harlow, 1994; Davis, 1996; Durocher, 1996; Rivers, 1996; Messer, 2002). This similarity leads me to believe that, regardless of the type of school, educational leaders are inclined to view situations from the human resource frame more often than the other frames. While this suggestion does not speak to effective leadership, it does suggest that a similarity in leadership orientation exists between independent school headmasters and other types of school leaders.

The mean scores for the symbolic and structural frames were similar (4.09 and 4.14 respectfully). Along with the human resource frame, all three rated in the often category on the Likert scale. The least used frame, the political, technically remained in the occasional use category, but only by a very slim margin (0.14 points). The lower use of the political frame is consistent with the research of Bolman and Deal (1984, 1991b, 2003), Bensimon (1989), Pavan and Reid (1991), Redman (1991), Peasley (1992), Meade (1992), Strickland (1992), Yerkes, Cuellar, and Cuellar (1992), Miro (1993), Rivers (1996), and Ulrich (2004).

The political frame's mean score, while not technically enough to be classified as a used frame, certainly suggests that these headmasters use this frame much more than just sometimes. Responses relating to the political frame were also nearly split in half between sometimes used (44, 46.8%) and often used (47, 50.0%). The items used to measure the political frame in the survey could have been difficult to interpret because the nature of the wording may not be typical of the natural state of mind educators find themselves. The concept of being politically minded may have caused some respondents to be less enthusiastic in rating themselves high in political terms. Given that the mean score was only .14 points away from qualifying and the somewhat small sample size, it could be argued that the political frame should be counted among the used frames. If so, the findings suggest all four frames are used by the headmasters. Utilizing all four frames (a multi-frame approach) presents the best opportunity for headmasters to reframe situations and make decisions that are most likely to lead to positive outcomes (Bolman and Deal, 2003).

The head of an independent school is both leader and manager for the school. Ultimately responsible for the entire operation of the school, the headmaster must also perform the often public role for recruitment of families and faculty, as well as fund development. The headmaster

is also called upon to provide internal leadership. Setting policies and procedures, establishing expectations, identifying needs, addressing concerns, and navigating conflict are among the many items a headmaster faces on the job. Given these demands, it is not unusual for that headmaster to call upon any frame needed to make a decision and take action. While any frame may be called upon, the answer to research question three indicated that the human resource frame is called upon and used by independent school headmasters more than the other three frames.

Are the leadership orientations reported by ISAS, SAIS, and AISGW headmasters related to their self-reported effectiveness as a manager and leader?

Bolman and Deal's (2003) four frame model has also been studied in terms of frame use and managerial and leadership effectiveness. The headmasters in this study reported high self rating for both managerial and leadership effectiveness. Self-reported leadership effectiveness had a rating of 4.66 on a 5-point Likert scale, with 5.0 representing the effectiveness places the headmaster in the top 20% when compared to their peers. Over 69% (65) of respondents gave themselves a 5.0 for leadership effectiveness. For self-reported managerial effectiveness, over 56% (53) of the headmasters gave themselves a 5.0. The mean score for managerial effectiveness was 4.48. This study set out to investigate the possible correlations between self-reported effectiveness and the self-perceived leadership orientations.

This study found a significant correlation exists between self-reported structural frame use and self-perceived managerial effectiveness. Managers are primarily concerned with structure, planning, and organizing (Kotter, 1988). The structural frame focuses on implementation and development of policies and procedures (Bolman and Deal, 2003). Once management and the structural frame are examined, it becomes clear that the two are very

closely related by definition. The structural frame and the role of managers have common language that describes each. This study also indicates a relationship between self-reported structural frame use and managerial effectiveness also exists. Therefore, it is suggested that in order to provide more effective managerial oversight, headmasters should consider the structural view of a situation to process information and make decisions. Such findings support Bolman and Deal's (1991b), Harlow's (1994), and Durocher's (1996) studies which concluded that use of the structural frame was a predictor of managerial effectiveness.

The examination of self-perceived managerial effectiveness and frame use also revealed a slightly negative relationship with the use of the human resource and symbolic frames. Bolman and Deal (1991b) have previously suggested that the symbolic frame was a poor predictor of managerial effectiveness, but there has been no other research that has implied a negative relationship between managerial effectiveness and the use of either the human resource or symbolic frames. The findings from this study would suggest that not only does use of the human resource and symbolic frames deter managerial effectiveness; the use of these frames for independent school headmasters in a managerial role may actually result in ineffectiveness or possibly mismanagement.

The self-ratings for leadership effectiveness were even higher. Sixty five (69.1%) of these headmasters rated themselves in the top 20% in this category. In addition, a significant correlation was found to exist between self-perceived leadership effectiveness and the use of the political frame. Leaders, as opposed to managers, tend to view the long-term, emphasize vision, and navigate multiple constituencies with political skill (Gardner, 1989). Therefore, effective leadership may be demonstrated through maintaining a focus on the school's needs (both long and short term), filling those needs with resources obtained, sometimes, through compromise,

while nurturing and valuing a sense of shared identity (Bolman and Deal, 2003). This finding also supported Bolman and Deal's (1991b) study that concluded that the political frame was related to effective leadership by educational administrators in the United States.

Demographics

Previous studies have focused most attention concerning frame use and demographics to any possible difference of gender. These studies have determined that there is no difference of gender and that females use the human resource frame more than males (Bolman and Deal, 1992b; Suzuki, 1994; Davis, 1996; and Ross, 2006). This study examined the possible differences of gender on frame use and the results of that analysis supported the previous research.

Both males and females reported using the structural, human resources, and symbolic frames at or above the necessary 4.0 level. Also, females reported a slightly higher score for human resource frame use (4.25) than males (4.19). Further analysis revealed that there was no significant difference on frame use by gender. Whether the headmaster was male or female did not determine specific frame use, but when applied, females used the human resource frame more than males.

This study did examine frame use and possible differences of other demographic variables untested in previous studies. These included teacher certification, administrator certification, and highest degree earned. No significant difference of administrator certification or highest degree earned was found on reported frame use. In other words, whether or not a headmaster was a certified administrator had no effect on the reported frame use by that headmaster. Also, the headmasters' level of education, as indicated by the highest degree earned, did not have an effect on reported frame use. Reasons for this lack of influence on frame

use by highest degree earned may be a result of frame use not being necessarily learned through formal study, but rather a product of a person's predisposition to interpreting situations.

Results of an analysis on reported frame use and teacher certification did reveal a significant difference on reported frame use. Headmasters with teacher certification reported use of all four frames at or above the 4.0 level. Headmasters without teacher certification reported two frames (structural and human resource) used at the same required level. The most used frame for headmasters with teacher certification was the symbolic frame (4.29). Headmasters without teacher certification used the human resource frame more often (4.06). A significant difference on reported frame use by teacher certification was found to exist for all four frames. While these findings do not imply that headmasters will only use certain frames if they are teacher certified or not, it does suggest that the use of certain frames are affected by whether or not the headmaster is also a certified teacher.

The possible connection between a headmaster having the experience of a formal teacher certification program and that headmaster's leadership orientation is a new finding. Many teacher certification programs include practical experience in the classroom and therefore provide opportunities to refine leadership and management skills with a class of student, but there are a number of independent school headmasters who are not teacher certified and who also are multi-frame oriented. A closer look into the possible differences in practical experience and frame use could provide some insight into the leadership orientations of headmasters.

This study analyzed headmasters based on years of teaching experience and years of administrative experience. No difference was found to exist between frame use and years of teaching experience. In other words, while a significant difference in frame use and having teacher certification existed, no difference was found with frame use and years of teaching

experience. A possible explanation for this finding could be that the decision making process and the factors involved in making those decisions in a classroom setting do not necessarily lend themselves to the refinement of the leadership and management orientations in a way that leadership and management positions offer outside of a classroom and in a more administrative position.

The analysis of years of administrative experience did, however, produce a significant difference on frame use. Specifically, years of administrative experience was shown to make a difference in the use of the human resource frame. Further analysis revealed that headmasters with between 21-30 years of administrative experience were more likely to use the human resource frame than headmasters with between 11-20 years of administrative experience. Years of administrative experience did not demonstrate significant differences on the other frames.

As stated earlier, many headmasters are not teacher certified, yet are still multi-frame oriented. This study was able to demonstrate that teacher certification made a significant difference in headmasters' use of frames. Headmasters without teacher certification who are also multi-frame thinkers may have developed their leadership orientations by other types of experiences. While other means of developing multi-frame thinking skills may certainly exist, this study was unable to make such a connection to years of teaching experience. Multi-frame thinking could also not be connected to years of administrative experience, but the use of the human resource frame (which was the most used frame in the study as a whole) was likely to be used more often by headmasters with between 21-30 years in school administration. Perhaps, this finding points to the necessity of human resource thinking in educational leadership and the tendency of such experienced headmasters to lean often on the human resource frame as a means of interpreting the situations in which they are called to make decisions.

Contributions to Bolman and Deal's (2003) Leadership Orientations Research

The findings of this study support previous leadership orientation research suggesting that educational leaders are likely to be multi-frame users. The range of responsibilities of the headmaster as leader and manager of the school may account for the large percentage of multi-frame use, particularly three and four frame users. This study also supports the idea that the human resource frame is often the most likely frame used by educational leaders. At its core, the human resource frame is concerned with the needs of individuals and finding ways to address these needs while also addressing the needs of the school. The human resource frame is likely a strong frame for educators as most quality educators concern themselves with the needs of the individual and project a similar feeling of individual concern with their students. Most, if not all, headmasters have experience as teachers also. Of the respondents to this study, 48.9% (46) are also certified teachers. As a matter of fact, more headmasters who participated in this study were certified teachers (46, 48.9%) than certified administrators (40, 42.6%).

Lower use of the political frame by educational leaders has been previously reported and is supported in this study as well. This finding should not minimize the value of the political frame for these headmasters. The frame was very close to being classified as used on the 5-point Likert scale. A correlation was also established between political frame use and self-reported leadership effectiveness. Therefore, while the political frame may not be used often, when it is used, the headmaster may be providing effective leadership for the school.

This study contributed to the research in terms of examining self-reported managerial and leadership effectiveness and possible correlations with frame use. The results of this investigation suggest that managerial effectiveness is related to structural frame use and leadership effectiveness is related to the political frame. These findings are consistent with

Bolman and Deal's (2003) findings. The fact that this study demonstrates the same relationships between frame use and self-reported effectiveness helps reinforce the possibility that, regardless of type of school, if the leader can accurately decide if an issue requires a managerial approach or requires leadership displayed, there may be specific frames from which to assess the issue that could increase the chances of a positive and effective outcome.

The population examined by this study is another area in which this study contributes to leadership orientations research. This study was the first to examine the self-reported orientations of private, independent school headmasters. Other demographic variables were also examined for possible effect on frame use for the first time in this study. Included in these new variables are administrator certification, level of education achieved, teacher certification, years of teaching experience, and years of administrative experience. Analysis of gender differences supported previous research, but a couple of new findings emerged from the data analysis. One new finding suggested that teacher certification makes a variation on reported frame use. This difference attributed to teacher certification applied to all four frames. The other new finding was an effect on use of the human resource frame and years of administrative experience. Specifically, headmasters with 21-30 years of administrative experience were more likely to use the human resource frame than headmasters with 11-20 years of administrative experience.

Implications

Implications for Current Practice

Providing effective leadership in an independent school is important to maintaining a mission based educational experience and ensuring that the expectations of the school's Board of Trustees and its customers (students, parents, alumni) are met. Providing outstanding value is a critical element in not only retaining current families, but also in efforts to attract new families to an independent school.

Headmasters face a difficult challenge in that they are called upon to not only nurture an environment in which the school staff is delivering the school's mission, but also to be sensitive to the families who have a degree of market power that does not exist in a public school setting. The benefits of satisfied families and a mission focused education are tempered by the reality that unsatisfied families and an unfocused staff could lead to significant problems if tuition revenue diminishes. Therefore; the ability to develop a broader, multi-framed perspective puts headmasters in a much better position to effectively address the challenges that face leaders of independent schools.

This study suggests that effective leadership is related to a multi-framed approach to addressing independent school challenges. Specifically, headmasters who have the ability to view these challenges through the human resource, political, and symbolic frames are in the best position to effectively lead.

Based on the conclusions of this study, the following suggestions are made:

1. Leadership programs offered by national or regional accreditation organizations should include opportunities for current or future headmasters to develop, appreciate, and integrate a multi-frame perspective to deciphering information and making decisions.
2. Practicing headmasters should make a multi-frame perspective a critical tool in their mentoring of potential leaders within their schools.
3. Headmasters who identify a managerial challenge in their schools may want to pay special attention to the structural frame option for an effective response. If a challenge is identified to be more leadership in nature (than managerial), the political frame may be the most effective choice from which to make a decision.

4. Boards of Trustees should be made aware of the importance and value of a headmaster who, while maintaining mission based, has the ability to use a multi-frame approach to leading a school. This is particularly important during a search process for a new headmaster. Headmaster search committees should seek out candidates who can articulate a multi-frame approach. These committees should also highly value candidates who have a record of demonstrated effectiveness based on a multi-frame approach to decision making.
5. If a school is experiencing challenges requiring additional attention to political or symbolic leadership, findings related to the difference of teacher certification on frame use suggest that the school may benefit from a headmaster that also has teacher certification.
6. If a school is experiencing challenges requiring a more human resource approach to decision making, the findings in this study suggest that a headmaster with 21-30 years of administrative experience is more likely to use the human resource frame often.

Implications for Future Research

A replication of this study should be considered for headmasters from other regions in the United States. A comparison between the results of such a study to this one could provide additional insight and further define the leadership orientations of independent school headmasters.

An additional study using this survey could include leadership orientations of other independent school administrators. This group could include lower, middle, and high school headmasters (principals), deans of students, admissions directors, assistant headmasters, and fund development directors.

A follow-up study using Bolman and Deal's (1990) *Leadership Orientations (Others)* survey should be performed to determine the ratings for these headmasters by Boards of Trustees, other administrators, and faculty members. Such studies, when compared to this study using self-perceptions, could reveal important information in order to validate this study's results. In addition, a study that includes interviews/qualitative data to supplement quantitative data collected from Bolman and Deal's (1990) *Leadership Orientations* surveys may add to the validity of these conclusions.

The small sample size in this study made it difficult to make accurate claims concerning other demographic groups. Specifically, non-white headmasters are underrepresented in this study (there was one African-American respondent).

Finally, the new findings of this study involving frame use and teacher certification and frame use and years of administrative experience suggest that additional investigation into both of those areas may produce additional insight into the development of multi-frame oriented school leaders. Connected to such a study should also be an investigation in to how multi-frame oriented school leaders without much experience and/or teacher certification developed their multi-frame leadership orientation.

Summary

The results of this study suggest that, overall; the independent school headmasters in this study used three of the four frames (human resource, structural, and symbolic) at least *often*. The political frame's mean score technically qualified the frame as used *sometimes*, though the actual responses in the *sometimes* and *often* range are nearly split in half (44 responses *sometimes*, 47 responses *often*). These headmasters also approached their decision making from a multi-frame

orientation. While more than one frame was normally used, it is suggested that the human resource frame was dominant and the political frame least used.

This study also indicated that independent school headmasters believed they are very effective in both their managerial and leadership roles, but reported their leadership effectiveness to be greater than their reported managerial effectiveness. Further investigation by this study suggested a relationship exists between this self-reported leadership effectiveness and the use of the political frame. Self-reported managerial effectiveness was linked to the use of the structural frame.

The results of this study propose that headmasters of independent schools should continue to employ a multi-frame approach to leading and managing their schools. Headmasters looking to make decisions of a managerial nature may want to take a more structural approach. Situations requiring more attention to providing leadership, as opposed to management, should be viewed from a more political frame. Findings also suggest, for the first time, that teacher certification made a difference on reported frame use. The difference of teacher certification on frame use applied to all four frames. A difference in frame use and years of administrative experience was also found with further analysis revealing more likely use of the human resource frame and headmasters with between 21-30 years of experience than headmasters with 11-20 years of administrative experience.

As this was the first study to involve the multi-frame approach to the study of independent school leaders, it is suggested that future research continue to expand upon this study to include a larger sample of independent school leaders, to investigate any possible differences that may exist between leadership orientations and ethnicity, and to expand the exploration of frame use and teacher certification and years of administrative experience.

REFERENCES

- Allen, R. W., & Porter, L. W. (1983). *Organizational influence processes*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- American Association of School Administrators (1993). *Professional standards for the superintendency*. Arlington, VA.
- Argyris, C. (1970). *Intervention theory and method*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Argyris, C. (1980). *Inner contradictions of rigorous research*. New York: Academic Press.
- Argyris, C. & Schon, D. A. (1974). *Theory and practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baldrige, J. V., & Deal, T. E. (1983). *The dynamics of organizational change*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishers.
- Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving school from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bassett, P. F. (n.d.). *Independent perspective: Independence under fire*. National Association of Independent Schools. Retrieved April 17, 2006, from <http://www.nais.org/publications/ismagazinearticle.cfm?Itemnumber=148227&sn.ItemNumber=145956&tn.ItemNumber=145958>
- Bassett, P. (2002). *Why teach in an independent school*. National Association of Independent Schools. Retrieved April 17, 2006, from <http://www.nais.org/career/article.cfm?ItemNumber=145387&sn.ItemNumber=142458&tn.ItemNumber=142459>
- Bates, R. J. (1980a). Educational administration, the sociology of science and the management of knowledge. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16, 1-20.
- Bates, R. J. (1980b). *The function of educational administration in the processes of cultural transmission*. Paper presented at the Conference on the Origins and Operations of Educational Systems, International Sociological Association, Los Angeles, CA.
- Bennis, W. (1984). The four competencies of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 38, 15-19.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: Strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Bensimon, E. M. (1989). The meaning of good presidential leadership: A frame analysis. *The Review of Higher Education*, 12, 107-123.

- Blase, J. & Blase, J. (2001). *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do.* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bolman, L. G. (2010). *Research using Leadership Orientations survey instrument*, Retrieved April 8, 2010, from <http://www.leebolman.com/orientations.htm>
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1990). *Leadership Orientations (Self)*. Brookline, MA: Leadership Frameworks.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E., (1991a). *Images of leadership* (NCEL Occasional Paper No. 7). Nashville, TN: National Center for Educational Leadership. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 332345).
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E., (1991b). Leadership and management effectiveness: A multi-frame, multi-sector analysis. *Human Resource Management*, 30, 509-534.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992a). *Everyday epistemology in school leadership: Patterns and prospects*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, CA.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992b). Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture, and gender. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28, 314-329.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1993). Everyday epistemology in school leadership: Patterns and prospects. In P. Hallinger, K. Leithwood, & J. Murphy (Eds.), *Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 21-33). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2002). *Reframing the path to school leadership: A guide for teachers and principals*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. (3rd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, S. (2010). *Comparing More Than Two Means: One-Way ANOVA*. Retrieved June 18, 2010, from the Tompkins Cortland Community College Web site: <http://www.tc3.edu/instruct/sbrown/stat/anova1.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor (2009). *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2010-11 Edition*, Top Executives, Retrieved April 8, 2010, from <http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos012.htm>
- Callahan, R. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Campbell, R. F., Corbally, J. E., & Nystrand, R. o. (1983). *Introduction to educational administration*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Cannon, T. (1999). *SPSS Tutorial: How to do an Independent T-test*. Retrieved June 14, 2010, from the University of Scranton Web site:
<http://academic.uofs.edu/departments/psych/methods/cannon99/level2b.html>
- Corcoran, T. B., & Wilson, B. L. (1986). *The search for successful secondary schools: The first three years of the secondary recognition program*. Office of Educational Research and Development. United States Department of Education.
- Davis, T. I. (1996). The ways administrators work: A study of the theoretical frames of leadership used by female and male secondary school principals in Pennsylvania (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(06), 2287A.
- Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1991). *The principal's role in shaping school culture*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Programs for the Improvement of Practice.
- Drucker, P. F. (1989). *The new realities*. New York: Perennial Library.
- Durocher, E. A. (1996). Leadership orientations of school administrators: A survey of nationally recognized school leaders. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(02), 525A. (UMI No. 9620148)
- Fayol, H. (1949). *General and industrial management*. Trans. C. Storrs. London: Pitman. (Originally published in 1916).
- Fielder, K. (1982). Causal schemata: Review and criticism of research on a popular construct. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 42(6), 1001-1013.
- Fiske, S. T., & Dyer, L. M. (1985). Structure and development of social schemata: Evidence from positive and negative transfer effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48, 839-852.
- Follett, M. P. (1926). The giving of orders. In H. C. Metcalf (Ed.), *Scientific foundations of business administration*. Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gamson, W. A. (1968). *Power and Discontent*. Florence, KY: Dorsey Press.
- Gardner, J. W. (1989). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.

- Garson, G. D. (2008). *Correlation*. Retrieved March, 10, 2010, from the North Carolina State University Web site: <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/correl.htm>
- Garson, G. D. (2009). *Reliability Analysis*. Retrieved November 28, 2009, from the North Carolina State University Web site: <http://faculty.chass.ncsu.edu/garson/PA765/reliab.htm>
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. W. (2000). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application*. (6th ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Gioia, D. A. (1986). *Symbols, scripts, and sensemaking*. In Sims, H. P., Jr., Dennis A. Gioia and Associates (Eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Green, R. L. (2005). *Practicing the art of leadership: A problem-based approach to implementing the ISLLC standards*. (2nd ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Gregory, K. L. (1983). Native view paradigms: Multiple cultures and cultural conflict in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28(3), 359-376.
- Hallinger, P. (1992). The evolving role of American principals: From managerial to instructional to transformational leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 30(3), 35-48.
- Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217-247.
- Harlow, J. H. (1994). Educational leadership: A frame analysis (Doctoral dissertation, Seattle University, 1994). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55(08), 2227A.
- Killman, R. H., Saxton, M. J., & Serpa, R. (Eds.). (1985). *Gaining control of the corporate culture*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kotter, J. P. (1988). *The leadership factor*. New York: Free Press.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lawrence, M. S. (1989). *Characteristics of boards of education that govern nationally recognized successful secondary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Leithwood, , K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Buckingham, Eng: Open University Press.
- Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 325-340.

- Lord, R. G., & Foti, R. J. (1986). Schema theories, information processing, and organizational behavior. In Sims, H. P., Jr., Dennis A. Gioia and Associates (Eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper Collins.
- McGregor, D. M. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Meade, R. (1992). *The California school leadership academy: Its effect on the leadership orientations of California elementary school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, La Verne, CA.
- Merkle, J. A. (1980). *Management and ideology: The legacy of the international scientific management movement*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Messer, J. E. (2002). Elementary principal leadership orientations and selected professional and school variables (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(02), 450A.
- Miro, A. (1993). *A comparative study of leadership orientation frames between public high school principals serving in schools that applied and did not apply for California Senate Bill 1274 restructuring grants*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, La Verne, CA.
- National Association of Independent Schools. (2005). *Independent schools: Preparing students for achievement in college and beyond. Key findings from the Freshman Survey Trends Report*. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Independent Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 493599)
- National Association of Independent Schools. (2006). *A statistical snapshot of NAIS member schools*. Retrieved June 30, 2007, from <http://www.nais.org/parents/index.cfm?ItemNumber=149198&sn.ItemNumber=149253&tn.ItemNumber=149663>
- National Association of Independent Schools. (2007). *About independent schools*. Retrieved July 1, 2007, from <http://www.nais.org/parents/index.cfm?itemnumber=149252&sn.ItemNumber=149253>
- Ott, J. S., Parkes, S. J., & Simpson, R. B. (Eds.). (2003). *Classical readings in organizational behavior*. (3rd ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson.
- Owens, R. G. (1970). *Organizational behavior in schools*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

- Owens, R. G. (2004). *Organizational behavior in education: Adaptive leadership and school reform*. (8th ed). Boston: Pearson.
- Pavan, B. N., & Reid, N. A. (1991, April). *Espoused theoretical frameworks and the leadership behaviors of principals in achieving urban elementary schools*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 337533).
- Peasley, R. (1992). *The California school leadership academy: Its effect on the leadership orientations of California secondary school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, La Verne, CA.
- Pitre, E., & Sims, H., Jr. (1987, Autumn). The thinking organization: How patterns of thought determine organizational culture. *National Productivity Review*.
- Poniatowski, D. (2006). The relationship of student achievement to principals' self-reported use of the four frame theory (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(09).
- Redman, M. (1991). *A comparative study of the leadership orientation frames of administrators in private Japanese and American institutions of higher education*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, La Verne, CA.
- Rivers, P. G. (1996). A frame analysis of principals' leadership orientations (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(07), 2785A.
- Ross, D. B. (2006). *Leadership styles of secondary school principals as perceived by secondary school teachers*. Doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University, 2006, (UMI No. 3220674).
- Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1977). Who gets power – and how they hold on to it: A strategic-contingency model of power. *Organizational Dynamics*, 5, 2-21.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). *Handbook for effective department leadership*. (2nd ed). Newton, MA: Allyn Bacon.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1986). Cultural and competing perspectives in administrative theory and practice. In T. Sergiovanni & J. Corbally (Eds.), *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Shafritz, J. M., Ott, J. S., & Jang, Y. S. (2005). *Classics of Organizational Theory*. (6th ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth /Thomson.

- Strickland, J. (1992). *Leadership perspectives of Tennessee school leaders*. Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN.
- Suzuki, Y. (1994). *A comparative study of the leadership orientation frames of California Asian and other public school principals*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, La Verne, CA.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911). *The principles of scientific management*. New York: Norton.
- Ulrich, C. A. (2004). Leadership styles of high school principals in top performing California schools: Perceptions of stakeholders (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(06), 2050A.
- Urwick L. (1937). Organization as a technical problem. In L. H. Gulick & L. Urwick (Eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). *Private Schools: A Brief Portrait*. Washington, D.C.
- United States Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2007). *College enrollment and work activity of 2006 high school graduates*. Washington, D.C.
- Weber, M. (1922). Bureaucracy. In H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds.), *Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1966). *Identification and enhancement of managerial effectiveness: The social psychology of managerial effectiveness*. Greensboro, NC: Richardson Foundation.
- Weick, K., & Bougon, M. G., (1986). Organization as cognitive maps. In Sims, H. P., Jr., Dennis A. Gioia and Associates (Eds.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wilkie, A. F. (1993, April). *Lessons on corporate intervention into school-based management*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359648).
- Xenophon (1869). *The memorabilia of Socrates*. Trans. Rev. J. S. Watson. New York: Harper & Row.
- Yerkes, D., Cuellar, M. F., Cuellar, A. (1992, April). *Towards an understanding of organizational culture in schools of education: Implications for leadership development*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 348768).

Appendix A
Letter for Recruitment and Consent



Date

Dear _____:

I am a graduate student under the direction of Professor Tammie M. Causey-Konate' in the College of Educational Leadership, Counseling and Foundations at the University of New Orleans. I am conducting a research study to analyze the self-perceived leadership orientations of independent school headmasters.

I am requesting your participation, which will involve about five minutes of your time to complete a questionnaire. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time. The questionnaire is anonymous. The results of the research study may be published, but your name will not be known.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please call me at (337) 281-0022.

Completion and submission of the questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate.

Sincerely,

Troy P. Roddy

Appendix B

Letter for Permission to Use and Revise Survey Instrument

October 1, 2008

Lee G. Bolman, Ph.D.
Professor and Marion Bloch/Missouri Chair in Leadership
Bloch School of Business and Public Administration, University of Missouri-Kansas City
5100 Rockhill Road Kansas City, Missouri 64110

Dear Dr. Bolman,

Please accept this letter as my request for written permission to use and revise the Leadership Orientations Survey instrument authored by you and Dr. Terrence Deal. This survey will be used to gather data for my dissertation. Currently, I am the Head of the Middle School at Wakefield School in Virginia and am also a doctoral student at the University of New Orleans.

As per the conditions for use listed on your website, I agree to provide a copy of any reports, publications, papers or theses resulting from the research. If requested, I will also provide copy of the data file from the research.

I look forward to hearing from you soon. If you have any questions or suggestions, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you for your consideration,

Troy P. Roddy
186 Erin Drive
Warrenton, VA 20186
337-281-0022 (cell)
540-253-7500 (office)
troddy@wakefieldschool.org

Appendix C

Correspondence Granting Permission to Use and Revise Survey Instrument

From: Bretz, Sandra J. [bretzs@umkc.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 07, 2008 4:22 PM
To: Troy Roddy
Cc: UMKC Bloch School Dean
Subject: Leadership Orientations Survey instrument - permission

Mr. Roddy,

Professor Bolman has received your request and has granted you permission to use and revise the Leadership Orientations Survey instrument in agreement with your stated conditions.

All the best to you,

Sandra J. Bretz

Executive Assistant to the Dean

Henry W. Bloch School of Business

& Public Administration

University of Missouri - Kansas City

5110 Cherry Street, Suite 225

Kansas City, MO 64110-2499

816.235.2204

bretzs@umkc.edu

Appendix D

Leadership Orientations (Self) survey – Original Instrument

Your name: _____

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (SELF)

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

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

I. Behaviors

You are asked to indicate *how often* each of the items below is true of you.

Please use the following scale in answering each item.

1	2	3	4	5
Never		Sometimes		Always
	Occasionally		Often	

So, you would answer '1' for an item that is never true of you, '2' for one that is occasionally true, '3' for one that is sometimes true of you, and so on.

Be discriminating! Your results will be more helpful if you think about each item and distinguish the things that you really do all the time from the things that you do seldom or never.

1. _____ *Think very clearly and logically.*
2. _____ *Show high levels of support and concern for others.*
3. _____ *Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.*
4. _____ *Inspire others to do their best.*
5. _____ *Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.*
6. _____ *Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.*
7. _____ *Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.*
8. _____ *Am highly charismatic.*
9. _____ *Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.*
10. _____ *Show high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.*

11. _____ *Am unusually persuasive and influential.*
12. _____ *Am able to be an inspiration to others.*
13. _____ *Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.*
14. _____ *Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.*
15. _____ *Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.*
16. _____ *Am highly imaginative and creative.*
17. _____ *Approach problems with facts and logic.*
18. _____ *Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.*
19. _____ *Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.*
20. _____ *Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.*
21. _____ *Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.*
22. _____ *Listen well and am unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.*
23. _____ *Am politically very sensitive and skillful.*
24. _____ *See beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.*
25. _____ *Have extraordinary attention to detail.*
26. _____ *Give personal recognition for work well done.*
27. _____ *Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.*
28. _____ *Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.*
29. _____ *Strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.*
30. _____ *Am a highly participative manager.*
31. _____ *Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.*
32. _____ *Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.*

II. Leadership Style

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

1. My strongest skills are:

- _____ a. *Analytic skills*
- _____ b. *Interpersonal skills*
- _____ c. *Political skills*
- _____ d. *Ability to excite and motivate*

2. The best way to describe me is:

- _____ a. *Technical expert*
- _____ b. *Good listener*
- _____ c. *Skilled negotiator*
- _____ d. *Inspirational leader*

3. What has helped me the most to be successful is my ability to:

- _____ a. *Make good decisions*
- _____ b. *Coach and develop people*
- _____ c. *Build strong alliances and a power base*
- _____ d. *Energize and inspire others*

4. What people are most likely to notice about me is my:

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

5. My most important leadership trait is:

- _____ a. *Clear, logical thinking*

- _____ b. *Caring and support for others*
- _____ c. *Toughness and aggressiveness*
- _____ d. *Imagination and creativity*

6. I am best described as:

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

III. Overall rating

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate yourself on:

1. Overall effectiveness as a **manager**.

1	2	3	4	5
Bottom 20%		Middle 20%	Top 20%	

2. Overall effectiveness as a **leader**.

1	2	3	4	5
Bottom 20%		Middle 20%	Top 20%	

IV. Background Information

1. Are you: _____Male _____Female
2. How many years have you been in your current job? _____
3. How many total years of experience do you have as a manager? _____

Appendix E
Revised Survey Instrument

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATIONS (SELF)

Revised with permission, 2008

This questionnaire asks you to describe your leadership and management style. You are reminded that you may skip any question that you uncomfortable to answer.

I. Behaviors

You are asked to indicate *how often* each of the items below is true of you.

Please use the following scale in answering each item.

1	2	3	4	5
Never		Sometimes		Always
	Occasionally		Often	

So, you would answer '1' for an item that is never true of you, '2' for one that is occasionally true, '3' for one that is sometimes true of you, and so on.

Be discriminating! Your results will be more helpful if you think about each item and distinguish the things that you really do all the time from the things that you do seldom or never.

1. _____ *Think unclearly and illogically.*
2. _____ *Show low levels of support and concern for others.*
3. _____ *Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.*
4. _____ *Inspire others to do their best.*
5. _____ *Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.*
6. _____ *Disrupt the building of trust through closed and hierarchical relationships.*
7. _____ *Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.*
8. _____ *Am highly charismatic.*
9. _____ *Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.*
10. _____ *Show very little sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.*
11. _____ *Am not unusually persuasive and influential.*
12. _____ *Have difficulty being an inspiration to others.*
13. _____ *Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.*

14. _____ *Foster low levels of participation and involvement in decisions.*
15. _____ *Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.*
16. _____ *Am not highly imaginative and creative.*
17. _____ *Approach problems with facts and logic.*
18. _____ *Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.*
19. _____ *Am not very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.*
20. _____ *Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.*
21. _____ *Set ambiguous, unattainable goals and hold people accountable for lack of results.*
22. _____ *Listen poorly and am not very receptive to other people's ideas and input.*
23. _____ *Am politically very sensitive and skillful.*
24. _____ *Do not see beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.*
25. _____ *Have difficulty paying attention to detail.*
26. _____ *Give personal recognition for work well done.*
27. _____ *Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.*
28. _____ *Generate disloyalty and lack of enthusiasm.*
29. _____ *Strongly believe in clear structure and a chain of command.*
30. _____ *Am a highly dictatorial manager.*
31. _____ *Fail in the face of conflict and opposition.*
32. _____ *Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.*

II. Leadership Style

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

1. My strongest skills are:

_____ a. *Analytic skills*

- _____ b. *Interpersonal skills*
- _____ c. *Political skills*
- _____ d. *Ability to excite and motivate*

2. The best way to describe me is:

- _____ a. *Technical expert*
- _____ b. *Good listener*
- _____ c. *Skilled negotiator*
- _____ d. *Inspirational leader*

3. What has helped me the most to be successful is my ability to:

- _____ a. *Make good decisions*
- _____ b. *Coach and develop people*
- _____ c. *Build strong alliances and a power base*
- _____ d. *Energize and inspire others*

4. What people are most likely to notice about me is my:

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

5. My most important leadership trait is:

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

6. I am best described as:

- _____ a. *An analyst*

_____ b. *A humanist*

_____ c. *A politician*

_____ d. *A visionary*

III. Overall rating

Compared to other individuals that you have known with comparable levels of experience and responsibility, how would you rate yourself on:

1. Overall effectiveness as a **manager**.

1	2	3	4	5
Bottom 20%		Middle 20%	Top 20%	

2. Overall effectiveness as a **leader**.

1	2	3	4	5
Bottom 20%		Middle 20%	Top 20%	

IV. Background Information

1. Gender: _____ Male _____ Female

2. Ethnicity: _____ White _____ African-American _____ Asian _____ Hispanic
_____ Other

3. Highest degree/credential earned: _____ Associates _____ Bachelors _____ Masters

_____ Doctorate _____ Other (Please Specify): _____

4. Certified teacher: _____ Yes _____ No

5. Years of teaching experience: _____

6. Certified as an educational administrator: _____ Yes _____ No

7. Years of experience as an educational administrator: _____
8. Type of school you currently work: _____ Co-ed _____ Single-gender _____ Day
_____ Boarding _____ Non-denominational _____ Faith-based _____ Secular
9. Student enrollment of current school: _____ Less than 100 _____ 101 to 200 _____ 201 to
300 _____ 301 to 400 _____ 401 to 500 _____ 501 to 600 _____ Greater than 600
10. How many years have you been in your current job? _____
11. How many total years of experience do you have in senior leadership positions (both
within and outside of the field of education)? _____

Appendix F
IRB Approval

***University Committee for the Protection
of Human Subjects in Research***

University of New Orleans

Campus Correspondence

Principal Investigator: Tammie Causey-Konate

Co-Investigator: Troy Roddy

Date: June 24, 2009

Protocol Title: "A Frame Analysis of the Self-Perceived Leadership
Orientations of Heads of the Independent Schools
Association of the Southwest and Southern Association of
Independent Schools Member Schools"

IRB#: 03Jul09

The IRB has deemed that the research and procedures described in this protocol application are exempt from federal regulations under 45 CFR 46.101 category 2, due to the fact that the information obtained is not recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

Exempt protocols do not have an expiration date; however, if there are any changes made to this protocol that may cause it to be no longer exempt from CFR 46, the IRB requires another standard application from the investigator(s) which should provide the same information that is in this application with changes that may have changed the exempt status.

If an adverse, unforeseen event occurs (e.g., physical, social, or emotional harm), you are required to inform the IRB as soon as possible after the event.

Best wishes on your project.
Sincerely,

Robert D. Laird, Ph.D., Chair
UNO Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research

VITA

Troy P. Roddy was born and raised in the metro New Orleans area. After graduating from Jesuit High School (New Orleans) in 1989, he entered Rhodes College in Memphis, Tennessee. In May 1993, Troy earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Business Administration. That August, he began his career in education as a teacher and coach at St. Benedict at Auburndale School in Cordova, Tennessee.

Over the next few years Troy continued to teach and coach, eventually returning to the New Orleans area to work at Archbishop Shaw High School. In 2003, Troy began working at St. Martin's Episcopal School in Metairie, Louisiana. While at St. Martin's, he earned his first Master of Education degree in Human Performance and Health Promotion. Upon completion of that degree, Troy was appointed to Dean of Students for the Upper School at St. Martin's. At this time, he also entered the doctoral program in educational leadership at the University of New Orleans. In the course of that program, Troy earned his second Master of Education degree in Educational Administration. He completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Leadership in August 2010.

Troy became the Assistant Principal for Student Affairs at St. Catherine's in Metairie, Louisiana in 2005 and then was chosen to be the founding Head of St. John Berchmans School in Grand Coteau, Louisiana in 2006. In 2008, Troy was chosen after a nation-wide search to be the Head of Middle School at Wakefield School in The Plains, Virginia. While at Wakefield School, Troy has been responsible for the successful implementation of the Middle School Advisory Program, Effort Reporting System, Experiential Learning Team, Junior National Honor Society Membership, and the Middle School Student Virtues Council. Troy has twice been chosen by former students for the honor appearing in *Who's Who Among America's Teachers*. He believes

that successful educational leaders articulate a vision of success, motivate others to share that vision, and provide the necessary support and resources for others to work towards making that vision a reality.