



2014

Superintendent Leadership and Collective Bargaining Processes, Procedures, and Outcomes

Kevin David Rubenstein
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Rubenstein, Kevin David, "Superintendent Leadership and Collective Bargaining Processes, Procedures, and Outcomes" (2014). *Dissertations*. 912.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/912

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).
Copyright © 2014 Kevin David Rubenstein

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

SUPERINTENDENT LEADERSHIP AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING
PROCESSES, PROCEDURES, AND OUTCOMES

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

PROGRAM IN ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

BY

KEVIN DAVID RUBENSTEIN

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 2014

Copyright by Kevin David Rubenstein, 2014

All rights reserved.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

When I started to think about the process of writing a dissertation, I never would have imagined that I would finish it feeling transformed. From the outset, the topic was interesting to me because of issues that had arisen in my own school district and as a result of those issues, I began to have a perception that the relationships between a teachers' union and their administrators could only be negative. As this process concludes, it is clear to me that, not only is it possible for a teachers' union and the districts that they serve to be collegial, but that there are districts that have used these relationships to transform the practices and educational experience of the students, parents, and families. Imagine that – a teacher's union and the administrative team partnering for the improvement of the school district for the benefit of the students.

There are several people that I wish to thank for their support in completing this process. The five superintendents that I interviewed not only gave me rich qualitative data, but also provided insight into their daily lives and this is most appreciated. Dr. Marla Israel, my dissertation committee chair has been an invaluable source of professional and personal support throughout this process. Every bit of feedback that she gave allowed me to move forward with the process and without her, I am not sure that I would have been able to complete this work. Drs. Harry Rossi and Meng-Jia Wu were helpful in designing a project that was manageable and that will contribute to the field of educational administration and for this I am grateful. The superintendents and other

administrators from around the State of Illinois who listened to me discuss my ideas for research and gave me formative feedback and encouragement during the process of writing this dissertation were wonderfully diligent with their encouraging comments and thoughtful concerns. Most notable among this group of administrators are those in my doctoral cohort and those who have served alongside of me in Lake Bluff School District 65 and Deerfield Public Schools District 109.

Finally, I wish to thank my family for their support and love throughout this process. From my mom and dad who, I am sure, never believed that I would be the first in the family with a doctorate, to my sister, brothers, sisters-in-law, and brother-in-law who all constantly asked questions and who are ready to see me move to the next level in my career through the completion of this work. With that said, Connor, Logan, Dylan, Camilla, Kallie, Makenzie, and Jake all lost a small amount of time with me during this process and over the coming years, I hope to be able to make that up to them!

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to superintendents, school administrators, and other parties around the table to help restore their faith in the process. Focus on the development of high quality and trusting relationships, and the rest will follow.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	x
ABSTRACT	xi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	1
Research Questions	8
Significance of the Study to the field of Educational Leadership	9
Research Design and Methodology	10
Areas of Related Literature	12
Conceptual Framework	15
Limitations of the Study	22
Ethical Considerations and Bias Minimization	23
Summary	24
II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	26
Introduction	26
A History of Unions in the State of Illinois	27
Superintendent Leadership	31
Collective Bargaining Styles	36
The Five Leadership Practices	39
Summary	50
III. METHODOLOGY	51
Introduction	51
Null Hypotheses	52
Methodology	53
Data Collection	56
Phase One: Administration of Demographic Profile to Superintendents ..	57
Phase Two: Qualitative Interviews with Superintendents	60
Procedures for Data Analysis	63
Limitations of the Methodology	64
Ethical Considerations and Bias Minimization	65
Summary	66
IV. RESULTS	68
Introduction	68

Review of Research Questions	69
Mixed Methods Research	69
Phase I – Quantitative Data Collection	71
Respondents	72
Demographics	74
Bargaining Experience	78
Leadership Practices Inventory	82
Phase II – Qualitative Data Collection	89
Information about Five Superintendents	91
Superintendent A – Model the Way	92
Superintendent B – Inspire a Shared Vision	100
Superintendent C – Challenge the Process	106
Superintendent D – Enable Others to Act	114
Superintendent E – Encourage the Heart	121
Qualitative Review of Leadership Practices Data	124
Summary	127
 V. FINDINGS	 129
Overview	129
Summary of Rationale and Research Methods	129
Research Questions	130
Analysis of Leadership Practices and Collective Bargaining Styles	132
Model the Way	132
Inspire a Shared Vision	134
Challenge the Process	135
Enable Others to Act	136
Encourage the Heart	138
Analysis of Collective Bargaining Styles and Leadership Practices	138
Findings – Research Question One	139
Findings – Research Question Two	141
Findings – Research Question Three	143
Summation of Data	143
Limitations	145
Recommendations for Future Research	146
Research Implications	148
Summary	150
 APPENDIX	
A. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST	153
B. REQUEST FOR USE OF THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY (LPI) – SELF-ASSESSMENT	155
C. LETTER OF APPROVAL FOR USE OF THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY – SELF-ASSESSMENT	159
D. LETTER OF COOPERATION	161
E. SUPERINTENDENTS’ DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	163

F. CONSENT LETTER FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH	165
G. LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY – SELF ASSESSMENT	169
H. FIRST FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS	172
I. SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS	174
J. THIRD FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS	176
K. SCRIPT FOR CONTACTING SUPERINTENDENTS IN PHASE II RESEARCH BY PHONE	178
L. SCRIPT FOR CONTACTING SUPERINTENDENTS FOR PHASE II RESEARCH VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL	180
M. PROTOCOL FOR INTERVIEWS WITH THE SUPERINTENDENTS	182
N. CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT FOR TRANSCRIBER(S)	185
REFERENCE LIST	187
VITA	194

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percentage of People Who Identified Leadership Characteristics in Subsequent Studies	40
2. Leadership Practices Along with Underlying Values and Commitments	41
3. Superintendent Responses	72
4. Superintendents Included in Study by County.....	73
5. Gender of Respondents	75
6. Age of Respondents	76
7. Years of Experience in Current District.....	77
8. Type of Bargaining Utilized – All Respondents.....	80
9. Type of Bargaining Utilized – Those that Participated	81
10. Dominant Practices Identified.....	85
11. Means and Standard Deviations of Normative Group, All Superintendents, Superintendents that Utilized Win-Lose Bargaining and Interest-Based Bargaining Subgroup	86
12. Keywords Used in Coding of Qualitative Data	90
13. Demographics of Phase II Participants	91
14. Frequency of Coded Words for Each Practice and Document	125

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Overview of the process that was proposed and used in the completion of this paper	12
2. Overview of the Data Collection Process	57
3. Overview of the process used in the completion of this research.....	63
4. Years of Experience in Current School District	78
5. Superintendent's Role in Most Recent Collective Bargaining Experience with Teachers' Union.....	79
6. Type of Bargaining Utilized	81
7. Types of Bargaining Utilized by Superintendents that Negotiated the Contract.....	82
8. Profile Analysis of Superintendents that Utilized Interest-Based Bargaining, Those that Utilized Win-Lose Bargaining and the Normative Group	87
9. LPI Scores of Superintendents Chosen for Phase II	89

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between superintendent leadership practices and collective bargaining processes and procedures using a sequential explanatory, mixed methods approach. In phase one of the study, superintendents in the State of Illinois were asked to complete the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) (LPI-Self) and a demographic profile to identify the type of bargaining that had been used in the most recent negotiations with the teacher’s union in their district. The LPI-Self yields data to identify a dominant leadership practice among five leadership practices including “Model the Way,” “Inspire a Shared Vision,” “Challenge the Process,” “Enable Others to Act,” and “Encourage the Heart.” The results of the LPI-Self were analyzed to determine which leadership practices are associated with superintendents that engage in interest-based bargaining. In phase two of the study, five superintendents, one each from the aforementioned leadership practices were interviewed regarding their leadership and collective bargaining experiences. These interviews, along with the collective bargaining agreements that were in place in each of these districts, were transcribed and coded for keywords based on the five practices.

Results of the study indicate that there is not quantitative data to support any one of the leadership practices being associated with interest-based bargaining. However, there is qualitative data that points to the practice of “Enable Others to Act” as being closely associated with superintendents that utilize interest-based bargaining.

Additionally, the superintendent that engaged in a “pure form” of interest-based bargaining (Klingel, 2003) had a dominant practice of “Enable Others to Act.” Finally, the data identified from the analysis of the collective bargaining agreements pointed to the inclusion of language related to the practice of “Enable Others to Act” most often in the five districts. Suggestions for future research and implications for the field of educational leadership are also explored.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

On November 5, 2012, the headline on the cover of the *Arlington Heights Daily Herald* read, “Why So Many Teachers Unions Threaten to Strike” (Chinwah, 2012). The article discussed extreme levels of discord between school managers and the teachers that they employ. Specifically, the article quoted a teachers’ union representative as saying, “We feel like the environment that we are working in has reached a level where it so bad that at this point, typical means of doing things — like offers and counteroffers — just aren't going to get us anywhere. This was the only way to get them to make appropriate movement and stop asking for things we can't give up. It is going to take much more drastic action” (Chinwah, 2012). When the unions that represent teachers openly discuss “more drastic action” than negotiations, it is necessary to understand the dynamics between the teachers (represented by the union) and the district (represented by the superintendent). Cooper and Sureau (2008) noted that the relationship between school managers (school boards and superintendents) and school employees (the teachers) is “fundamental in understanding public education in the United States” (p. 88). In Illinois, the Illinois Education Labor Relations Act (IELRA) defines the interrelationship between school managers and employees and delegates the oversight for these relationships and implementation of this law to The Illinois Education Labor Relations Board (IELRB;

115 ILCS 5/1, 1983). More recently, the IELRB has been responsible for gathering the “last, best, offers” for school districts that have reached impasse in negotiations with their teacher bargaining unit (115 ILCS 5/12, 2012). A recent review of the IELRB website for Impasse Final Offers reveals 22 different school districts that have at least one party (union or board of education) declaring impasse since April of 2012 (State of Illinois, 2013). Taken together, these twenty-two districts educate close to 471,000 children or approximately 22% of the overall school population in the State of Illinois (Illinois State Board of Education, 2012). A review of the impasse final offers from these districts is helpful in understanding the relationships that exist in those districts between the teachers’ union and their respective board of education. The issues disclosed in the offers are helpful in illuminating how the parties came to the point of impasse after months of negotiating. In reviewing these impasse offers, a letter from the President of the Board of Education in Geneva School District 304 placed blame for the challenges on the methods used during the negotiations. More specifically, the Board President wrote:

This District has a long history of utilizing Interest Based Bargaining (“IBB”) in negotiations... in previous negotiations, the District has developed its own modified version of IBB in which sub-committees comprised of GEA and Board members were formed. This IBB format proved to be very effective and allowed the teachers and the Board to gain trust and momentum at the front-end of the negotiations process so that when the more difficult economic issues were addressed, there was a solid foundation to build upon. Over the past twenty years using Geneva’s modified IBB format, every contract has been negotiated and ratified before the first day of school. During these negotiations, however, at your insistence, there was limited use of sub-committees and instead increased use of the standard IBB process. Because of this rigid stance, no sense of trust or accomplishment was allowed to develop between the parties during those first few months. As you can imagine, this has caused a great deal of frustration for the Board. (Grosso, 2012, p. 3)

While there might have been other factors at play in this negotiation, the fact that the Board President laid the blame for the strife between the teachers and the district on the process that was being used to negotiate the contract is significant.

Strife between unions and employers is an old issue with roots in the union movement and fears openly expressed by socialist leader, Karl Marx in the late 1800's. Marx helped to inspire a generation of socialists around the union movement by discussing the dangers of the spread of capitalism by the managers of large factories. Larson and Nissen (1987) discussed Marx's call for working men to unite against their employers around the issue of wages and quoted Marx as saying "large-scale industry concentrates in one place a crowd of people unknown to one another. Competition divides their interests. But the maintenance of wages, this common interest which they have against their boss, unites them in a common thought of resistance" (Larson & Nissen, 1987). Marx's call for a uniting of forces – those of the working men – against "their boss" outlines the long history of strife between labor and management.

As an original part of the New Deal legislation, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the Wagner Act in 1944 that allowed public employee unions to begin organizing (Cooper & Sureau, 2008). A few years later, pursuant to the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FCMS) was created with the purpose of "preventing or minimizing the impact of labor-management disputes on the free flow of commerce by providing mediation, conciliation and voluntary arbitration" (Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, 2012, p. 2). Given this purpose, the FCMS has become a leading authority on the relationships between unions and their employers.

In the context of the aforementioned Geneva negotiations, the FCMS cited the work of Walton and McKersie (1965) who defined four types of bargaining that are used in the negotiation of agreements. These four types of bargaining are distributive ("fixed pie") bargaining; interest-based ("variable pie") bargaining; attitudinal structuring ("partnering"); and intra-organizational bargaining" (Walton & McKersie, 1965). While it is rare to find organizations that use "pure" forms of these bargaining techniques, partnering and intra-organizational bargaining have been viewed as precursors or conditions to collective bargaining since they involve the reframing of attitudes about each party in the process (partnering) or subtle negotiation of the issues that will actually be bargained (intra-organizational) and often do not occur during the actual bargaining process itself. While distributive bargaining forces both parties to propose the solution to a problem followed by a counter-proposal until the parties have reached agreement on an issue, Interest-Based Bargaining begins with the interests of two parties in mind and the two parties use these collective interests to negotiate solutions which are amicable for all parties involved. In short, while distributive bargaining focuses on positions, something that might lead to adversarial conversations, Interest-Based Bargaining focuses on understanding the underlying issues to a problem so that all parties end up "winning" during negotiations. The FCMS notes that Interest-Based Bargaining works best when:

- (1) there are good relationships between the parties (in this situation, school managers and school employees);
- (2) a sufficient period of time exists before the contract expires;
- (3) there is a willingness to collaborate and share information between the two parties;
- (4) both parties are willing to forego the acquisition and retention of power as a means of

winning and; (5) there is an understanding and acceptance of the process by all involved (Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, 2012). Interest-Based Bargaining was further defined and made popular by Fisher, Ury, and Patton's (1991) book, *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreements Without Giving In*, noting "both parties must have ownership in the process if it is to be successful" (p. 36). After conferring with a panel of experts in the field of educational labor relations in Illinois, Ristow (1999) examined several decisions by the Illinois Education Labor Relations Board and then interviewed key members of the team of litigants from the teachers' union and the board of education in these cases to determine the long-term impact of the decisions on their school districts. In his analysis of the decisions and subsequent interpretation of the interviews he completed, Ristow noted, "while differences in perception (about the impact of these decisions) exist, it was apparent that the collaborative relationship that has developed between the union and management in these three districts helped to reduce tensions and improve working conditions" (pp. 102-103). Just as "Rome was not built in a day," the collaborative relationship between these employee unions and school management teams did not develop quickly and only occurred, in some circumstances, when district-level leaders committed to working in new ways with their respective teacher unions for the betterment of their school organization and student learning. In each of the aforementioned works, the collaborative relationship between the two parties was mentioned as a key factor in the success of Interest-Based Bargaining.

Barry and Richard Rubin (2006) noted "organizational behavior can be viewed as aggregated individual behavior" (p. 283). That is to say that an organization's behavior

can be viewed as the behaviors of the individuals working within that organization.

Given this, understanding how collaborative relationships develop in school districts can be broken down into a study of the individual behaviors of the leaders within those districts. Understanding the challenges between the parties who are at an impasse, then, becomes a study of the relationships that have been built between the district leaders and school employees.

While many school leaders shape the relationships between the district and their school employee unions, the superintendent, director of human resources, and selected administrative team members are critical members who may have a direct role in shaping the district's relationship with its school employee union and whose leadership practices merit further study. Kouzes and Posner (2008) identified five essential practices of exemplary leadership in an effort to dispel myths about leadership as an innate ability found at the core of some humans. The presence and use of these five practices: (1) Model the Way; (2) Inspire a Shared Vision; (3) Challenge the Process; (4) Enable Others to Act; and (5) Encourage the Heart; have been measured using the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (Kouzes & Posner, 2008).

In an update to the 2008 edition, the authors released the fifth edition of *The Leadership Challenge* in 2012 and offered further examples of their research in the field of leadership while clarifying the meaning of the five practices. The authors found that leaders who “model the way” know that “if they want to gain commitment and achieve the highest standards, they must be models of the behavior they expect from others” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 23). This practice emphasizes the importance of congruence

between words and actions in the practices of leaders and in the imperative nature of leading by example. The second practice, “inspiring a shared vision,” relates the “ennobling and exciting vision of the leader to the dreams and aspirations of those who they lead” so that the leader and her followers now share one bold vision for what the organization will be in the future (p. 52). Noting the fact that these visions are a change from the status quo, and that change is a difficult process, the authors identified the third leadership practice; “challenge the process.” Here, it is noted that leaders must “experiment and take risks” while learning from every mistake and celebrating the small victories of the organization. The fourth practice is, perhaps, the most important in the current context as it specifically identifies the role of collaboration in the success of a leader. Specifically, the authors identify the practice of “enabling others to act” by fostering collaborative and trusting relationships as an exemplary leadership practice amongst hundreds of interviews of leaders. Finally, the fifth leadership practice identified by Kouzes and Posner demonstrates the importance of recognizing the actions, hard work, and successes of those within the organization so that a “spirited community” is created within the organization. These leadership practices and the role they have in the creation of great organizations have been cited in over 500 studies of leaders across four continents using data from interviews of thousands of leaders.

All of the practices emphasize collaboration between the leader and those around him and thus, the examination and understanding of a school leader’s ability to collaborate could be measured using the *Leadership Practices Inventory - Self Assessment* (2013). In the scope of Interest-Based Bargaining, it is imperative that the

people who appoint a bargaining team in a school district understand the factors that allow school leaders to develop strong collaborative relationships with their respective collective bargaining units. While a significant amount of research has been done on the leadership practices of school leaders (Barnett, 2012; Cain & Gunter, 2012; Crum & Sherman, 2008; Hulpia & Duvos, 2010; Orr & Orphanos, 2011; Sanzo, Sherman & Clayton, 2011; Wasonga, 2009), there has been little research completed that examines the relationship between the practices of school district leaders and their impact on the relationship with the teachers' union and its collective bargaining approach.

Research Questions

Using the *Leadership Practices Inventory - Self Assessment* (2013), colloquially known as the LPI, in this study provided the researcher with the tools to understand the leadership practices of individual members within school leadership teams in order to identify what relationships, if any, existed between school leaders with strong practices in any of the five areas of the LPI to the bargaining methods used and the outcomes associated with the bargaining. More specifically, several questions about the intersection of leadership and Interest-Based Bargaining are offered:

1. What dominant leadership practices by superintendents, if any, as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) are reflected in school districts that utilize Interest-Based Bargaining?
2. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013)

manifested in the collective bargaining process and procedures within each of their school districts, if at all?

3. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) evident within the language of the collective bargaining agreements negotiated by each of the superintendents, if at all?

Significance of the Study to the field of Educational Leadership

This study is significant to the field of educational leadership because understanding the leadership practices of district-level leaders as they relate to the quality of the relationship with their respective teacher unions provides insights to improve labor relations and help school administrators to better understand how their practices impact these relationships. Given the significant power of teacher unions in shaping a culture of student learning in a school district, it is necessary to understand the factors impacting the relationship between the union leadership and district leaders. Schacter (2010) discussed the power that could come from a strong relationship between a teachers' union and school district leaders in his article titled "A More Perfect Union." Schacter highlights a district long controlled by the stagnation and roadblocks of the teachers union in a review of the reform efforts in New Haven, Connecticut. Lead by the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) local, the review of the New Haven reforms includes in-depth interviews and an examination of the dynamics that brought forth the first teachers contract in the nation to utilize test scores and merit pay on a large scale. Key among the factors in the monumental agreement being reached was the ability of the District administrators and

teachers to collaborate on important issues including teacher dismissal, administrator dismissal, evaluation, and tenure. The article also highlights several other successful collaborative efforts in Denver and Minnesota that seem to be moving the role of collaboration to the forefront in an effort to focus all energies in the bargaining process on student learning. Indeed, understanding what relationships, if any, existed between these two parties is imperative in understanding and advancing educational leadership.

Research Design and Methodology

To answer the research questions listed above, the researcher took several actions. First, since it is known that approximately 98% of school districts in the State of Illinois have a teachers' union with whom they negotiate a collective bargaining agreement (Illinois State Board of Education, 2013), and further that "many districts" that negotiate these contracts use Interest-Based Bargaining, the researcher was able to determine that there is a strong sample population of districts using this technique (K. Rubenstein, personal correspondence, August 6, 2013). Given this information, the researcher identified the superintendents in every school district in the State of Illinois by requesting a list of school superintendents with their contact information from the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) through a Freedom of Information Act Request. After this list had been obtained, the researcher removed the names of several superintendents in an effort to obtain fair and unbiased feedback. Specifically, the researcher excluded superintendents in Deerfield Public Schools District 109, Lake Bluff School District 65, Adlai E. Stevenson High School District 125, and Community Unit School District 95 since the researcher knows the superintendents in these districts. Additionally, given the

fact that a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) oversees the Chicago Public Schools, the CEO in this district was excluded from the study. The school districts studied were districts of varied size, scope, and nature so as to be representative of the schools in the state without forcing the districts to be readily identifiable. This was not challenging given information publicly available on the Internet about collective bargaining agreements and district demographics. Once school district superintendents were identified, the researcher asked these superintendents to complete the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* from Kouzes and Posner to determine the dominant leadership practices of these school leaders. Additionally, these school leaders completed a demographic profile that provided the researcher with information about the type of bargaining (interest-based, distributive) that the district has engaged in during their most recent negotiations with their teachers' union, the background of the superintendent; and whether the negotiations reached impasse. Once these data were obtained, five districts were chosen so that one superintendent represented each of the five leadership practices identified by Kouzes and Posner: Model the Way; Inspire a Shared Vision; Challenge the Process; Enable Others to Act and; Encourage the Heart. Once these superintendents were identified, an interview was set up with the superintendent where the researcher sought information about the superintendent's perspective on what worked and did not work in the most recent negotiations and discussed how their leadership style was reflected, if at all, during the negotiations and in the subsequent agreement. These interviews and the collective bargaining agreements that were negotiated were transcribed and coded for themes. When combined with a quantitative analysis of the

LPI data, it was possible to determine which leadership practices within the Kouzes and Posner framework are most associated with collaborative relationships between school leaders and teacher unions and which practices are most used within districts that conduct Interest-Based Bargaining to reach agreement with their teachers' union.




Figure 1. Overview of the process that was proposed and used in the completion of this paper

Areas of Related Literature

To thoroughly understand the linkages between management and labor, there are several areas that were a part of the literature review including: the leadership of superintendents, relationships that typically exist between unions and management teams, a history of unions in the State of Illinois, and the leadership practices espoused by Kouzes and Posner as a conceptual framework. In preparing for this literature review, a

preliminary review of the research revealed several key sources. Birnbaum and Inman (1984), the noted scholars in the field of higher education used data gathered from the Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI) that was administered on the campuses of fifty institutions of higher learning in 1970 and 1980. Eighteen of the schools in the study had begun collective bargaining during the ten-year period between the two studies and the authors expected that the unionization of these campuses would have a negative impact on several of the factors measured. However, the researchers found no statistically significant changes in scores on the IFI at schools with collective bargaining or schools without collective bargaining. This study was helpful in defining the limitations of the current work.

Green and Eldridge (1999) studied the relationships between unions and their school district administrators and its impact on the students in the district and the involvement of teachers in instructional decision-making processes. The authors identified three characteristics of school districts where collaborative relationships are strong: (1) there is a redefinition of the purpose of unions and their relationship with the district; (2) a strong sense of professionalism among union members and; (3) confrontational bargaining between the union and district leaders is replaced by collaborative decision making (Green & Eldridge, 1999). The article gives examples of contract language that is used in each of these districts. This article, given its significant and solid contract language from key districts that promote collaboration amongst their teachers and administrators, was helpful in examining whether strong relationships exist in all districts with similar language or if there were additional common underlying

factors that influenced the relationships. Further, while Strunk (2011) examined the relationship between collective bargaining agreement language and student achievement in California schools, the framework utilized to examine and measure the strength of collective bargaining agreements presents another possible method for understanding unions. To complete their research, the researchers from the University of Southern California used partial independence item response (PIIR) approach using self-collected data from 465 California public school district teachers' union contracts from the 2005-2006 school years and compared them with achievement data associated with the No Child Left Behind Act. The PIIR approach allowed the researchers to code collective bargaining agreements for restrictiveness and then compared the level of restrictiveness with variables including math proficiency, reading proficiency, and students with Individualized Educational Plans who meet or exceed standards. The research indicates that there is consistent evidence that contract restrictiveness is associated with a greater probability that districts will be in Program Improvement status (PI), and at higher levels of PI, as well as experiencing lower graduation rates. In applying the methods from this study to the current context, the researcher would have needed to have a much larger sample size (in the study, the number of respondents was close to 1,000 as compared to the estimated universe in the proposed study of 300) for the research to be considered valid. Nonetheless, it was possible for the researcher to identify key words that are associated with the five leadership practices identified by Kouzes and Posner (2012) and then identify the same language in collective bargaining agreements of the respective superintendents.

Ireh and Bailey (1999) explored the superintendent's leadership style through the situational leadership model and found that the only factor that the superintendent's style significantly impacted was that of the student expenditures. McAdams (1998) specifically examined correlations between school climate and superintendent leadership style, in Pennsylvania school districts, but Kouzes and Posner's practices were not reviewed nor is it a lens for the author. Finally, Ortiz (1987) examined the leadership styles of superintendent's in three different districts and found that the biggest impact was when they embraced charismatic, symbolic, or intentional styles and that superintendents who embraced these styles were able to produce significant levels of organizational change.

Conceptual Framework

Over 25 years ago, two researchers set out to examine the practices of leaders in a variety of industries around the world. In their research, James Kouzes and Barry Posner, asked leaders to identify the practices that they used when they were at their "personal best." After asking this question thousands of times to leaders in hundreds of different settings, they were able to identify five practices and behaviors that exemplary leaders utilized. They are: (1) Model the Way; (2) Inspire a Shared Vision; (3) Challenge the Process; (4) Enable Others to Act and; (5) Encourage the Heart (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 15). Understanding the key characteristics of each of these practices was necessary if they are to be utilized as a conceptual framework for superintendent leadership practices as they relate to collective bargaining processes, procedures, and outcomes.

It would be challenging for a leader to become exemplary if there were not congruence between his/her values and the behaviors that he/she expects from those around them. For example, in the City of Chicago, Mayor Rahm Emmanuel has been criticized for sending his children to private schools while espousing the virtues of the public school system that he oversees. In an article in the Chicago Tribune, Amy Woesthoff, the Executive Director of an organization called Parents United for Responsible Education noted that this decision by Emmanuel “sends a message that he has not found a Chicago Public School that he is confident enough to send his kids to” (Mack, 2011). Inherent in the proposition of congruence between personal values and the values of the people who follow the leader is an understanding of the personal values of the leader and those that follow him. Kouzes and Posner (2012) noted that leaders must “clarify values by finding your voice,” and then identifying the values of the organization and community and “affirm the shared values of the group” (p. 17). However, the case of Mayor Emmanuel demonstrates that the alignment between the personal values of the leader and those of the community are not nearly enough. The personal values of the leader and of the organization must be aligned with all of the actions taken by the leader and organization. Specifically, exemplary leaders must “set the example by aligning actions with shared values” (p. 17). In short, exemplary leaders demonstrate practices that “Model the Way,” both literally and figuratively for those around them.

When President Barack Obama was elected on November 4, 2008, his campaign slogan had been broken down into one word: change. This slogan, fitting for a country that was crawling into the depths of an economic depression and mired by the debt

associated with two wars, helped people in the United States to see a future where things would be different. Similarly, Kouzes and Posner (2012) found that exemplary leaders “Inspire a Shared Vision” for the future by “imagining exciting and ennobling possibilities” and “enlisting others in a common vision by appealing to shared aspirations” (p. 18). In the case of President Obama, the night before his victory in 2008, he stood before thousands of people and reminded them of all that his campaign stood for through the story of his trips around the country and the inspirational city councilwoman in Greenwood, South Carolina who helped people to get “fired up” and “ready to go” against all odds. He noted that the story of the city councilwoman “shows you what one voice can do. That one voice can change a room. And if a voice can change a room, it can change a city, and if it can change a city, it can change a state, and if it can change a state, it can change a nation, and if it can change a nation, it can change the world” (Obama, 2008). President Obama may have won the election because he “inspired a shared vision.”

Superintendents are often brought into organizations to change an environment or to turnaround a failing district. Kouzes and Posner (2012) found that leaders who were at their “personal best” helped to create change in organizations. To create change, rather than waiting for changes to come to the organization, leaders “search for opportunities by seizing initiative and by looking outward for innovative ways to improve” while “experimenting and taking risks” and “constantly generating small wins and learning from experiences” (p. 20). The literature on school reform is replete with several examples of leaders who had “challenged the process,” but the story of Dr. Richard

DuFour at Stevenson High School in Lincolnshire, IL stands out. Michael Schmoker, author of the *Results Fieldbook*, noted that “When DuFour began as principal in 1983, Stevenson didn't even rank in the top 50 schools in the Midwest. By 1995, they were ranked by the College Board as the top high school in the Midwest and the sixth in the world, based on student success on Advance Placement (AP) exams” (Schmoker, 2001). To do this, DuFour looked to the business world and leveraged the power of data to overhaul the school and focus its mission on instructional improvement. Schmoker noted that to induce change at Stevenson, DuFour had to “embrace rather than to eschew the lessons of leadership research from the business world. He saw that the use of data is indispensable to improvement.” Rather than allowing Stevenson to rest on its laurels, DuFour “challenged the process” and enabled the students at the school to achieve at levels not seen prior to his tenure.

A leader can demonstrate congruence between their vision and actions, inspire others, and challenge the process, but Kouzes and Posner (2012) also found that exemplary leaders “Enable Others to Act” and it is this leadership practice that seems to speak most toward the practices associated with Interest-Based Bargaining. Leaders who enable others to act “foster collaboration by building trust and facilitating relationships” and “strengthen others by increasing self-determination and developing competence” (p. 22). The work of a superintendent is multifaceted and ever changing. In a given day, it is possible that a superintendent might be required to demonstrate knowledge in the areas of curriculum, special education, human resources, and business and given these demands, it would be nearly impossible for a superintendent to oversee the work of a

district without trusting and enabling those around him/her to act. Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (2007) posited, “leadership is a relational process of people together attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common good.” This definition moves leadership from a position that one holds to an action that is taken to create change. To do this, Kouzes and Posner (2012) encourage leaders to create a climate of trust and facilitate relationships as they work toward enabling others to act. Organizational leaders without trust built might run into challenges. St. John (2013) related the story of Sue, a leader of a business who was faced with a dilemma. As the leader of a division in her business firm, Sue was required to give a presentation once per month to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and senior leadership team of the organization. These presentations involved hours of work, pulling together a variety of different data sources, and putting it together into a presentation that was acceptable. While these presentations were typically held on the final Tuesday of the month, a change in the schedule for the CEO required the presentation to be moved to another date that week. The new date for the presentation, however, was a date that Sue had already been scheduled to be out of the office presenting to another group of colleagues. Sue could either cancel the other presentation and risk losing the business that went along with that presentation or come up with an alternative solution. Sue, in the true spirit of a leader, enabled others to act and enlisted the help of the employees in her division to prepare for the presentations and helped the employees to take responsibility for the work that was being done for that division. As the date for the two presentations approached, Sue had prepared adequately for both of the presentations and because of the fact that she

included her employees in the planning and development phase of both presentations; she was ready for the big day. In the end, the presentation to the CEO was made by the team of employees that had helped to put together the presentation even though this was different than what the leadership team had become accustomed to. Sue demonstrated her power as a leader in multiple ways through this experience. First and foremost, she had enabled those around her to act and to present to the CEO and senior leadership team. Second, she had taken something that she felt “only she could do” and given it to those around her, which demonstrated implicit trust in their actions and their work. Finally, through the process of developing the presentations, she had paired people together and challenged them to develop relationships with each other through the process of working on the presentation. The story of Sue shows the power of a leader who helps others to work together. Superintendents, given their significant responsibilities in the school district, must be comfortable with enabling others to act and must be able to trust those around them to make decisions that will move the organization forward. With respect to Interest-Based Bargaining, when a superintendent has enabled others to act, there is an underlying belief that the positions and interests of the teachers’ union are in line with the positions and interests of the district and that because of this underlying alignment in views, there will be a negotiated agreement. In short, this leadership practice fosters greatness by demonstrating the power that comes from working together and developing the individual skills of those around the leader.

Finally, Kouzes and Posner (2012) found that exemplary leaders practice the art of “encouraging the heart.” Thinking about the individual contributions of the members

of the organization is not good enough. It is when the leader “recognizes the contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence” and “celebrating the values and victories by creating a spirit of community” (p. 24). Kouzes and Posner highlighted the work of Jessica Herrin, the CEO of Stella and Dot, one of the fastest growing businesses in the country. Herrin noted, “recognition is the most powerful currency you have and it costs you nothing” (p. 23). Leaders who “encourage the heart” create a sense of “esprit de corps” in their organizations and help others to believe in the power of their work.

Measuring these behaviors using the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* tool is a valid and reliable method according to the publishers of the tool. In 1993, Kouzes and Posner reviewed the instrument that had been created in 1988 using qualitative and quantitative research methods. The authors of the study performed several statistical analyses of the data with 5,298 respondents from a variety of fields who completed the LTI – Self. Internal reliability of the instrument was found to be above the .75 level for all five sub-scales described (Kouzes & Posner, 1993). Here, a score closer to the .99 level would demonstrate the most consistency in the items (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The tool is reliable across both genders and the many employment categories (i.e., business, education, health, etc.) of those that were included in the study. Since this second study was completed in the early 1990’s, the authors report the strong reliability of the tool on their website and note the use of it in several hundred research studies (Kouzes & Posner, 2013).

These leadership practices are expanded upon in the literature review, but having an understanding of them and their statistical properties is necessary in reviewing the conceptual framework and proposed instruments.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations of the study that are noted from the outset and in the subsequent sections and chapters, the researcher attempted to minimize these limitations. First and foremost, while the State of Illinois is quite diverse, the return rate for the demographic profiles and follow-up interviews might not be representative of all of the types of school districts that exist in the country meaning that this study is contextually based in a large Midwestern state. The racial, ethnic, sexual orientation, language, and gender orientations of the study participants along with the size and ethnic backgrounds of the students served, achievement rates, and a variety of other factors about the superintendents and the districts that were researched were not known at the outset. This means that the study participants might or might not be representative of the overall diversity that exists in school districts in Illinois and across the country. Further, because this study was not conducted with every superintendent in the country, data about the leadership practices of superintendents will not be gathered or readily available so it will not be easy to generalize the results of this study to other states in the country. As such, it is possible that the superintendent leadership styles represented in the study equally (i.e., one from each of the leadership practices) might not be equally represented in the superintendent population as a whole. Finally, while the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* tool is considered a valid and reliable tool to measure the leadership

practices of superintendents, for the purposes of this study, only one portion of the overall tool, the Self Assessment, was used. It is possible that superintendents might not have been honest in their self-assessment and since this tool's data was not being triangulated with the data of observers or co-workers, the actual dominant leadership practice might not have been obtained during this study.

Ethical Considerations and Bias Minimization

It is also of mention that the researcher is an administrator in the area that was studied and is acquainted with several superintendents in the area. To minimize the potential ethical concerns surrounding the researcher interviewing these superintendents, this study excluded the superintendents in Deerfield Public Schools District 109, Lake Bluff School District 65, Adlai E. Stevenson High School District 125, and Community Unit School District 95. When the superintendents responded to the researcher and are subsequently interviewed, there was a potential for the researcher to misunderstand, or misquote the superintendent or to take one interview in one direction while taking another interview in another direction. To minimize these concerns, the superintendents were asked to read and verify a transcript of the interview to ensure that the researcher had accurately captured what was said during the interview while allowing the superintendent to amend their comments (Merriam, 2009). Finally, it is noted that the researcher has lived in the area being researched for much of his adult life. As an avid reader of local media, it is possible to gain an inappropriate perception of a superintendent and their leadership style. For example, the researcher could view the superintendent in a district who recently had a teachers' strike less favorably or as a

“poor” leader. Schwandt (2007) discussed the biases that come with completing qualitative research and called the process of reflecting on the researcher as an instrument as “reflexivity.” To minimize the potential biases associated with these perceptions, the researcher used a semi-structured interview format so that the perceptions of the researcher are reduced in the new knowledge that is produced from this study. Additionally, the researcher kept a private journal to record initial thoughts and feelings after completing the interviews. The journals will be a method for discussing any potential biases that the researcher might have as the process of interviewing superintendents develops. This journal also helped in minimizing the biases associated with the researchers own dominant leadership practice, “challenge the process,” as this could be the source of potential questions about the validity of the research findings.

Summary

The study is one that will attempt to answer three research questions:

1. What dominant leadership practices by superintendents, if any, as defined by Kouzes and Posner’s *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) are reflected in school districts that utilize Interest-Based Bargaining?
2. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner’s *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) manifested in the collective bargaining process and procedures within each of their school districts, if at all?
3. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner’s *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013)

evident within the language of the collective bargaining agreements negotiated by each of the superintendents, if at all?

To answer these research questions, the researcher identified school superintendents from the State of Illinois and asked them to complete the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) and a Demographic Profile. Once the superintendents completed these tools, a representative sample of superintendents who each represent one of the five leadership practices was gathered. These five superintendents were asked to participate in a semi-structured interview with the researcher. Next, the interviews were transcribed and the study participants were asked to verify the accuracy of their spoken words and were given an opportunity to comment on words or comments that might have represented them inappropriately. These transcripts and the applicable collective bargaining agreements of the school districts that were studied were then coded for themes from the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013). These coded data were analyzed to determine what relationships, if any, exist between the leadership practices of the superintendent and the process used to bargain a contract with their teachers' union and the language that is contained within the agreements that were reached.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter summarizes the literature surrounding the topics of superintendent leadership, before diving into a review of the history of collective bargaining in the State of Illinois, the relationships between unions and the superintendent, and the five leadership practices espoused by Kouzes and Posner. Reviewing this literature is necessary to provide the appropriate context for answering the research questions of:

1. What dominant leadership practices by superintendents, if any, as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) are reflected in school districts that utilize Interest-Based Bargaining?
2. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) manifested in the collective bargaining process and procedures within each of their school districts, if at all?
3. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) evident within the language of the collective bargaining agreements negotiated by each of the superintendents, if at all?

A History of Unions in the State of Illinois

1983 is considered a “landmark” year for the field of education because of one publication: *A Nation at Risk*. In that publication, state policy makers and local school districts are called upon to overhaul the system of educating children or face perilous consequences. In this context, the idea that the first education related bill to pass the Illinois House of Representatives would be the Illinois Education Labor Relations Act might seem odd. Indeed, Representative Diana Nelson argued that the focus of lawmakers following the publication of this report (referring to *A Nation at Risk*) should be on something other than passing laws allowing for collective bargaining in public education in the State of Illinois. Stated Nelson, “nowhere in that entire report that took two years of study is there any mention of granting mandated collective bargaining with the right to strike to teachers and other educational employees” (Illinois General Assembly, 1983). Yet, with the history of the two major education unions (The National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers) dating to the late 1800’s and the increased membership in public labor organizations that occurred in the middle of the 20th century, House Bill 1530 which would later become the *Illinois Education Labor Relations Act* seemed destined for passage (Kahlenberg, 2006). Further it is likely that the fact that dangerous road discussed in *A Nation at Risk*, a report that had been issued by a commission that was appointed by a conservative president (Reagan), might not have been so alarming to an Illinois Legislature that was dominated by liberal Democrats.

Kahlenberg (2006) cites the work of Murphy in his discussion of the early days of teachers unions. "...At the time, collective bargaining for teachers was not a realistic option. Instead, local teacher organizations would attend school board meetings and make requests for salary increases. They participated in what the AFT (American Federation for Teachers) later called 'collective begging'." While teachers fought to be included in the 1935 National Labor Relations Act, the legislation was eventually limited to only private sector employees (Murphy, 1990). Illinois nearly became the first state to allow collective bargaining with public employees in 1945 when both houses of the legislature passed a collective bargaining statute, but Governor Dwight Green vetoed the bill (Clark & O'Brien, 2001). The push for public sector employees to collectively bargain continued in the 1950's and in 1952, Carl Meigel, the president of the AFT noted the challenging nature of the disparity in incomes between educated teachers and those of factory workers when he stated "the average salary for teachers in the United States during the past year was approximately \$400 less than the income of the average factory worker" (Murphy, 1990). Yet it was not until 1960 when the teachers in the City of New York staged a walkout the day before the presidential election that the talk of collectively bargaining with teachers really began to heat up and in December of 1961, the first collective bargaining agreement for teachers was established. Later that year, President Kennedy issued an executive order authorizing collective bargaining with public employees (Murphy, 1990). During the 1960's teachers unions began bargaining collectively with their employers in Detroit and Philadelphia and the membership in the two teachers unions grew exponentially (Kahlenberg, 2006). In Illinois, a key turning

point in the labor movement occurred in 1967 in the landmark case known as *McLaughlin vs. Tilendis* (Kearney, 2009). Here, one teacher's contract was not renewed and another teacher had her contract revoked because of their alleged involvement with the American Federation of Teachers. However, the teachers filed suit against the district and the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals held that the terminations violated the employees' rights to free association and concluded that "unless there is some illegal intent an individual's right to form and join a union is protected by the First Amendment" (Kearney, 2009, p. 47). Also in 1967, the Illinois Senate took the recommendations of the Wagner Commission and passed legislation that would have covered all public employees in the state under one act allowing them to collectively bargain with their local governments. However, the Illinois House of Representatives defeated the measure because labor unions objected to the clause that prohibited unions from striking (Clark & O'Brien, 2001). The role of unions expanded in the 1970's with the passage of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act that provided funding for schools across the country. Teachers then became engaged in arguments with boards of education about the proper way to spend the money (Kahlenberg, 2006). In 1981, the Illinois Legislature amended the Illinois School Code to require the Regional Superintendents of Schools to conduct elections to certify unions, but because of the fact that the provisions did not require school boards to bargain in good faith, the provision carried little weight (Malin, 1985). Additionally, Malin (1985) noted that the weight of these collective bargaining agreements were questionable since they might have violated Illinois law by agreeing to pay money to employees that had not yet been appropriated to

the local entity. Nonetheless, by May 18, 1983, close to 35 states had laws governing the collective bargaining rights of teacher unions and a “high number” of districts in Illinois had begun to collectively bargain with their faculty members (Illinois General Assembly, 1983). On that day, representatives from across Illinois argued in the chambers of the Illinois General Assembly about the rights of workers to organize, strike, bargain collectively, and seek fair wages (Illinois General Assembly, 1983). When it finally became the law of the land on January 1, 1984, collective bargaining agreements between teacher unions and local boards of education soon began to become a norm in Illinois public schools. Under the law, boards of education with unionized staff members must negotiate wages and working conditions. However, issues like outsourcing, frequency of staff meetings, and class size are subjects that might be considered in negotiations, as the law does not explicitly prohibit any subject from being bargained (Illinois Policy Institute, 2010).

As of 2010, approximately 50% of all public employees in the State of Illinois are covered by a contract with a union (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). Since its inception, the Illinois Education Labor Relations Act has undergone a number of changes, but the most noticeable occurred in 2010 when Governor Pat Quinn signed Senate Bill Seven into law. The bill changed the requirements regarding what should happen in the case of an impasse being declared by one of the parties who are bargaining. Specifically, it requires school districts to engage in mediation with teachers unions before declaring an impasse, calls on both parties to wait fifteen days after mediation has begun before an impasse is declared, challenges both sides to publish their “last, best, and

final offers” with the Illinois Education Labor Relations Board, and requires unions to wait a total of thirty days before striking once the impasse has been declared (115 ILCS 5/1, Illinois Educational Labor Relations Act, 1983). As noted in Chapter I, this publication of notices has yielded a total of twenty-two districts in Illinois declaring impasse including the union that represents teachers in the Chicago Public Schools System. Given this relatively high number of impasses and the role of the superintendent in negotiating and finalizing these agreements, it is necessary to review the leadership practices of superintendent’s as they relate to collective bargaining processes, procedures, and outcomes.

Superintendent Leadership

Leadership can be viewed through the lens of many different theorists and from a variety of different viewpoints. A quick search on the Internet for the word “leadership” yielded over 287 million hits with topics ranging from political leadership to leadership in the business sector. Some of the literature around leadership in schools and communities has been focused on “servant leadership” as espoused by Robert Greenleaf in the 1970’s. Greenleaf believed that community leadership must be focused on serving others. According to Greenleaf’s (1977) book, *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*, leaders of community organizations, including school leaders and superintendents, must focus on serving others if anything in society is ever to be accomplished. Specifically, he notes:

This is my thesis: caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is the rock upon which a good society is built. Whereas, until recently, caring was largely person to person, now most of it is mediated through

institutions – often large, complex, powerful, impersonal; not always competent; sometimes corrupt. If a better society is to be built, one that is more just and more loving, one that provides greater creative opportunity for its people, then the most open course is to raise both the capacity to serve and the very performance as servant of existing major institutions by new regenerative forces operating within them. (Greenleaf, 1977, p. 2)

Schools are “major institutions” in most communities and therefore it is school leaders that Greenleaf calls upon to act as servant leaders for the children of our society.

Sergiovanni (2007) suggested that today’s schools require a much different type of leadership because of their unique political environments, government oversight, and cultural implications. Indeed, Heifetz and Linsky (2004) noted that

leadership in education means mobilizing schools, families, and communities to deal with some difficult issues - issues that people often prefer to sweep under the rug. The challenges of student achievement, health, and civic development generate real but thorny opportunities for each of us to demonstrate leadership every day in our roles as ... administrators... in the community. (p. 33)

In 2006, researchers from the Mid-Continent Research in Education Laboratory found a statistically significant relationship between superintendent leadership and student achievement after a meta-analysis of studies (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Sayre (2007) studied superintendents’ leadership through lens of transformational and instructional leadership frameworks in an effort to further understand the impact of superintendent leadership on the instructional capacities of teachers. Findings in this study indicated that superintendents who were most likely to improve the instructional capacity of teachers worked to establish collaborative relationships across the district in the areas of curriculum and instruction; engaged in monitoring and evaluation of student learning and teacher progress; maintained a high level of visibility in all of the schools in the district;

and established a culture of high expectations for student learning and achievement. Given these assertions and understandings, it is important to understand the unique nature of superintendent leadership and a number of researchers have attempted to do so.

Bird and Wang (2013) interviewed superintendents from across the southeastern United States and asked them to describe their leadership styles in terms of autocratic, laissez-faire, democratic, situational, servant, or transformational and found no discernible differences in the numbers of superintendents who identified themselves as one style or another. According to the study “the vast majority of the participating superintendents (> 97%) chose from the last four leadership styles but chose quite equitably across the following four styles, respectively: democratic (16.61%), situational (25.25%), servant (23.92%), and transformational (32.23%; Bird & Wang, 2013). In 2010, Wilson reviewed the leadership of superintendents in the State of Missouri in an effort to identify the leadership practices that they felt were effective in leading a school district. The study identified several practices including vision, communication, visibility, inspiring followers, shared leadership and collaboration, professional growth, ethical behavior, political awareness, and building relationships. Interviews with the superintendents in the study confirmed that it is the combination of these practices that is important (Wilson, 2010). More recently, Kellner (2012) found that superintendents who used moral authority in decision-making had a positive impact on overall student achievement. Earlier studies indicated that successful school superintendents share the common traits of placing a strong value on human resources, taking risks, being good

communicators, and focusing on learning (Barnes & Kriger, 1986; Daresh & Aplin, 1987; Joiner, 1987; Mendez-Morse, 1992).

Superintendents who are measured as “effective” through the lens of strong student achievement scores exhibited several common traits including collaborative goal setting with principals and teachers; non-negotiable standards that are agreed upon by all faculty members; alignment of the goals between the superintendent and the school board; close monitoring and review of the goals that have been set and; a realignment of resources to support the goals that have been set in a district (Waters & Marzano, 2006). Using information from these authors as a framework, Roelle (2009) examined the leadership of superintendents through the eyes of the principals using the *Leadership Practices Inventory - 360* scale developed by Kouzes and Posner and found that, on average, the principals who were most satisfied with their jobs rated their superintendents highest in the leadership practice of “Enable Others to Act” (Roelle, 2009). With this said, Leithwood (2005) argued that having the leadership skills are not the only pre-requisites necessary for a successful superintendent. Instead, it is the way that the superintendent applies the leadership skills to the unique context of schools that allows superintendents with leadership skills to be successful. Through the lens of collective bargaining methods, a superintendent might discuss the need to build relationships with their teachers’ union. However, if that superintendent engages the district in several positional bargaining sessions so that the outcomes are favorable to the district, then there is incongruence between the superintendent’s abilities and the methods that he or she uses to apply these abilities to the situation of collective bargaining.

In an effort to better understand the work of superintendents in the State of Illinois, it is helpful to have knowledge of the standards set forth by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE). The Illinois School Superintendent Content Area Standards are listed below as they are noted in the Illinois School Code:

STANDARD 1 – Facilitating a Vision of Educational Excellence

The competent school superintendent is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of educational excellence that is shared and supported by the school community.

STANDARD 2 – Learning Environment and Instructional Program

The competent school superintendent is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating and nurturing a constantly improving learning environment and an instructional program based upon educationally sound principles of curriculum development, learning and teaching theory, and professional development.

STANDARD 3 – Management

The competent school superintendent is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

STANDARD 4 – Collaboration with Families and Communities

The competent school superintendent is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

STANDARD 5 – Knowledge of Laws, Regulations and Professional Ethics

The competent school superintendent is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding and applying knowledge of laws, regulations, and professional ethics related to schools and children (23 ILCS. 1.29.130, 2004).

Under standard three, one of the performance indicators specifically applies to the work of superintendents as it relates to collective bargaining. Specifically, the standards require the competent superintendent to have “knowledge and understanding of principles

of human resource management and development to maximize the effectiveness of all constituents of the school district” (23 ILCS 1.29.130 C.4, 2004). While this standard does not call on the district leader to bargain collectively with its employees, it does require the superintendent to understand how to leverage the power of human resources in the district for the overall improvement of the district. Given this requirement, it is necessary for the superintendent to understand how to “maximize their effectiveness.” As noted in Chapter I, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS) identified “a willingness to collaborate and share information” as a key factor in the success of Interest-Based Bargaining (Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, 2012). Therefore, in order for the superintendent to “maximize their effectiveness,” he or she must have an understanding of how their leadership style impacts the teachers’ union and other stakeholder groups in their districts.

Collective Bargaining Styles

One of the nation’s largest labor organizations, the AFL-CIO, defines collective bargaining as “the process in which working people, through their unions, negotiate contracts with their employers to determine terms of employment, including pay, benefits, hours, leave, job health and safety policies, ways to balance work and family and more” (AFL-CIO, 2013). In chapter one, the reader was introduced to the different types of collective bargaining. The seminal work on collective bargaining was written by Walton and McKersie in 1965 and outlined four different collective bargaining practices including distributive (“fixed pie”) bargaining; interest-based (“variable pie”) bargaining; attitudinal structuring (“partnering”); and intra-organizational bargaining.” While much

has been written about these bargaining styles, Varkados (2012) posits that collective bargaining for teachers has typically been focused on distributive bargaining, also known as positional bargaining, and Interest-Based Bargaining . It is important to understand these two types of bargaining in the current context since they are inherently different and require leaders on both sides of the table to come at the problems from different points of view. Underlying both of these styles is the principle of negotiation. In 2005, Patton laid out seven elements of negotiation including interests, legitimacy, relationships, alternatives, options, commitments, and communication. Most importantly, Patton defined the interests as “a parties basic needs, wants, and motivations” while he defined positions as “a proposed outcome that represents merely one way among many that issues might be resolved” (p. 2). The difference between these positions and interests is where the two different styles of bargaining become important.

Positional bargaining is an approach to negotiations that frames the arguments between the two sides as a “zero-sum” meaning that what one party gives another party gains (Patton, 2004). For example, in order for a school district to extend the hours in the school day, they might have to “give” the teachers more money or planning time. It is noted that positional bargaining focuses on the only perceived solution to a problem by one party or another (Varkados, 2012). In positional bargaining, one side will stake out an opening position that is outrageously high (or low) forcing the other to stake out an alternative that is polar to this position (Patton, 2004). Typically, this negotiation results in a series of concessions that are made until an agreement is reached between the two parties. Fisher and Ury (1981) noted, however, that there is a problem with this sort of

negotiation because it is both inefficient and "...the agreements tend to neglect the parties' interests. It encourages stubbornness and so it tends to harm the parties' relationship" (p. 32).

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service discusses Interest-Based Bargaining (IBB) as a two part process whereby both parties first seek to understand the problem and then try to understand the underlying interests of the parties involved in negotiations (Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, 2012). Klingel (2003) notes, "the structural differences in an IBB approach are in the composition of the bargaining team, the amount and type of information used in negotiations, and the involvement of constituents" (p. 2). Throughout the process of negotiating, rather than a series of proposals and counter-proposals, those involved with the negotiation of a contract develop a series of problem statements, gather information on a topic together, jointly analyze the information, and share as much information as possible with the other party. However, McKersie and Walton teamed with two other researchers in 1995 to produce an updated version of their noted work and posited that the selection of a bargaining technique is not an "either or" choice and is instead influenced by a variety of economic, legislative, and social factors that define the everyday work of those at the bargaining table (Cutcher-Gershenfeld, McKersie, & Walton 1995). As Klingel (2003) noted "focusing solely on bargaining practices ignores the role of the external environment in shaping labor-management strategies. Thus, the development of IBB cannot be understood in isolation from the larger strategies and forces at play in educational settings" (p. 4). This dissertation proposal is developed on the idea that it is the

leadership practices of superintendents, as defined by Kouzes and Posner, which are the key “forces at play.” Therefore it is helpful to understand these leadership practices, what they mean, how they are developed, and their possible implications for professional practice in the field of educational leadership and the practices of superintendents engaged in collective bargaining with their respective teachers’ unions.

The Five Leadership Practices

In Chapter I, the reader was introduced to the five leadership practices that were validated by Kouzes and Posner (2012) after thousands of interviews with managers and leaders who discussed their practices when they were at their personal best. Those practices are (1) Model the Way; (2) Inspire a Shared Vision; (3) Challenge the Process; (4) Enable Others to Act; and (5) Encourage the Heart. In order to answer the identified research questions, it is necessary to understand the underlying concepts behind these leadership practices.

In 1982, James Kouzes and Barry Posner set out to examine “exemplary leadership” by asking people the question “what did you do when you were at your personal best as a leader” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). While the initial interviews were of people with leadership oriented titles (i.e., manager, supervisor, etc.), many of the interviews that allowed the authors to develop their leadership practices theory were of average people in organizations with strong leaders who openly and actively practiced leadership as an action. Specifically, the authors noted that “leadership is not about who you are; it’s about what you do” (p. 15). The very fact that the researchers studied average people in an effort to understand leadership means that leadership is not just

found at the upper echelons of organizations, but at all levels. Further, in their research, it was noted that none of the stories of leaders at their “personal best” were stories of leaders who acted alone. They were stories of leaders who had worked those around them to overcome great obstacles and against all odds. Leadership, then, is a relationship between the leaders in a group and those that are around them (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Research on these leadership practices, however, is not just as simple as the stories being told by people. The other portion of the research around leadership capitalized on the relationship between leaders and those around them by asking people what characteristics a leader must have if they were to be willingly followed. What they found was that over sixty percent of the people identified the same four characteristics each of the years that this research was undertaken. Those characteristics and the percentage of people who identified this as a trait that they would require their leader to possess if they were to be followed are seen in the table below:

Table 1

Percentage of People Who Identified Leadership Characteristics in Subsequent Studies

Characteristic/Year	1987	1995	2002	2007	2012
Honest	83%	88%	88%	89%	89%
Forward-Looking	62%	75%	71%	71%	71%
Competent	67%	63%	66%	68%	69%
Inspiring	58%	68%	65%	69%	69%

Note: Adapted from Kouzes and Posner, 2012.

While the people cited the leadership trait of “inspiring” just fewer than 60% of the time during the initial study, it was the leadership trait that rounded out the top four traits and has been above 60% ever since the initial study. Each of these characteristics is closely aligned with one of the leadership practices written by Kouzes and Posner. For example, the leadership practice known as “inspire a shared vision” is made up of leaders who are “forward-looking.” Indeed, each of these characteristics is the theoretical underpinning of the practices themselves and in the table below, these practices and commitments are summarized.

Table 2

Leadership Practices Along with Underlying Values and Commitments

Leadership Practice	Underlying Values and Commitments
Model the Way	Clarify Values
	Set the Example
Inspire a Shared Vision	Envision a bright future
	Enlist others in a common vision
Challenge the Process	Search for opportunities to seize the initiative.
	Experiment and take risks
Enable Others to Act	Foster Collaboration by building trust and relationships.
	Strengthen others
Encourage the Heart	Recognize contributions by showing appreciation for individual excellence.
	Celebrate the values and victories.

Note: Adapted from Kouzes and Posner, 2012.

The authors identified their first law of leadership: “If you don’t believe the messenger, you won’t believe the message” (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 38). Underlying the proposition of honesty in leadership is the congruence between personal values and outward experiences. Put simply, good leaders, according to Kouzes and Posner ‘do what they say, and say what they do.’ In order to match actions with words, however, leaders must have a clear understanding of his/her own personal values and have an understanding of how these values align with the values of the people in the organizations that they lead. It is this alignment between the values of the leader and those that make up the leadership practice known as “model the way.” Once these values have been clarified, exemplary leaders set the example for those around them by living the vision and values of the organization. To live a vision, it is necessary to allocate time and attention to the values that have been espoused by the leader and organization as important. For example, a school district that has identified student learning in the area of reading as the top priority for the current school year, then makes certain that a good portion of the work that is done in the district during that school year is focused on improving reading. If a school leader put the reading goal in the district’s strategic plan and then never provided professional development to teachers, rarely spoke about it in public, or failed to allocate time for the analysis of reading scores, then it would be challenging for others to see the importance of improving student learning in the area of reading. Similarly, a superintendent who discusses his or her collaborative nature and a preference for collective bargaining that brings all parties together, but who engages only in positional bargaining might not be able to demonstrate congruence between his or her

actions and their beliefs.

In Chapter I, the leadership of Barack Obama was cited as an example of the leadership practice known as “Inspire a Shared Vision.” This practice capitalizes on the understanding that good leaders have an internal compass that drives them and, in turn, drives the organization that they lead. Superintendents who help to create a strategic plan for their district are helping to “inspire a shared vision” of the future of the organization by imagining what the organization could become and then enlisting the help of those around them to ensure that the vision becomes a reality. However, Kouzes and Posner (2012) noted their belief that creating a vision is a process rather than an action. The process begins with the leader reflecting on the past and, in this situation, helping the organization to reflect on the past through exercises that are designed to remind people about the core values of the organization and how they have come to the present. Then, through these core values, the leader helps the organization to “take stock” of what is going on around them so that they understand what is working and what needs to change in order for the organization to move forward. Finally, the leader helps the organization itself to imagine a bold future. But good leaders don’t just get those around them to hover around a shared vision through this process; it is an internal drive or passion that others see in a leader that allows the leader to talk about a vision for the future and have others instantly want to follow. Imagining a future is important for a superintendent (or the chief executive officer) more so than in other positions within the school organization according to Kouzes and Posner.

Leaders need to spend considerable time reading, thinking, and talking about the long-term view, not only for their specific organization, but for the environments

in which they operate. This imperative intensifies with the leader's scope and level of responsibility. When a leader's role is strategic (as it is for a CEO or president), the time orientation is longer term and more future oriented than it is for the leader whose role is more tactical in nature. (p. 110)

Inherent in this imperative espoused by Kouzes and Posner is the understanding that leadership in organizations is found at all levels and not just at the upper echelons. It is this understanding that recognizes the importance of one word in this leadership practice: *shared*. Visions are shared when they have been imagined by a group of people who have set out for a common purpose and, according to Kouzes and Posner, "the key task for leaders is inspiring a *shared* vision, not selling their own idiosyncratic view of the world" (p. 115). In doing so, Kouzes and Posner posit that good leaders "listen deeply to others," and "make it a cause for commitment" (p. 119). Through the lens of collective bargaining, it is foreseeable that a superintendent who "inspires a shared vision" might seek to engage with a teachers' union using Interest-Based Bargaining since it is a method that embraces a "win-win" philosophy and runs counter to the strategies used in win-lose bargaining. A teachers' union that has developed a shared vision with their superintendent would be hard-pressed to engage in positional bargaining since they have a shared understanding of what is important in the district. A shared vision might also be found in the collective bargaining agreement between a teachers' union and the district given that this would be an ideal place to state openly the unified vision for the district that has been developed by the superintendent and those she or he supervises.

The third practice of exemplary leaders is known as "Challenge the Process." In their research for *The Leadership Challenge*, Kouzes and Posner (2012) noted that the stories about leadership almost always came from difficult or challenging experiences.

That is to say that exemplary leadership practices are demonstrated when the proverbial waters are rough. Regardless of these challenging situations, good leaders demonstrated an openness to change and new ideas and were consistently searching for opportunities that could be seized to help the organization to change and move forward. According to Kouzes and Posner, “innovation and leadership are nearly synonymous. This means that your focus is less on the routine operations and more on the untested and untried” (p. 182). The authors then remind the reader of the fact that the best leaders are often looking outside of the organization for breakthroughs and exemplary practices. In an effort to help others to “challenge the process” the authors remind people to “do something each day that makes you better” and to “actively and openly reflect on the current situation with a critical eye rather than a calm sense of complacency” (p. 183). Indeed, leaders who challenge the process in the school setting are consistently looking around for other models that might help the organization to improve and actively ask the question “why do we do it this way rather than another way.” They are risk-takers who demonstrate a mindset of growth and possibility rather than one of stability and stagnation. For collective bargaining, those superintendents with a dominant leadership practice of “challenge the process” might engage in Interest-Based Bargaining, as it is a practice that is considered new and different. The school district might have suffered through several contentious negotiations in the past and therefore were looking for a “better” way to bargain that might be more productive and less contentious. Superintendents who demonstrate this leadership practice most effectively might ask, “Why do we bargain using this style” rather than using another method or approach.

Leaders who “enable others to act” foster collaboration by building trusting relationships and strengthen those around them in the process of doing so (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). A good leader understands that she or he can’t do all of the work and that, even if they could do all of the work, there is nothing extraordinary that happens when one person does something. Indeed, extraordinary things happen when a group of like-minded individuals come together toward a common purpose and goal. In schools, the goal is often focused on ensuring that every child gets over the proverbial “bar.” To help every child reach their highest potential, leaders invest in the creation of trustworthy and integrative relationships focused on the greater team (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). To create a culture of collaboration, good leaders create a climate of trust. Put simply, “we’ can’t happen without trust. It’s the central issue in human relationships and, without trust, you cannot lead. Without trust you can’t get people to believe in you or in each other” (p. 219). In the situation of collective bargaining, trust between the teachers’ association and the leaders of an organization, seems to produce outcomes where people are happier with the outcomes and decisions and are often more open with their feelings than their counterparts who do not trust. Kouzes and Posner discussed these dynamics in their book:

In a classic research experiment, for example, several groups of business executives in a role-playing exercise were given identical factual information about a difficult manufacturing-marketing policy decision and then asked as a group to solve a problem related to that information. Half of the groups were briefed to expect trust-worthy behavior (“You have learned from your past experiences that you can trust the other members of top management and can openly express feelings and differences with them”); the other half to expect untrustworthy behavior. After thirty minutes of discussion, all team members

completed a brief questionnaire about their experiences. Those who'd been told that their role-playing colleagues could be trusted reported their discussion and decisions to be significantly more positive than did the members of the low-trust group on every factor measured. The members of the high-trust group were more open about feelings, experienced greater clarity about the group's basic problems and goals, and searched more for alternative courses of action. They also reported greater levels of mutual influence on outcomes, satisfaction with the meeting, motivation to implement decisions, and closeness to the management team as a result of the meeting. (p. 220).

It is clear, therefore, that trust is a key factor in the enabling of others to action and in order to create a climate of trust, Kouzes and Posner (2012) note that it is important for the leader to be the first to trust others, show concern for others in the organization, and continually share knowledge and information openly and respectfully. Doing so will help to facilitate relationships which are based on honesty. Further, in the development of relationships, it is noted that exemplary leaders help a group to develop cooperative goals and roles. The authors note, "common purpose binds people into cooperative efforts" (p. 230). In reviewing this literature, with respect to collective bargaining, it is possible that this common purpose is linked to the "interests" of the school district and that the exemplary leader is the leader that is able to tap into these common interests and purposes using relationships built on trust that allows the organization to become great and a leader to demonstrate excellence.

Finally, the leadership practice known as "encourage the heart" is underscored by the essentials of recognizing the contributions of others by showing appreciation for individual excellence and celebrating the values and victories by creating a spirit of community (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). In order to recognize the contributions of others,

Kouzes and Posner note that it is important for the leader to “expect the best” from those around them and then “personally recognize” the outstanding achievements of the people in the organization. When we expect the best from those around us, we help them to set goals with the belief and total faith that the person will be able to achieve those goals. As the person works toward the achievement of these goals, the exemplary leader gives active feedback to the person to ensure that they are able to moderate their course and change directions when needed. Implicit in this feedback is the belief that everyone makes mistakes and it is through these mistakes that people learn, grow, and change. In short, “without feedback, there is no learning – it’s the only way for you to know whether or not you’re getting close to your goal and whether or not you’re executing properly” (p. 284). But giving feedback and expecting the best is not the only thing that makes an organization move forward, it is the fact that good leaders consistently and clearly recognize the accomplishments and victories of the individuals and team members. To do this, Kouzes and Posner task the leader with “getting close to people” so that they can understand how they like to be recognized and then to be “creative about incentives” when necessary. However, the power of a simple “thank you” can’t ever be underestimated in the leaders’ ongoing quest to create “esprit de corps” in their organization. In the school districts that have superintendents who are masters at “encouraging the heart,” it is possible that these superintendents might engage in collective bargaining using an Interest-Based Bargaining approach since it allows the leader and those around him or her to identify the key “interests” of those in the organization and recognize these interests as being key to the organization through

inclusion in the collective bargaining process.

As noted in Chapter I, measuring these behaviors using the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* tool is a valid and reliable method according to the publishers of the tool. In 1993, Kouzes and Posner reviewed the instrument that had been created in 1988 using qualitative and quantitative research methods. The authors of the study performed several statistical analyses of the data with 5,298 respondents from a variety of fields who completed the LPI – Self. Internal reliability of the instrument was found to be above the .75 level for all five sub-scales described. Here, a score closer to the .99 level would demonstrate the most consistency in the items (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). The tool is reliable across both genders and the many employment categories (i.e., business, education, health, etc.) of those that were included in the study. Since this second study was completed in the early 1990's, the authors report the strong reliability of the tool on their website and note the use of it in several hundred research studies including several in the fields of business (Avena, 2005; Espe, 2007; Greenlee, 2002), government (Green, 2012; Harvey, 2004), health care (Craffey, 2006; Foor, 2004), and religion (Kouzes & Posner, 2013). The participant's workbook for the LPI-Self notes that the tool has high face validity and predictive validity (Kouzes & Posner, 2013). Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) define face validity as "the extent to which a test is subjectively viewed as covering the concept it purports to measure" and predictive validity as "the extent to which a score on a scale or test predicts scores on some criterion measure" (p. 143). Several studies (Kouzes & Posner, 1988; Fields & Herold, 1997; Pugh et al., 2004) have noted the strong validity of the instrument.

Summary

After reviewing the research questions, a comprehensive review of collective bargaining in the State of Illinois found a long history of challenges between unions and management including “collective begging” by teachers to their boards of education and Illinois’ failure to include teachers in the public sector collective bargaining agreements law that was passed in 1967. With these understandings, it was possible to review the relevant literature on superintendent’s and their leadership practices. Indeed, many other studies have attempted to review the work of superintendent’s, though none of them directly investigate the role of leadership practices on collective bargaining procedures and processes. Next, a review of the research on collective bargaining identified multiple different types of bargaining in the public sector and it is this section that will allow the researcher to understand the collective bargaining procedures used in school districts with a critical eye. Finally, a review of the conceptual framework identified the five leadership practices posited by Kouzes and Posner and provided several examples of each of these practices as they relate to schools and other organizations. These practices have been measured using the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (LPI), which has been found to be a consistently reliable method for measuring the dominant leadership practices of leaders in organizations. Given these understandings, it is necessary to clearly identify the scope of the research that was undertaken.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

After a review of the relevant literature surrounding superintendent leadership, the leadership practices noted by authors Kouzes and Posner, and the potential intersection between these topics, an in-depth study using a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design was proposed to address several research questions. Specifically, the researcher sought to answer the following questions:

1. What dominant leadership practices by superintendents, if any, as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) are reflected in school districts that utilize Interest-Based Bargaining?
2. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) manifested in the collective bargaining process and procedures within each of their school districts, if at all?
3. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) evident within the language of the collective bargaining agreements negotiated by each of the superintendents, if at all?

Prior to answering these questions, however, a road map for the research was necessary so that the researcher could minimize any bias or ethical challenges associated with the study while maximizing the possibility of successful research outcomes.

Null Hypotheses

This study also explored several null hypotheses. After first defining the hypothesis as a “prediction of what you expect to happen in a research study,” Trochim (2006) then defined the null hypothesis as “the remaining possible outcomes” for a research study. Within the current context, the null hypotheses subsequently listed were expected, though they were examined as a result of the research.

- 1) What dominant leadership practices by superintendents, as defined by Kouzes and Posner’s *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) are reflected in school districts that utilize Interest-Based Bargaining?
 - 1a. There are no leadership practices which are dominant reflected in the school districts that are being studied.
 - 1b. There are no leadership practices reflected in the superintendents in districts that utilize Interest-Based Bargaining.
- 2) How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner’s *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) manifested in the collective bargaining process and procedures within each of their school districts?
 - 2a. The leadership practices of school superintendents are not manifested in the collective bargaining process within each school district.

2b. The leadership practices of the school superintendents are not related to the procedures used in negotiating a new contract.

3) How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) evident within the language of the collective bargaining agreement negotiated by the superintendent?

3a. The leadership style of school leaders associated with bargaining of the contract is not reflected in the language adopted within the new agreement.

3b. There is no qualitative data to suggest that the superintendent's leadership style influenced any language in the collective bargaining agreement that was adopted.

Methodology

It would be nearly impossible to answer the aforementioned research questions using only a quantitative research design or only a qualitative research design. In certain situations, a combination of the two methodologies is necessary and it is this mixed method research design that was used. Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, and Turner (2007) provided a succinct definition of the mixed method research design as “a type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combined elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e.g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration” (p. 123). However, the use of a mixed method

approach is not simply the gathering of quantitative data in one silo while simultaneously gathering qualitative data to be kept in another silo. Creswell and Plano Clark (2007) posited that mixed method approaches “involves the use of both approaches in tandem so that the overall strength of a study is greater than either qualitative or quantitative research.” When a quantitative measure is completed first, followed by a qualitative measure the analysis of which is based upon the quantitative measures, this is called a sequential explanatory design (Creswell, 2009). It is the mixed methods approach using a sequential explanatory design that was used for the current study.

In the simplest terms, a quantitative research design emphasizes a relationship that might exist between two variables, an independent variable and a dependent variable, as explained by empirical data. Often used to identify the causality between two variables, quantitative research has been used by researchers in the field of education for the fact that it allows the researcher to analyze and quantify large amounts of data. Further, it has been used as the mainstay of medically based research methods as it allows for significantly decreased levels of bias and subjectivity. The researcher chooses the variables to be studied, gathers the data using tools selected to minimize error, and then analyzes the data to determine what relationships, if any, might exist between the variables (Creswell, 2009). However, this sort of research has often been criticized in the field of education for the fact that it does not provide a complete picture of complex subjects.

Conversely, qualitative research is a process whereby researchers begin to understand “how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and

what meaning they attribute to their experiences (Merriam, 2009, p. 23). The qualitative researcher emphasizes the importance of collecting data from people who work in the field and who are actually involved in the process or phenomena being studied. Data is often gathered and then coded into themes based on the researcher's interpretation of the data. This form of research places an extreme emphasis on the complexity of the research subject. That is, a qualitative research design inherently understands that certain variables are too complex to be studied using an external instrument while attempting to isolate variables. A more complete picture of qualitative research emerged from Denzin and Lincoln (2005) who noted,

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. (p. 3)

A mixed method understands and attempts to eliminate or minimize the potential biases associated with one form of research over another. To do this, scholars who emphasize the use of mixed methods have offered three distinct procedures for using this methodology in research. Sequential mixed methods involves the gathering of one type of data (quantitative or qualitative) that is analyzed and then the results of that data analysis are used to expand the research (or narrow it) using the alternative method. For example, researchers have often gathered a large amount of quantitative data and then, once that data has been analyzed a specific subset of the data will be targeted for further review using qualitative research methods. When a researcher starts with a broad topic in order to gain a further understanding of some of the variables that might be contained

within that topic, this is called a “sequential exploratory” approach (Creswell, 2009).

Alternatively, when a researcher begins with a narrow topic that is studied and expands that topic only after gathering the data on that narrow topic, this is called a “sequential explanatory” approach (Creswell, 2009). Another type of mixed method, the concurrent mixed method, involves the gathering of two types of data, quantitative and qualitative, only this data is gathered at the same time and the two data sets are combined to provide a more thorough understanding of the research subjects. Finally, a Transformative mixed method is utilized in situations where the researcher has already constructed themes that are then used as a lens for the simultaneous examination of qualitative and quantitative data (Creswell, 2009).

In the current context, the priority for gathering data was given to the quantitative data since it provided the sample group for the next phase of the study. Working from a qualitative perspective and conducting the interviews first might have allowed the researcher to hypothesize about the leadership practices of the superintendents, but would not have been necessary unless a causal relationship was being suggested.

Data Collection

Given the complexity of this research and the multiple phases, it is helpful to review each step in the process and what information was gained:




Figure 2. Overview of the Data Collection Process

Phase One: Administration of Demographic Profile to Superintendents

In the current context, the researcher used a mixed method design using a sequential explanatory approach in several phases. In the first phase, the researcher submitted a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request to the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE) requesting the names and contact information of all superintendents in the State of Illinois. Though this information was publicly available, a FOIA request ensured that the researcher did not accidentally exclude a potential member of the research group. The FOIA request that was sent to ISBE is attached as Appendix A. Once the contact information for the superintendents had been obtained, the researcher sought a

commitment from the superintendents to complete a demographic profile and *The Leadership Practices Inventory - Self Assessment* (2013), colloquially known as the LPI using a letter of commitment sent via the United States Postal Service. In order to use the LPI in the study, the researcher sought and obtained permission from the publishers of the instrument. The request for consent form that was submitted to the publisher is attached as Appendix B and the letter of consent that the publishing company sent back to the researcher is attached as Appendix C. With this approval, a packet containing the letter of commitment to the study (see Appendix D), the Superintendent's Demographic Profile (see Appendix E), the Informed Consent Agreement (see Appendix F) and the Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment (see Appendix G) was sent to each of the superintendents in the State of Illinois. A reminder letter that was sent to the superintendents after two weeks, three weeks, and one month, are included as Appendices H, I, and J. The purpose of this phase of the research was for the researcher to identify the leadership practices in use by superintendents in the sample group.

The *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (LPI) was used to answer the first research question and as a theoretical framework for examining leadership in superintendents of schools. During the past 30 years, the authors of the LPI have conducted research in a broad spectrum of industries on nearly every continent in the world with a belief that leadership is a behavior and that leadership can be refined, reformed, and reframed for the purpose of leading organizations and groups (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Consisting of 30 questions that correspond to the five leadership practices: (1) Model the Way; (2) Inspire a Shared Vision; (3) Challenge the Process; (4)

Enable Others to Act; and (5) Encourage the Heart, the LPI has become one of the most “widely used tools to inventory the practices of leaders in their setting” (Kouzes & Posner, 2013). Questions 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26 align with the first practice. Similarly, questions 2, 7, 12, 22, and 27 align with the second practice. This pattern continues for all five practices. While the tools written by Kouzes and Posner allow for a 360 degree evaluation of a leader from the perspectives of subordinates, colleagues, self, and supervisors, given the fact that this research study is focused only on the leadership practices of superintendents as perceived by superintendents, only the “Self” version of the LPI was utilized in this study. This tool yielded quantitative data to identify the dominant practices of school superintendents in the study group. The superintendent’s demographic profile asked questions related to the size and location of the school district while soliciting information about the type of collective bargaining that was completed in the most recent negotiations with their teachers’ union. When combining the data from these two pieces of information (the LPI and the superintendent’s demographic profile), it was possible to both identify the leadership practices of superintendent’s in Illinois as measured by Kouzes and Posner while simultaneously identifying school districts that have engaged in Interest-Based Bargaining.

Once the researcher had received the packet of materials from as many of the superintendents as possible, the researcher scored the LPI of all of the respondents and the inventories of superintendents who indicated that they were willing to participate in phase two of the study was sorted into five different categories, one for each of the practices identified in the work of Kouzes and Posner. If the five leadership practices

were not evident in the responses from the study participants, then only four leadership practices would have been used for sorting. If needed, this process of narrowing down the leadership practices of the study participants would have continued until the minimum number of leadership practices identified in the study participants is two so that there is some basis for comparison. However, in designing this study, the researcher attempted to minimize the chances of this “narrowing” as much as possible. While a much smaller and focused sample of school superintendents in several counties within a geographic region could have been proposed, the sample group was expanded to minimize the potential for a sample group that is not reflective of the five leadership practices defined by Kouzes and Posner. While expanding the number of superintendents surveyed did not eliminate the potential for receiving an inadequate sampling of the five leadership practices, it did minimize the potential for this occurring. Once this portion had been completed, then phase two commenced.

Phase Two: Qualitative Interviews with Superintendents

Once the leadership practices had been identified, then a representative superintendent from each of the five practices was identified for participation in phase two of the study. To identify the superintendents for phase two of the study, the researcher performed a profile analysis of the data that was obtained from the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013). In performing the profile analysis, several areas were reviewed including the profile dispersion and shape when plotted onto a graph. Ding (2001) notes that profile dispersion is a value of how much each score in the profile deviates from the mean where the profiles are the plotted scores of each of the

leadership practice scores obtained in the superintendent's LPI. Profile shape is defined as the "ups" and "downs" in the profile and can be determined by the rank-order of scores on the LPI. The researcher examined this data to find the superintendents that use Interest-Based Bargaining and who had the strongest profiles.

In phase two, the researcher conducted a semi-structured, in-depth interview with each of the research subjects. DeMarrais (as cited in Merriam, 2009) defined an interview as “a process in which a researcher and participant engage in a conversation focused on questions related to a research study” (p. 87). Merriam (2009) notes that a semi-structured interview is the type of interview where “all of the questions are worded flexibly” and that there is a mix of some “structured” and some “free-style” questions (p. 88). This sort of interview is often used in situations where the researcher is seeking information on a certain topic or to better understand an issue and, while all of the questions are asked of all of the participants, there is room for follow-up in these questions allowing for a more free-flowing conversation about the chosen topic. To solicit the participation of superintendent's for Phase II, the researcher contacted some superintendent's via phone and others via e-mail. The scripts for the phone and e-mail contacts are attached as appendixes L and M respectively. Using a semi-structured interview protocol, the researcher engaged in a conversation with the superintendents to determine their viewpoint of how their own leadership style influenced the process of bargaining a contract in their district. These interviews were recorded using a digital media recorder and, concurrently, the researcher took notes to assist in recalling key details of the interview at a later time. The protocol for the interviews with the

superintendents can be found in Appendix M.

Once these interviews were completed, they were transcribed (confidentiality agreement can be found in Appendix N) and underwent a process of review by the superintendent to ensure that the comments that the superintendent made were accurately reflected in the transcripts. Concurrently, the researcher examined and coded the collective bargaining agreements that were the products of the bargaining that the superintendent subjects discussed. While some superintendents might be reluctant to discuss their successes in working with the teachers' union in their respective district, the collective bargaining agreement holds data that is not "tainted" by the interaction of the superintendent and researcher. This thorough analysis of the leadership traits of the superintendent in the qualitative context of the interview and collective bargaining agreements provides a thorough picture of the relationships that exist between these variables.




Figure 3. Overview of the process used in the completion of this research

Procedures for Data Analysis

Once this phase of the research was completed, then the researcher analyzed the data using *IBM SPSS Statistics*. After analyzing these data, the collective bargaining agreements that were negotiated by each of the superintendents who were interviewed in phase two was reviewed and coded based on the five practices in the LPI. To do this, the five leadership practices were reviewed using the LPI and the book, *The Leadership Challenge*, for key words associated with each of the leadership practices. For example, an initial review of the practice known as “Model the way” revealed several key terms

including the words example, principles, standards, commitment, feedback, common-values, and philosophy. These words were sought in each of the collective bargaining agreements to determine the number of times that these words appear in the agreement. Once this had occurred, then the transcripts of the interviews were coded for themes based on the five practices in the LPI. Richards (2005) described analytical coding as coding that goes beyond descriptive coding and that comes with “interpretation and reflection on meaning” (p. 94). To code the data, the researcher assigned each practice a color and manually “highlighted” words and phrases that were identified as being associated with a leadership practice. The results of these steps were then analyzed to identify any themes that might have emerged between superintendents and their leadership practices. The hypothesis that superintendents who utilize Interest-Based Bargaining are more likely to demonstrate the leadership practice of “enabling others to act” as a dominant leadership practice was then able to be reviewed.

Limitations of the Methodology

Examining the limitations of mixed-methodologies requires an examination of the methodologies that are “mixed.” While researchers attempt to minimize the limitations of qualitative methodologies through the employment of quantitative methodologies, the combination of the two research paradigms continues to present several limitations in the research of theories in the field of education. While qualitative research has been criticized for its time intensive approaches, mixed-methods research expands on the time that is needed for the researchers to complete the study (Greene, Caracelli & Graham, 1989). Further, while studies which use one methodology require the researcher to

become acquainted with one research paradigm, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004) noted that an inherent challenge in the use of mixed-methodologies is the fact that the researcher must be thoroughly acquainted with both several research methodologies and be able to justify their use in the exact ways that they are being utilized in the study. As noted earlier, quantitative research has been criticized for the fact that the questions that can be answered by the research are limited to that which can be quantified. In the current situation, use of a quantitative research design would have been appropriate if the researcher were attempting to quantify the numbers of superintendents who utilize the leadership practices and analyze these data based on race, class, gender, geographic region, and years of experience. However, this was not the focus of the study and so the researcher added qualitative methods to ensure a richer understanding of the leadership practices and their influence on collective bargaining in the State of Illinois. Nonetheless, Carter and Hurtado (2007) posited “using a mixed-method research design can help us achieve goals for generalizability and context specificity, allowing us to assume a more critical eye toward the limitations of what we can know for each technique” (p. 34).

Ethical Considerations and Bias Minimization

It is possible that, as the documents were analyzed and the data from the interviews were coded, that the researcher could have misinterpreted information that had been gathered. To account for this possibility, as these data were being analyzed, the researcher allowed for the possibility of verifying information and theories with each of the superintendents who participated in the interviews. This process, known in research

circles as “member-checks” or “response validation” is the process of soliciting feedback from some of the participants on the emerging findings of the research (Merriam, 2009). Additionally, the researcher kept a private journal to record initial thoughts and feelings after completing the interviews. The journals were a method for discussing any potential biases that the researcher might have developed as the process of interviewing superintendents got underway. This journal also helped in minimizing the biases associated with the researchers own dominant leadership practice, “challenge the process,” as this could have been the source of potential questions about the validity of the research findings.

Summary

Using a mixed methods sequential explanatory approach, the researcher attempted to answer the aforementioned research questions. Specifically, the researcher administered the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) written by Kouzes and Posner to the superintendents in school districts that serve students in grades kindergarten through 12 in the State of Illinois. Simultaneously, the participants were asked to complete a demographic profile about their district and invited to participate in an interview with the researcher. The participants were then sorted into five different groups based on the leadership practices in the inventory. If five groups had not emerged, then only four groups would have been used with a minimum of two practices being included in the study. Once the practice groups had been identified, then interviews with the superintendents were arranged and a semi-structured process of gathering data surrounding the leadership practices of the superintendent as they relate to

the collective bargaining process and outcomes was undertaken. These data were transcribed, coded using language from the *Leadership Practices Inventory*, and verified while the researcher coded the collective bargaining agreements of the districts where the superintendents are employed. In coding the data using the *Leadership Practices Inventory*, key words from each of the leadership practices were identified and then these same words were identified in the collective bargaining agreements and the transcripts of the interviews. This comprehensive process of quantifying the leadership practices in superintendents followed by a semi-structured interview and document analysis may have identified conclusions for the researcher based on the initial research questions.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

This purpose of this study was to examine the impact of superintendent leadership practices on collective bargaining practices, procedures, and outcomes. The dominant leadership practices of superintendents in the State of Illinois were identified through the completion of the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) written by Kouzes and Posner. Demographic information about the superintendents including the type of bargaining that they used in their most recent negotiations with their teachers' union was gathered simultaneously. Once this phase of data collection had been completed, five superintendents, one representing each of the practices identified by Kouzes and Posner (2013) were interviewed about their experiences with collective bargaining, their leadership practices, and how their leadership might have impacted the process of negotiating the contract with their respective teachers' union. Finally, the products of the most recent contract negotiations between the superintendents interviewed and their respective teachers' union, the collective bargaining agreement, were coded and analyzed for the themes found in *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

Review of Research Questions

This study added to the literature on collective bargaining experiences and the research on leadership practices of superintendents through an examination of the following research questions:

1. What dominant leadership practices by superintendents, if any, as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) are reflected in school districts that utilize Interest-Based Bargaining?
2. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) manifested in the collective bargaining process and procedures within each of their school districts, if at all?
3. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) evident within the language of the collective bargaining agreements negotiated by each of the superintendents, if at all?

Mixed Methods Research

This study used a sequential-explanatory mixed-method research design in two phases. The sequence of the study is depicted in Figure 3 in Chapter III. After gaining access to a complete list of superintendents in the State of Illinois through the use of a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, the list was reviewed. In an effort to minimize bias, the names of four superintendents were removed since the researcher had either worked in or had significant interactions with the superintendents in these districts.

Additionally, the researcher removed the names of any superintendents who appeared on the list more than once. In Illinois, several districts have shared services and a superintendent of schools might oversee several school districts. Finally, the name of the Chief Executive Officer of the Chicago Public Schools was removed prior to entering Phase One of the research since the State of Illinois has allowed for several alterations to the laws governing collective bargaining and the educational experiences necessary to be a superintendent in the City of Chicago.

During the first phase of the research study, quantitative data was collected from superintendents in the State of Illinois using a demographic profile that asked questions about the background educational experiences of superintendents, the years of experience as a superintendent, whether the superintendent was involved in the last negotiations with the teachers' union, and what type of bargaining was used to negotiate the contract. In addition to the demographic profile, respondents were asked to complete Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013), a 30-question instrument that identifies the dominant leadership practice or practices. The purpose of the first phase of the research was to stratify participants into several groups. First, the participants were stratified into two groups – those who were involved in the last negotiation with the teachers' union in their district and those who were not involved. Participants who were involved in the most recent negotiations with their teachers' union were then asked to classify the negotiations into one of three categories: interest-based bargaining, win-lose bargaining, or unknown. In this question, the researcher was specifically focusing on those superintendents that utilized interest-based bargaining.

Finally, superintendents that utilized interest-based bargaining in their most recent negotiations with the teachers' union were classified based on their dominant leadership practice or practices.

For phase two of the research, the researcher used a semi-structured interview format to discuss how the leadership practices of the superintendent impacted the process of collective bargaining. For this phase, one superintendent from each of the five leadership practices were identified and contacted for an in-person interview. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, reviewed by the superintendents for accuracy, and coded for themes based on each of the leadership practices. Finally, the products of the negotiations, the collective bargaining agreements, from each of the superintendents respective districts were coded for themes based on each of the leadership practices.

Phase I – Quantitative Data Collection

The Illinois State Board of Education responded to a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for a list of every superintendent in the State of Illinois. When the researcher received the list, it also included the names of every person who served as a principal and these names were then removed from the target list. Eight hundred sixty-five superintendents were then left on the list and 15 of the remaining names were removed because they were superintendents with whom the researcher had worked or had significant interactions, served as the Chief Executive Officer of the Chicago Public Schools, or served as the superintendent in more than one district. A total of 850 superintendents were sent a packet that included a letter of introduction, a demographic

profile, a copy of the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013), and a letter of consent.

Respondents

The researcher received a total of 255 responses to the first mailing representing a response rate of 30%. However, of the 255 responses that were received, only 212 of the respondents were actually included in this study because some respondents did not complete the consent form ($n = 12$), while others failed to complete the Leadership Practices Inventory Self-Assessment ($n = 2$). Another group of superintendents indicated that they did not want to participate in the study ($n = 29$). Of the 102 counties in Illinois, responses were received from superintendents in 72 of these counties. Not surprisingly given the high population, approximately 16% of the respondents were from Cook County.

Table 3

Superintendent Responses

Target Group	Responses	Cumulative Response Rate
All superintendents	255	30%
Declined to participate	29	
Did not complete LPI	2	
Did not give consent	12	
Superintendents included in study ($N=$)	212	24.9%

Table 4

Superintendents Included in Study by County

County	# Of Respondents Included in Study	# Of Superintendents Asked to Participate	Percentage of Superintendents included in Study
Adams	1	5	20.0%
Bureau	3	12	25.0%
Carroll	1	3	33.3%
Cass	1	3	33.3%
Champaign	4	14	28.9%
Christian	1	5	20.0%
Clay	1	3	33.3%
Cook	35	145	24.1%
Crawford	1	4	25%
Cumberland	1	2	50%
Dekalb	4	8	50%
Dewitt	1	2	50%
Dupage	11	42	26.1%
Effingham	1	5	20.0%
Franklin	3	9	33.3%
Fayette	1	4	25.0%
Fulton	2	6	33.3%
Greene	3	3	100%
Grundy	3	11	27.3%
Hancock	3	7	42.9%
Henry	3	10	30.0%
Iroquois	3	7	42.9%
Jackson	2	8	25.0%
Jasper	1	1	100%
Jefferson	4	15	26.7%
Jersey	1	1	100%
Jo Daviess	2	6	33.3%
Johnson	2	6	33.3%
Kane	2	9	22.2%
Kankakee	4	11	36.4%
Kendall	2	6	33.3%
Knox	1	5	20.0%
La Salle	6	25	24.0%

Lake	9	41	22.0%
Lawrence	2	2	100%
Lee	1	5	20.0%
Livingston	2	11	18.2%
Logan	3	7	42.9%
Macon	1	7	14.3%
Macoupin	2	8	25.0%
Madison	3	13	23.1%
Marion	3	13	23.1%
Mason	2	3	66.6%
McHenry	5	17	29.4%
McLean	3	8	37.5%
Menard	1	3	33.3%
Monroe	1	3	33.3%
Montgomery	1	4	25.0%
Morgan	2	5	40.0%
Ogle	4	10	40.0%
Peoria	6	18	33.3%
Piatt	1	5	20.0%
Randolph	2	7	28.6%
Richland	1	2	50.0%
Rock Island	2	10	20.0%
Saint Clair	6	27	22.2%
Saline	1	4	25.0%
Sangamon	2	10	20.0%
Shelby	1	5	20.0%
Stephenson	1	5	20.0%
Tazewell	5	18	27.8%
Union	2	7	28.9%
Vermillion	3	12	25.0%
Warren	1	2	50.0%
Washington	3	7	42.9%
Wayne	4	7	57.1%
Will	7	29	24.1%
Williamson	1	5	20.0%
Winnebago	3	11	27.3%
Woodford	2	9	22.2%

Demographics

The respondents were a diverse group of participants with approximately 30% of the respondents identifying as females and 70% of respondents identifying as males. There was a 40-year range in the ages of superintendents with the youngest superintendent being 31 years old and the oldest superintendent included in the study being 72. The mean age of superintendents who responded was 49.7 years. The superintendents represented a wide variety of experience in their current district with at least one superintendent on the current job for a little over a month at the time that he responded to the survey to the most experienced superintendent indicating that they had served their current district for 22 years. The average experience noted by respondents within their current district was 5.13 years. Given the expansive ranges of experiences, it is important to note that the median tenure for superintendents included in the study was four years.

Table 5

Gender of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Female	59	27.8%
Male	153	72.2%
Total (N=)	212	100%

Table 6

Age of Respondents

Age Range	Frequency	Overall Percentage
31	1	0.5%
35 - 40	26	12.4%
41 - 45	37	17.5%
46 - 50	56	26.4%
51 – 55	35	16.5%
56 – 60	32	15.1%
61 – 65	18	8.5%
66 - 70	4	1.9%
71	1	0.5%
No Response	2	0.9%
Total (<i>N</i> =)	212	100%

Table 7

Years of Experience in Current District

Years	Frequency	Percentage
0 years - .99 years	14	6.6%
1 year – 1.99 years	19	9.0%
2 years – 2.99 years	32	15.1%
3 years – 3.99 years	23	10.8%
4 years – 4.99 years	19	9.0%
5 years – 5.99 years	17	8.0%
6 years – 7.99 years	37	17.4%
8 years – 9.99 years	21	9.9%
10 years – 11.99 years	16	7.6%
12 years – 14.99 years	11	5.2%
15 or more years	2	0.9%
No response	1	0.5%
Total (N=)	212	100%




Figure 4. Years of Experience in Current School District

Bargaining Experience

When looking at the respondents to further stratify these data, the researcher asked the participants to indicate if they had been involved in the negotiations of the current contract in place for their teachers' union. Here, it is noted that the respondents did not fall neatly into two groups and instead some superintendents indicated that they were negotiating this year. Eighty-four percent of the respondents had participated in the most recent negotiations with their teachers union even if it was not as the superintendent. For example, several superintendents in their first or second year of employment as a superintendent noted that they had participated as the assistant superintendent or as the lead negotiator for the board of education in their district prior to

moving into their current role. Fourteen percent of those who responded indicated that they had not participated in the most recent negotiations and 2% of the respondents indicated that they were currently negotiating or that they will be negotiating at the end of this school year.




Figure 5. Superintendent's Role in Most Recent Collective Bargaining Experience with Teachers' Union

Next, respondents were asked to indicate the collective bargaining style that was used to negotiate the current contract with the teachers' union. The superintendents were asked to classify the bargaining experience as interest-based, win-lose, or unknown. Again, however, the respondents added a category of "hybrid" or "blended" to the possible response choices. While the researcher had initially expected a low number of school superintendents to indicate that they had used interest-based bargaining, this was actually the largest group of respondents. In total, approximately 44% of the respondents

indicated that they used interest-based bargaining and approximately 32% of the respondents indicated that they used a win-lose approach. However, given that the purpose of this phase of data collection was to stratify respondents, it was important to analyze a certain subset of the group of respondents – those who indicated that they were involved in the most recent negotiations. When this subset of the respondents were analyzed, it is noted that 47.8% of the respondents indicated that they participated in the most recent bargaining and that they had used interest-bargaining procedures, 6.2% of the subgroup indicated that they had used a hybrid of the two techniques, 35% of the subgroup had used win-lose procedures and the remainder of the participants (10.7%) indicating that they were not sure of the techniques that they had used in negotiating the most recent contract with their teachers' union.

Table 8

Type of Bargaining Utilized – All Respondents

Type of Bargaining	Frequency	Percentage
Interest – Based	93	43.9%
Hybrid / Blended	15	7.1%
Win - Lose	67	31.6%
Unknown	35	16.5%
No Response	2	0.9%
Total (N=)	212	100%




Figure 6. Type of Bargaining Utilized

Table 9

Type of Bargaining Utilized – Those that Participated

Type of Bargaining	Frequency	Percentage
Interest – Based	85	47.8%
Hybrid / Blended	11	6.2%
Win - Lose	63	35.0%
Unknown	19	10.7%
No Response	0	0%
Total (N=)	178	100%




Figure 7. Types of Bargaining Utilized by Superintendents that Negotiated the Contract

Leadership Practices Inventory

In 2002, Kouzes and Posner published a compendium of statistics about the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* including statistics about the mean scores for participants in the study, the identity of the leadership practice that is most prevalent in the populations that have been studied, and a review of the procedures that have been utilized in developing these practices. The authors identified the mean scores for each of the practices for all participants that have been studied ($n = > 100,000$) along with the distribution of practices in the targeted populations. Kouzes and Posner have found that “Enabling Others to Act” is the leadership practice that is identified most often

in the population followed closely by the practice known as “Model the Way.” The practices of “Challenge the Process” and “Inspire a Shared Vision” are found in approximately the same percentages of the research participants while the practice known as “Encourage the Heart,” is found least in the population. The *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) was administered to the superintendents to determine their dominant leadership practices. The inventory consists of 30 questions and gives information regarding the respondent’s tendency to demonstrate the leadership practices known as “Model the Way,” “Inspire a Shared Vision,” “Challenge the Process,” “Enable Others to Act,” and “Encourage the Heart.” Combining the scores of the superintendents for several questions identified the leadership practices associated with the superintendents. For example, the responses to questions 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, and 26 were combined to give a score for the leadership practice of “Model the Way.” Similarly, the responses to questions 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, and 27 were combined to give a score for the leadership practice of “Inspire a Shared Vision.” It is typical for one of these practices to be dominant, but it is possible for respondents to have more than one dominant practice. For all respondents, the dominant practice that occurred most often was identified as Enable Others to Act (38.2%) followed by participants who had a dominant practice of Model the Way (12.6%). The remaining practices of Encourage the Heart, Challenge the Process, and Inspire a Shared Vision were found to be dominant in 11.8%, 9.4%, and 6.1% of the respondents respectively. This confirms the findings of Kouzes and Posner (2002) in their compendium of research regarding the LPI. Respondents from the overall group who had multiple dominant practices accounted for 20.8% of the population.

When the subgroup of participants who were involved in the most recent contract negotiations and who utilized interest-based bargaining was examined, the results were similarly distributed with 29.4% of the subgroup identified as being dominant in the practice known as “Enable Others to Act,” 14.1% of the participants identified as having a dominant practice of “Model the Way” and 12.9% of the participants identified as having a dominant practice of “Challenge the Process.” The remaining practices of “Encourage the Heart” and “Inspire a Shared Vision” were dominant in 11.8% and 5.9% of the respondents respectively. Slightly more than one-quarter of the subgroup (25.9%) had multiple dominant leadership practices according to the inventory.

Kouzes and Posner (2002) also provide data about the mean scores for each of the practices amongst all of the data that has been gathered during the past thirty years. The mean scores and standard deviation for the Kouzes and Posner compendium of Leadership Practices Inventory published in 2002 is seen in Table 11 next to the same statistics for the overall population of respondents and the population of respondents that utilized interest-based bargaining.

In an analysis of these data (one sample t-test, ANOVA, paired sample t-test) the researcher found no statistical difference between the means of those that participated in Interest-Based Bargaining and the rest of the participants in the study.

Table 10

Dominant Practices Identified

	<i>All participants</i>		<i>Those that used Interest-Based & Participated in Bargaining</i>	
Dominant Practice	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Model the Way	27	12.7%	12	14.1%
Inspire a Shared Vision	13	6.1%	5	5.9%
Challenge the Process	20	9.4%	11	12.9%
Enable Others to Act	81	38.2%	25	29.4%
Encourage the Heart	25	11.8%	10	11.8%
Multiple Dominant – Two or More	38	17.9%	18	21.2%
Multiple Dominant – Three or More	5	2.4%	4	4.7%
Multiple Dominant – Four or More	1	0.5%	0	0.0%
Total (N=)	212	100%	85	100%

Table 11

Means and Standard Deviations of Normative Group, All Superintendents, Superintendents that Utilized Win-Lose Bargaining and Interest-Based Bargaining Subgroup

	Normative Group (Kouzes & Posner Compendium, 2002)		All Superintendents that Responded		Superintendents that Utilized Win- Lose Bargaining		Superintendents in the Interest-Based Bargaining Subgroup	
	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Model the Way	47.0	6.0	49.4	4.86	47.9	7.68	50.0	4.66
Inspire a Shared Vision	40.6	8.8	46.8	7.02	44.5	9.40	48.2	6.32
Challenge the Process	43.9	6.8	46.7	7.04	44.7	9.03	47.7	6.33
Enable Others to Act	48.7	5.4	50.8	4.92	50.0	7.94	51.3	4.65
Encourage the Heart	43.8	8.0	47.1	7.21	44.4	8.97	47.9	6.80




Figure 8. Profile Analysis of Superintendents that Utilized Interest-Based Bargaining, Those that Utilized Win-Lose Bargaining and the Normative Group

For the subgroup of those that utilized interest-based bargaining, the participants were distributed amongst the five practices and a profile analysis was completed to determine which participants would be asked to participate in the second phase of the research study that included a face-to-face interview. Completing the profile analysis allowed the researcher to narrow the field of participants to 63 from 85 as this was the

number of participants that had only one dominant practice. Then, the researcher calculated the total difference between the scores for each of the five practices. For example, the difference for a participant with the following scores is 18 because the highest score is 55:

- Model the Way Score - 52
- Inspire a Shared Vision Score - 49
- Challenge the Process Score - 48
- Enable Others to Act Score - 53
- Encourage the Heart - 55

When 52 are taken away from 55, you have 3. Add that to the difference between the high of 55 and each of the other scores (55-49, 55-48, and 55-53) and the difference is 18. However, just figuring the difference between all of the scores would not be sufficient because a person might have had close scores between two different practices. Given this fact, the researcher then calculated the range of scores. The ranges for the subgroup of the population were between one and seven points. The researcher then started with those with the biggest range of points and identified one who was representative of each of the dominant practices. These respondents, those with a large range of scores between the highest and next highest practice and who also had a wide range of scores indicating an uneven and distributed leadership practices profile, were then contacted and asked to participate in the second phase of the research. These five superintendents then became the sample for the qualitative portion of the study. A visual display of their scores on the leadership practices inventory is seen below:




Figure 8. LPI Scores of Superintendents Chosen for Phase II

Phase II – Qualitative Data Collection

The second phase of the research involved an in-person semi-structured interview with five superintendents – one each from the five different practices outlined in *The Leadership Challenge* (2012). The interviews with the superintendents were recorded and were then transcribed by the researcher. Then, the researcher sent a copy of the transcript to the interview participants to verify that the information had come across accurately and to minimize the potential for error in this phase of the process. Once the

transcripts had been reviewed, the researcher coded the transcripts based on the five leadership practices and completed a similar coding process for the products of the negotiations, the collective bargaining agreements, from each of the districts where the superintendents currently served. In coding the data in this step of the process, key words were identified for each of the leadership practices. A table of the key words appears below:

Table 12

Keywords Used in Coding of Qualitative Data

Leadership Practice	Key Words
Model the Way	Clarify, Example, Model, Principle
Inspire a Shared Vision	Common, Future, Persuade, Shared, Vision
Challenge the Process	Experiment, Innovate, Process, Risk
Enable Others to Act	Collaborate, Relationship, Respect, Trust
Encourage the Heart	Accomplishment, Appreciate, Contribution, Recognize

However, simply searching for each of these words in a transcript would not yield much data. As such, it was necessary to review each transcript and identify elements of each of these practices in the underlying stories or messages that are told by each of the superintendents. Similarly, the collective bargaining agreements were reviewed for underlying themes in each portion of the agreement.

Information about Five Superintendents

The five superintendents that took part in the second phase of the research process represented those leadership practice profiles that were uneven (one practice was dominant, the difference between the highest practice and the second highest practice was greatest, and the range of scores was high) in superintendents who participated in the negotiation of the current contract with the teachers' union, and who utilized interest-based bargaining in the negotiations. The demographic profile of each of the five superintendents is listed in table below:

Table 13

Demographics of Phase II Participants

Dominant Leadership Practice	Gender	Age	Years as Superintendent	Type of District	Highest Degree
Model the Way	Male	59	13 years	9-12	Doctorate in Educational Administration
Inspire a Shared Vision	Female	50	2 years	PK-12	Doctorate in Progress
Challenge the Process	Male	36	8 years	PK-8	Doctorate in Educational Administration
Enable Others to Act	Male	49	10 years	PK-8	Doctorate in Educational Administration/Supervision
Encourage the Heart	Female	41	8 years	PK-8	Doctorate in Educational Administration/Supervision

Phase II of the research focused on the use of a semi-structured interview to elicit conversation about superintendent leadership practices as measured by the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self* and collective bargaining experiences. The researcher was looking at the possibility that one or more of the leadership practices might be imperative in the process of engaging in interest-based bargaining. While the first research question had yielded no such finding, the second and third research questions to be answered would examine the qualitative aspects of collective bargaining and superintendent leadership practices.

Superintendent A – Model the Way

Superintendent A met with the researcher on a cold and rainy day. The sky was filled with clouds and the breath of the researcher could be seen as he walked into the building that seemed to appear out of nowhere after a three hour drive. After being scanned into the building (the front desk checked my driver's license), the researcher was escorted to the office of the superintendent by two students in the twelfth grade. When the students asked the researcher what he was going to see the superintendent about, the researcher noted that he was interested in talking with the superintendent about his leadership practices. The student quickly responded, "Well, Dr. Sampson is a great guy to talk about leadership." As I arrived in the superintendent's office, I noticed that every staff member was wearing the school colors. While it was Friday, a day that is typically associated with "spirit day" at high schools across the country, the fact that every staff member was wearing the school colors stood out to the researcher. When the superintendent was ready to meet with the researcher, the modeling of the school spirit

continued. Standing in the doorway was a tall man wearing a black sport coat and orange pants – the two colors associated with the school district. The researcher commented on the superintendent's pants and noted "those are some bright pants," to which the superintendent responded "I would love it if everyone would wear these color pants on Friday, but I will settle for orange and black shirts." This simple statement provided a subtle context for the interview about leadership and collective bargaining and spoke volumes about the impact that this superintendent has had on his school district during the last ten years.

Superintendent A came to the small school district of 1,700 students close to ten years ago. Prior to serving as superintendent in the current district, Superintendent A served as the superintendent in another district for three years and has also held the positions of assistant superintendent for instruction, principal, assistant principal, and classroom teacher in schools across the central portion of Illinois. At the age of 59, Superintendent B is slightly older than the average superintendent in the State and, in this situation, with age comes experience as his years of experience as a superintendent (13 total) is above the average years of experience for all superintendents that participated in this study. His experiences at the bargaining table and working with members of the teacher's union are extensive and the district will work through the negotiation of its last contract with the superintendent at the helm at the end of this school year. Superintendent A plans to retire at the end of the school year and to say that he is ending his career at a time when the district stands at a crucial crossroad would be an understatement.

Earlier in the year, portions of Superintendent A's school and much of the town that feeds into it were destroyed by a significant natural disaster. A town that was once peaceful and idyllic became tattered and bruised. As many as one-third of the students in Superintendent A's school district lost their homes in the natural disaster and a good portion of the staff employed by the district were impacted as well. While the bulk of the conversation with Superintendent A focused on collective bargaining, another interesting portion was discussed after the semi-structured interview. It is important to note that Superintendent A's handling of the natural disaster speaks to his dominant leadership practices. Specifically, Superintendent A shared the challenges that the district faced in the wake of the disaster. Handling the development of new bus routes, covering teachers that were not able to return to school, and providing training and professional development for a cadre of school counselors who now needed to provide support for children working through issues related to post-traumatic stress were now on the plate of this superintendent. In small towns, schools serve as beacons for the community and Superintendent A took actions shortly after the natural disaster to ensure that his district would continue to serve as a place for kids to come and feel safe. With a town that was ripped from stem to stern and a staff that was not sure of when they would be able to return given the significant damage to their own homes, Superintendent A asked that school resume just three days after the disaster. He was openly criticized and noted that people were "not happy" with him in town, but he knew that reopening the school soon after the disaster was imperative to the health and well being of the students and the town itself. "I knew that I could not rebuild one house or help all of my families to pick

up all of the debris, but I could provide our students with a place to go for seven hours each day where they did not have to think about what or who they lost.” He continued, “I could give all of those students a sense of normalcy where they could see their friends and get back into a schedule.” Reopening the school, Superintendent A recalled, was “the best decision that I have ever made.”

Kouzes and Posner (2012) describe leaders with the dominant practice of “Model the Way” as follows:

Exemplary leaders recognize that if they want to gain commitment and achieve the highest standards, they must model the behaviors they require of others: it’s their behavior that wins them respect. But first they must be clear themselves about their own guiding principles, and be prepared to talk about what they hold as important. They then ‘model the way’ – demonstrating through their daily actions their deep commitment to their beliefs, and inspiring people to follow them as a result. Because the prospect of complex change can overwhelm people and stifle action, they set interim goals so that people can achieve small wins as they work toward larger objectives. They unravel bureaucracy when it impedes action; they put up signposts when people are unsure of where to go or how to get there; and they create opportunities for victory. (p. 16).

Superintendent A’s leadership practice is demonstrated in his actions related to returning the students to school shortly after the natural disaster. He stuck to his core beliefs about the role and purpose of the school district in a small town and because of that, the lives of students were impacted in a positive way. Similar to the way that Kouzes and Posner describe leaders with this dominant practice as setting “interim goals so that people can achieve small wins as they work toward larger objectives,” Superintendent A set the interim goal of opening the school after the natural disaster. He did not care about how many substitute teachers he would need to find or worry about the

student schedules that might need to be rearranged. He never blinked when teachers told him that they could not come back for at least a week and instead promised them that they would not have to use their vacation and sick days. Reopening the school was not an easy decision, but because he reopened the building three days after the disaster, it was possible for teachers and students to see that their lives could continue. Day one was rough, but day two was easier. Superintendent A held faculty meetings at the beginning and end of each school day for the first week that the students returned after the storm. The faculty meetings had a formal purpose of updating every staff member on recovery efforts and on what was being done to support the families that were impacted. Informally, these faculty meetings served as a way to show the team, qualitatively, that they would be able to move past the disaster if they relied on the strength and courage of each other.

The leadership practices of Superintendent A were not limited to his response related to the natural disaster. His practices at the bargaining table demonstrated the fact that he was committed to helping the board of education and the teachers to see, through small victories, that they could be something much better. Time and time again, Superintendent A described the work that had been done with the teachers to eliminate the bureaucracies that might negatively impact students. For example, in discussing the most recent collective bargaining agreement that was reached with the teachers in his district, Superintendent A discussed the changes in starting and ending time for students. The master schedule used to begin at 7:00 a.m., also known as “zero hour,” and continue through to sixth period, which ended at around 2:25 p.m. However, teachers that taught

during “zero hour” could leave the building and be done at just after 1:00 p.m. “We got to the point where we had teachers leaving here and then going to work at another job.

From three in the afternoon until nine or ten at night... it was like, really? I need you here for kids.” Superintendent A sought a shift in the schedule during the process of collective bargaining because it was not good for kids.

We had seventeen teachers out of eighty teachers that started teaching at seven in the morning and at 1:25 p.m., that is it, they were done and leaving. Well, when you are trying to build a schedule for students, I mean if that was your physics teacher and you needed a physics class at the end of the day, you could not run it because that person is done and gone.

In making this shift, Superintendent A laid the ground work for the next incremental change that was to be added to the master schedule – the addition of the Patriot Academic Coaching class. Given the fact that all teachers were now in the building at 8:00 a.m. and could not leave until 2:55 p.m., Superintendent A negotiated an agreement in the most recent contract to add one extra class for every teacher. In this model, every teacher that was not already teaching an overload was assigned a Patriot Academic Coaching (PAC) class with 20 students.

You are with them fifty minutes per day. You teach one lesson per week... eighteen lessons for the fall semester and they are lessons as in, they spend one whole period teaching them how to use the student management system so that they know how to pull their grades up, their attendance up, to see what assignments are missing. Reading skills, writing skills, note taking skills. Bullying strategies, all of those kinds of things. They teach one lesson per week and the other four days are pretty much assisting them in keeping them on track.” The outcomes that the district has realized as a result of this class are significant. “We have run a lot of data on it, our freshmen, the number of Ds and Fs and discipline referrals have consistently dropped since we have started this program. Basically because they are just keeping them on track and focused.

While Superintendent A's dominant leadership practice was identified through the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* as “Model the Way,” other leadership practices were discussed prominently in the interview with the researcher. Specifically, words associated with the leadership practice known as “Enable Others to Act” occurred with the most frequency, surpassing even his dominant practice in “mentions” during the conversation. Superintendent A described the importance of having a relationship with the leadership of the teachers' union and noted,

there was, when I got here ten years ago, there was a definite tension between the teachers union and the administration and the board and we have worked hard over the last ten years to try and eliminate that and I think that we have. I mean, we don't still agree on everything, but I have always worked pretty hard to have an open relationship with the union president.

Later on in the interview, Superintendent A returned to the relationship that needed to be developed and stated, “I think that the other thing that helped impact it was the relationship that I have developed and created with the union presidents. Even when Superintendent A used words associated with his dominant leadership practice, it was in the context of “enabling others to act.” He helped the researcher to understand how the relationships with the union president were created by saying,

so the biggest thing that I have always got is that you have to meet face-to-face with them and get a good relationship created if you are really going to solve this. And you know, initially that is not comfortable for a lot of people. They do not want to do that. So I have tried to tell them, you know, it is not going to be comfortable, but you have to do it and the more you do it, the more skilled you will become at it and the more comfortable you will be at it and the gains will be three-fold from it. So I have tried to model that and emulate that with our administrative staff.

Superintendent A discussed the bargaining process that was used with the teachers' union in the most recent negotiations. He described a series of meetings that

would begin with the teachers union discussing what is important to them in the bargaining of this contract and this is followed by a similar process of sharing from the members of the board of education and administrative team. After this, the teams focus on “cleaning up” language in the contract that might need to be addressed. According to Superintendent A, after several bargaining sessions of four or five hours at a time, agreements are reached. For the last three contracts that he has negotiated with the teachers’ union, bargaining began in early June and concluded by the end of July. Superintendent A was asked whether he felt that this process represented an interest-based approach and he replied,

I think that it is definitely an interest-based approach because each side has that opportunity to come in and talk about what is important to them in a friendly and professional atmosphere versus that "us and them" or a little bit of that caustic, we need to get this and here is why and we had better get it and those kind of things so I think that it has been much more palatable.

In a review of the collective bargaining agreement that was negotiated by Superintendent A, very few key words associated with any of the leadership practices were identified. However, similar to the way that the practice known as “Enable Others to Act” was identified most often in the conversation with Superintendent A, this practice was the only practice that was identified in the researcher’s review of the collective bargaining agreement. The passage, part of a much longer section on teaching assignments, focuses on the Patriot Academic Coaching that was created by Superintendent A. The bargaining agreement notes,

The parties shall approach the PAC assignment as a collaborative opportunity to provide tutoring, to better monitor students’ overall high school performance and to make the school experience less impersonal. The design shall be subject to

modification as necessary to meet the objective of enhancing student achievement.

No other words associated with any of the other leadership practices were identified in the collective bargaining agreement negotiated by Superintendent A.

Superintendent B - Inspire a Shared Vision

Superintendent B is a female who has held several positions in education during her tenure as an administrator. After beginning as a high school teacher, she served as a department chair in a large urban district and then moved to the position of assistant principal in that same school. Following this work, she was selected for a high-level position in curriculum and instruction at the Illinois State Board of Education, but her love for students led her back to the schools two years ago. At age 50, she is slightly above the mean age of all participants in the study, though she notes that she has several more years left before she considers retiring. Her district is classified as a medium-sized rural district with just over 1,600 students attending schools in grades pre-kindergarten through twelve. Unique to the school district is the fact that it was a district that formed three years ago after consolidating three separate school districts (two districts with pre-kindergarten through eighth grade students and one high school district). The consolidation involved the temporary negotiation of a contract by Superintendent B's predecessor, followed by the election of a new board of education for the three school districts. Once the new board of education was elected, Superintendent B was chosen as the superintendent and her first responsibility was to assist in the negotiation of a contract with the teachers' union. The negotiations process proved to be difficult for several reasons. First and foremost, a member of the bargaining team from the teacher's union

had been distributing the incorrect version of the former negotiated agreement. When Superintendent B began following a version of the contract that was on file in the district office with signatures from all interested parties, teachers began to feel as though the new superintendent was intent on destroying the union and taking away the rights of teachers. At the same time that this began to occur, Superintendent B began to discover that the contract had been misapplied in the district leading to teachers being paid higher wages than they should have been and other teachers to have been dismissed when they actually had a right to retain their position. One month into the job, Superintendent B was contacted by the local bank regarding a problem with the upcoming paychecks. While the past superintendent had reported a surplus of \$3,000,000 in the education fund, the bank informed Superintendent B that there would not be enough funds to cover the payroll expenses. What happened next was crucial in the development of a relationship between Superintendent B and the board of education. She called an emergency meeting of the board and quickly maneuvered through a process of redistributing appropriated funds in an effort to make payroll. Superintendent B reported meeting with the president of the school board nearly every day during this process as they worked collaboratively to solve the budget problems. The scope of the budget problems was so significant that the teachers' union asked that the process of negotiating a new contract be suspended until all of the monetary issues in the district could be sorted out. For two months, the negotiations stood still and the two sides then came back to the bargaining table after funds had been appropriated to cover payroll expenses. However, while the superintendent and the board of education were a more cohesive bargaining team given

their work together to solve the budget process, the teachers' union remained fractured after being thrown together during the process of district consolidation. The superintendent had managed to develop a shared vision with the board of education where the members of the board could see a bright future where finances were in better shape and the schools were noted as amongst the best in the state. "We wanted our people treated fairly and we wanted our district to survive and thrive," noted Superintendent B. The lack of cohesiveness on the part of the teachers' union, the continued distribution of a bargaining agreement that was not in effect, and the overall difficult bargaining conditions in the State of Illinois helped to lead the two parties toward the declaration of an impasse and a request for third-party mediation by teachers' union. The mediator, however, did not bring the two sides together and when the talks between the two sides and the mediator broke down, visionary Superintendent B stepped up. She summoned the board president, the Uni-serve director (lawyer for the teachers' union), and two leaders from the teachers' negotiating team to her office. At the meeting, she helped to ensure that her vision for the district became a shared vision by the teachers' union. She openly shared information about the financial status of the district using third party audits, bank statements, and other documents to demonstrate the district's dire financial situation. "I would be like I've got the audit, I've got the numbers come in and sit down we will go through them and I will help you prepare your next financial offer. I kind of felt that was my job." To demonstrate the fact that the negotiated agreement that she was using as a basis for the contract negotiations was the correct version of the agreement, she asked the Uni-Serve director, with whom she had

worked in a past district, to vouch for her honesty and then showed them that the agreement she had was actually signed by all parties involved, something that was not included on the copy of the agreement being distributed by the teachers' union. "They had their Uni-Serve director come in and the board president, myself, the Uni-Serve Director and their two head bargainers just had a little meeting. That is where we clarified which contract was THE contract," noted Superintendent B. She continued by helping to clarify the problems that the teams were having and said,

I have finally figured out what the problem is. You think this is the contract and I know that this is the contract because this is the signed one that was printed a thousand times over and sent to everyone. This is what for some reason some people have as the contract. They are different including the salary schedule - DIFFERENT! I pushed them across and fortunately I have known the Uni-Serve Director because he was in the system I was in before and I looked at him and said I am going to need for you to vouch for me here... and he said I can do that.

She then made a passionate appeal to the teachers about the fact that she cared for them and for the students in the district. The teachers sat and listened intently and the Superintendent acknowledged that she can be difficult to work with (Superintendent B noted, "I said to them, 'I will own the fact that I can be a bitch, but I am not a liar.'"), but she called upon them to join in her shared vision of greatness for the district rather than going on strike. Her passionate pleas and discussion of her vision with the teachers broke the stalemate and within one week, the contract was settled after eight months of negotiations.

When Superintendent B was asked whether she felt that the process that had been used was an interest-based bargaining approach, she answered,

By the end, it truly was, I do not even like, it was "win-win". We were trying to take care of both sides. It really was, we were not looking for somebody having

to get something from someone else.” However, earlier in the interview, Superintendent B had discussed the challenges of classifying collective bargaining into a narrow “box.” Specifically, she opined, “you know, they talk about “are you interest-based” are you “win-win,” you know all of these different models and really there is no model when you go into it.

Superintendent B’s dominant leadership practice was found to be “Inspire a Shared Vision” and there were several points in the conversation with her that this practice came out. Superintendent B might have left the State Board of Education because she was not able to have her vision in place. She discussed the fact that “I always look back and I look at everything that I have done while in schools, the state board was just an anomaly, a great learning experience, but you can’t have a vision there.” In discussing what her role might be as a superintendent with respect to collective bargaining, superintendent B noted, “I started out with this vision as a new superintendent walking in that my role would be advisory, sitting in the middle.” Even as the contract negotiations were at a boiling point, Superintendent B helped the teachers’ union representatives to understand how the strike would impact the district and community so that they could clearly see the impact of this sort of job action. “This community is broke and getting more broke and they will not take it well. Their taxes are up, jobs are going away, I don’t want anything to happen to you. I did have a legitimate fear that people would throw things on them. There was not support in the community for the teachers asking for more money when everyone there was losing their jobs. I think it took them aback a little that I actually wanted to talk about that.” She recognizes her visionary practices and noted that past employees had discussed Superintendent B’s vision with her over dinner after she had left the district. “What we liked about you,” her

past employees noted, “is that you asked us what to do and what we thought we should be doing, but we knew you were manipulating us to the vision you had all along.”

However, examples of other leadership practices were also identified in the transcripts from the interviews with Superintendent B. Most notably, words associated with the leadership practice, “Enable Others to Act” were identified in the transcript of Superintendent B a total of nine times. Specifically, Superintendent B discussed the importance of relationships and trust building in her work as a superintendent around collective bargaining. When the researcher asked the superintendent to describe her leadership style, she discussed several items, but also noted that; “I really try to drive it down to relationships and people talking.” In talking about the people that she enjoys working with, Superintendent B hit on the respect that must exist between her and the teachers and discussed the type of teacher that she respects the most. “I have a lot of respect for people that ask intelligent questions and come in and want to get involved in their leadership teams.” During the negotiations, during the crucial meeting between the teachers and the district, Superintendent B noted that the turning point came when there was a mutual trust between the two parties. “It was a turning point and I think we established rapport and a trust to go back in and finish it up.” Since the collective bargaining agreement was reached, Superintendent B has worked to continue the relationship building and consistently looks for things that might impact the relationship between her and the teachers’ union. She stated

The other thing that I don't know that every superintendent thinks about is that if I have an itch or an instinct that something that is about to happen is going to have an impact on how the relationship between management and labor is going, I seek out the union president and we have a conversation and I ask for her advice.

Furthering the association with the leadership practice of Enabling Others to Act, a practice that requires an underlying trust to be built, Superintendent B noted, “I meet with the union leadership every other week and we just informally talk and we hash out a lot of things so there is a much different level of trust at this point about me wanting to take care of their best interests because they are my employees.”

In a review of the collective bargaining agreement that had been reached by Superintendent B with the teachers’ union, only key words associated with one practice – “Enable Others to Act,” were identified. Specifically, the contract states

To promote an exchange of information to improve the relationship between the Association and the Administration/Board, the Board and Association agree to establish a Board/Association Communication Committee. The Committee will meet at mutually agreed upon times, but not fewer than two times per year to discuss topics of mutual concern.

It further notes that “The Superintendent and an Association representative will collaboratively establish an agenda for each meeting including topics brought forth in advance. These topics of mutual concern shall not replace the collective bargaining process.”

Superintendent C - Challenge the Process

The researcher first interacted with Superintendent C during a social media chat with other administrators. The chats, held weekly using social media outlets like Twitter, are a time for educators from across the state to discuss current issues in education. Several months later, Superintendent C was the keynote speaker at a dinner for school board members and the researcher was able to be present at this event to hear Superintendent C discuss the differences between the contract in his school district and

most others in the area. However, to truly have an understanding of Superintendent C as a person, it was necessary to discuss his long background in education.

At the age of 36, Superintendent C is young when compared to the rest of the superintendents that participated in the study. However, he has been a superintendent in his current district for four years and was in another school district as superintendent for four years prior to that. He has also served as a high school principal and an elementary school principal, but his true love is for teaching music; something he was able to do for every student in his former district. He grew up on a farm in a small community in the western part of the state and is the youngest of four children. In his former district, he recalled the first time that he ever sat at the bargaining table. “We had all of our aides and support staff, they were represented by the Teamsters. The Teamsters. If you want to talk about unique. That was the first contract that I ever negotiated.” The teamsters union has a long history of involvement with organized crime including collaboration with noted mobster Al Capone (Witwer, 2000). Negotiating with the Teamsters union, a union that mostly represents blue-collar workers can be difficult and the negotiating process between Superintendent C was no different. He noted

their bargaining agent was probably six-foot, eight and he had one tool in his tool box and that was to bully. I got my tail handed to me the first time that I negotiated. We did not even have an attorney in the room so this is a small rural school where they expect the superintendent to negotiate the contract. I am 27 years old in my first superintendency in my first year.

After attempting to negotiate the contract with little success, Superintendent C was pulled aside by the school board president who directed him on what needed to happen. “The board president pulls me aside and says we need to get a one-year deal, close this thing

out, and you need to get smart in a hurry so that this does not happen again. And I am like ‘or we could hire an attorney and help me out’ and he was like ‘we don't do that around here, you're going to get smart.’” This direction from the board president forced Superintendent C to begin to dive deep into the field of collective bargaining. He read through the latest books, journals, and articles to build a solid background for the history of collective bargaining. He attended workshops and other events with the intent of developing his skills at the bargaining table. He knew that coming back to the bargaining table, he needed to be armed differently and that, if he was, things would go much better. Coming back to the bargaining table with the six-foot eight bully was no easy task for Superintendent C, but that is what happened six months after he was given the directive by his board president. This time, however, it was a different experience. In one exchange during our interview, Superintendent C described that round of bargaining and some damage that was done to the room.

I was much better prepared to handle the aggressive tactics of the teamsters union and I knew I was on the right track when he got so worked up under one negotiation that he wasn't getting where he could get before. I mean before he could bully me and I would fold and he wasn't able to take the contract where he wanted to take it and so he got so worked up that he picked a chair and was shaking it as he is screaming at me and he threw it so hard that it literally went through the wall. Not into the wall, but like the legs poked through the other side of the drywall. All I kept thinking to myself was ‘do not laugh.’ I remembered reading somewhere not to laugh at the guy because he may jump the table and he is really frustrated with me right now so we suspended negotiations and it ended up being very successful.

After his horrific first experience at the bargaining table, Superintendent C began to prepare for his work negotiating the contract with his teachers’ union. What began as a small amount of research surrounding comparable districts and their pay scales turned

into a passion and interest for eliminating what has become a staple of most collective bargaining agreements – the salary schedule. While most districts pay teachers based on their years of experience and education, Superintendent C recognized that there were many hidden costs associated with the salary schedule. In coming to this realization, Superintendent C gathered the salary schedules for every district in a fifteen county area of western Illinois. He then developed a comprehensive chart that showed the average pay increases behind the salary schedule. For example, a teacher who is moving from their first year of teaching to their second and who simultaneously has earned a master's degree might have a pay increase of two percent on top of the agreed upon pay increases. Superintendent C noted "I was just fascinated by the salary schedules and the art of negotiation and so I collected information from forty-four school districts in Northwest Illinois and I was plotting B1, M1, and M32 and I was cross-referencing that based on enrollment and EAV." Here, it is helpful to note that B1, M1, and M32 are lanes that are commonly found on the salary schedule. B1 stands for a teacher with a Bachelor's degree in his or her first year of teaching and M1 stands for a teacher with a Master's degree in his or her first year of teaching. EAV is the Equalized Assessed Value and it is the dollar value of all of the land in a given area and it is used in the formula for determining state aid. Superintendent C used all of the information that he had gathered from these comparable districts to assist other districts in negotiating their contracts. In assisting other districts with their contracts, Superintendent C not only established himself as a leader in the field, but also gained critical experience at the bargaining table that he could use in his next contract negotiations. Additionally, all of this background

research helped him to understand that the salary schedule did nothing to promote good teaching or learning and only rewarded teachers who stayed in the district for a long period of time. This simple fact – that the salary schedule did not work – was a driving force behind the negotiations that he took part in while in his current district.

Beginning early, Superintendent C began to work on establishing a rapport with the union president from almost the very first day on the job. He noted,

when we started meeting and I was bringing different ideas to the table and even different ways of talking and approaching her and so on and so forth that I think at first it must have seemed very unique to her. This whole thing must have seemed weird and out of place. She must have thought, ‘This is not what a superintendent does.’ Superintendent does not show up with coffee at 7:15 in the morning to talk negotiations to share his negotiations strategy with me months before they sit down to negotiate. That is not normal.

And yet, this approach is what allowed Superintendent C to negotiate the contract in a total of two weeks with three meetings at the bargaining table. The secret to the success was in the constant open and relationship-oriented approach that he used in working with the teachers’ union. When he had an idea about something that he wanted to include in the bargaining agreement, he did not bring it to the board of education. Instead, he brought it to the president of the teachers’ union and he encouraged the union president to do the same thing. In settling the agreement, Superintendent C was not content with continuing to honor the tradition of the salary schedule in the contract and instead worked collaboratively with the union president and business manager to abolish the salary schedule in favor of a schedule that is based on increases in the Consumer Price Index (CPI). While the union and the district still had to agree upon the starting salaries and the lanes that would be included, there were no more hidden costs associated with the salary

schedule. A rise of two percent in the CPI would equate with a rise of a portion of that based on the current lane placement for that teacher. Since there were fewer lanes in this contract, Superintendent C negotiated the use of innovation grants whereby teachers could apply for money from the district to complete research and develop authentic learning experiences. When the teachers are done with the research, they present their findings to the board of education and receive a one-time payment for their services to the district. These innovation grants have revolutionized the district and their work according to Superintendent C. He noted,

at our board meeting last night, we had two of our teachers...present on some of the stuff that they have been doing and at the board meeting, they talk about how they brought in however many thousands of dollars in research money from Eastern Illinois University. They talk about this new stuff that they have been creating and they are now taking it on the national market for more and more people and they are speaking at international conferences and people from Australia are interested in their work. It's sort of like if you think back to the Bell Labs stories of the 1940's and the other really cool things that have changed the world and I feel like that is what we have created here. We have created an innovation grant that we can support through our contract of all places.

Superintendent C is proud of the teachers in his district and he is thrilled with the relationship that he developed through the experience of collective bargaining.

Superintendent C had openly described the process used to reach agreement as one that was interest-based earlier on in the interview with the researcher. Specifically, he described the terms used to classify bargaining into different types as “woefully inadequate” and went on to say, “They are good terms because it is how we can negotiate. You can take a fully interest-based approach, you can take a fully win-lose approach, but I do not think that is the right way to think about it. I think that we just have to think differently about how we approach the process in its entirety.” As the

researcher probed further, Superintendent C elaborated by stating, “Interest-Based, at its heart, is still this mine and yours proposition. That is how I perceive interest-based to be.

It still has a feeling like

we are going to come into this and there are two sides to this and there is an official dance that we will play... it just presupposes that we are setting up frameworks, rules, and boundaries to how we are going to approach it. And so rather than talking about a style of negotiation, I think it is more important to talk about the relationship for the people who you are working with.

In rethinking the salary schedule, Superintendent C was focused on challenging the process and it is this leadership practice that is his dominant practice. In reviewing the transcripts from the interview, there was a total of 11 times where words associated with this practice were noted. Most importantly, Kouzes and Posner discussed those who “Challenge the Process” as people who often “search for opportunities to change the status quo. They look for innovative ways to improve the organization. In doing so, they experiment and take risks (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 181). Similarly, Superintendent C has looked for ways to be innovative in the districts that he leads. In discussing the innovation grants, he noted, “What I get excited about is like big, innovative, out there, cutting edge kind of stuff and so we have had a handful of teachers take on these innovation grants and change the world.” Superintendent C also discussed. He further discussed the fact that small failures are inevitable and that every organization needs to have people who are willing to take the small steps toward innovation. “You have got what I will call mechanical learning... It is how the organization takes incremental steps forward. Maybe I should call it incremental learning.” He continued, “they are micro steps forward, but it is important work and it needs to be done.”

While the leadership practice of “Challenge the Process” was dominant for Superintendent C, it was another practice; “Enable Others to Act” that had key words coded the most number of times during his interviews. Superintendent C focused on the relationships and trust that must be built between the superintendent and the teachers’ union. Specifically, in discussing how bargaining might work, Superintendent C posited, “it can just be conversational if the relationship is strong enough.” As he answered questions about the type of collective bargaining that he had used in his current district, he spoke of the importance of building relationships, trust, and credibility between and amongst those that you work with. He asserted “I just got involved in negotiating these contracts and the more that I did it, the more that I realized that the real key to successful negotiations is all about transparency and all about relationships and how fast can you build credibility and that sense of trust.” These themes of trust and relationships, typically associated with the style of ‘Enable Others to Act,’ were noted a total of thirteen times during the interview – more than any of the leadership practices including his dominant practice.

The contract that Superintendent C had negotiated with the teachers’ union contains words that are associated with three different leadership practices. Passages that highlighted Superintendent C’s dominant practice included a discussion of class sizes where the agreement reads, “The parties agree that the following limits on class size represent desired objectives. Attainment of these objectives shall be subject to space availability, installation of experimental or innovative programs, budgetary limitations, and availability of teachers or necessary funds.” Later on, the agreement identifies

workshops that will be creditable on the salary schedule and specifically, it notes that, “one hour of graduate credit will be granted for participants in workshops devoted to the improvement of the teaching process, provided the workshop operates for at least twenty hours.” While these passages were coded as being in line with the leadership practice known as “Challenge the Process,” other passages were aligned with the practice of “Enable Others to Act.” While none of the key words associated with this practice were identified, the preamble of the collective bargaining agreement reads,

Attainment of objectives of the education program of the District requires mutual understanding and cooperation between the Board, the administrative and supervisory staff, and the professional teaching personnel. To this end, free and open exchange of views is desirable and necessary, with all parties participating in deliberations and good faith negotiations leading to the determination of matters defined as negotiable.

Here, it is reasonably thought that the passage focuses on the development of an open and ongoing relationship between the board of education and the teachers’ union. The only other leadership practice that was identified in the review of the collective bargaining agreement was aligned with the practice of “Encourage the Heart.” The passage states, “certified staff shall be encouraged to participate in study groups as a matter of curricular and staff development and shall be compensated for their participation,” and while this passage does not specifically apply to the concepts associated with this leadership practice, its presence was identified.

Superintendent D – Enable Others to Act

As the researcher arrived at the district office for an interview with Superintendent D, a tall man with a booming voice came out of an office at the end of the hallway. Superintendent D stands over six-foot tall and has a firm handshake. He smiled

and invited the researcher back to the office and there was small talk exchanged on the way down the hall. The interview began and, like the engine of a car during a cold winter, it seemed to sputter a bit with short answers and simple exchanges of information. Then, without notice, the interview began to take off as the superintendent talked about the strong working relationship that he had with the members of the teachers' union. The relationships, he reported, had been built during the last 20 years in the district and it is these relationships that Superintendent D credits with the collegial collective bargaining experiences that he has had during the last ten years.

Prior to becoming superintendent of the 1900 student district, Superintendent D served as the business manager even though he did not have experience in that role. He noted that the prior superintendent "thought it would be a great opportunity to learn on the finance side of things." He quickly learned about the financial picture in the district – bleak, even then – and participated, for the first time, in the collective bargaining process with the teachers' union. However, it is important to note that the relationships that Superintendent D has worked so hard to develop over the years did not just begin when he became the superintendent. He served as the middle school principal; a job that he feels is the most difficult in the district, and prior to that served as an assistant principal. He came to the district after having worked in a small district near central Illinois where he was able to wear many "hats." Superintendent D has settled in to the position and to the community and he has two daughters who attend school in a neighboring district. Family is very important to him and, in fact, he has an agreement with his board of education and with the teachers that family should always come first. He openly

discussed the importance of having a balance between work and home and ensures that staff members also seek to keep this balance. He discussed it in a way that made it seem like it was a moral imperative for him and opined

I think that it is very important for teachers too because they get stressed out. They have a stressful job. When their kid makes some great baseball tournament in Florida and it is April, it is all right to take off a few days. That is a once in a lifetime thing. I am not going to be some ‘why are you doing that superintendent.’ I understand because my daughter is a big time swimmer so I want to go to her swim meets too. I never, I am never going to miss one of those and I have not. I think that balance and work life and family is important. There are too many divorces as it is amongst superintendents and I do not want to get on that soapbox, but I think that's not healthy.

What struck the interviewer most during the hour-long meeting on a cold Friday morning was the fact that Superintendent D did not seem to know what was in the contract very well, but it did not seem to matter. What was more important and what he reiterated over and over again was the importance of relationships and trust building away from the bargaining table. It is these relationships that have allowed him to keep the district afloat during these tough financial times. When the recession began in early 2008, Superintendent D sought, and was granted, a concession by the teachers’ union. He asked that they agree to a salary freeze for one year given the challenging economic times. While many teachers’ unions might have balked at this proposition – they were in the middle of a five-year contract with built-in raises scheduled at the end of every year – Superintendent D leveraged his relationships with the union leadership to help keep the district’s financial picture strong. He noted, “we had a contract in place a couple of contracts ago with three to five percent increases and I went to them in March and said we can't afford this and they said ‘just take a freeze next year instead of taking the raise

that was already negotiated.” This kind of concession by the teachers union was rewarded during the next contract when the superintendent and union were able to agree on pay raises that would bring the pay of teachers in the district in line with those of their surrounding communities. As the interviewer probed further about the salary freeze that the union had taken voluntarily, Superintendent D boasted, “that was just me talking to them... I think that tells you the kind of trust that exists here.” Stories like this were fascinating to the interviewer and they were abundant in nature.

This level of trust, Superintendent D noted, exists because of the mutual respect that the two parties have for each other at the bargaining table along with the process that has been used in negotiating the contract.

We don't use the traditional negotiating process, we use an interest-based bargaining process and we have used that for four or five contracts now. We are very transparent and everyone knows what our finances are. We have worked together for so many years as a team so there are no surprises. It does not necessarily take a long time to go through our interests or issues and our topics and tell our stories and then come up with some solutions

When the interviewer probed further about how the district began using the interest-based bargaining process, Superintendent D noted that several years ago, all of the members of both of the negotiating teams came together and read the books associated with interest-based bargaining and since that time, they have used the process in negotiating every contract. He credits the solid work of the Illinois Education Association (IEA) for facilitating the process and ensuring that both parties (teachers and the district) are able to come together around common interests. Before the two parties begin to discuss interests, however, they come together away from the school to break the proverbial ice.

Everyone is always nervous on the first day when we go into it. We actually meet in a nice location at the Independence Country Club; we put out a nice spread. We have the chefs make a nice lunch. We only work from like nine until two. We never work in the evening. We get subs for the teachers and we make it a nice environment and so I think that everyone is nervous on that first day.

Then, the districts begin the process of negotiating a new contract and it begins with telling stories. During the most recent negotiation, Superintendent D framed the story of the district around the budget crisis and financial stress that had come to the district, community, state, and country.

We had balanced budgets... for the last ten years and now we are starting to run deficits... how can we get ourselves a bit back on track without impacting student learning. That is our story. Our story is always about kids and student learning. What can we do to make sure that we can maintain our staffing and programming and our teachers?

After telling their stories to each other, the teams discuss their common interests and in the most recent contract negotiations, that was being fiscally responsible and attracting and retaining the best teachers. These interests are broad enough so that they can foster agreement between the two parties. He commented

those are the types of interests that you have and you usually, those are pretty global, and those are interests that the most hard core teacher that wants to bang the drum and the most difficult board member can all agree upon that hey we want the best staff, we want to keep them, we want to be fiscally responsible for the community since many of us live here.

Even when it comes to the financial pieces of the contract, something that can be challenging to negotiate using an interest-based model, Superintendent D has continued to rely on the relationships and uses interest-based bargaining to bargain the teacher salaries noting,

a lot of people think that interest-based bargaining works well when you are working on relationship types of things or what they would consider to be the

fluffy stuff. It is probably more difficult when you get to the financial pieces, but I do not agree that you can't do those too. I guess we are living proof that you can, but you have to have a strong trust and if you have a union that does not trust the administration or the board, then it will not work.

As the researcher left the interviewer a refreshing feeling about collective bargaining and the possibilities that exist when relationships are strong began to emanate.

All of the superintendent's that were interviewed for this study were read a description of their dominant leadership practice by the researcher. The dominant leadership practice of Superintendent D is known as "Enable Others to Act" and the authors discussed leaders with this dominant practice in the following way:

Leaders recognize they cannot change everything themselves – they must foster collaboration and build trust in their teams and everyone who has a stake in achieving the vision. Leaders who enable others to act make it possible for others to do good work, working hard to make others feel strong, capable and committed. They don't hoard power – they give it away in order to foster commitment. Great leaders build relationships based on trust and confidence, and make people feel strong and capable – as if they can do more than they ever thought possible. (Kouzes & Posner, 2012, p. 21)

In meeting with Superintendent D, this description so accurately described his practices in the district that when the researcher finished reading the description, Superintendent D spoke only two words: "Nailed it!" In reviewing the transcript of the interview, Superintendent D mentioned words or phrases associated with "enabling others to act" a total of twenty-six times, the most out of any superintendent that was interviewed. Specifically, the words trust and relationship were so interspersed with the conversation that the entire paradigm around collective bargaining seemed to shift. Trust is more than a two-way street in the district Superintendent D serves. It is a constant building of relationships that helps the district to move forward. "I have been here for

twenty years and because our board president has been here for a long time and has a strong credibility with the staff, I have a strong relationship with the union president and many of the teachers so they trust me and we trust each other.” Issues that might seem irreconcilable in other districts are discussed openly because of the relationships that exist in the district. When discussing issues that were in dispute during the most recent negotiations, he commented, “I think that the financial pieces were in dispute and they were difficult to go through, but because of our relationships and the process we were able to get through it.” He openly discussed what might happen in districts without the trust when he said

If you have had, or if you do not talk with them respectfully or you do not have somebody like Lynn (speaking of the IEA field director) keeping people on track, then it will not work, and it might be worse than doing the traditional negotiations. The practice of “Enabling Others to Act” is about relationships, trust, and collaboration and that is what exists in this district.

These elements have helped to create a strong bond between the superintendent, the Uni-Serve Director, and the union president and Superintendent D noted that he enjoys seeing each of them and tries to do it as much as possible.

I try to go over and see Wanda; she is our tech teacher over at Willow. I try and get over and see her. We have done things socially a little bit. You know, we hug each other when we see each other, same with the Uni-serve director, we have a close bond and we have been together a long time. We have been through some wars. We have been through some tough times over the years. It has not always been perfect; there have been tough situations, tough issues, personnel issues, staffing issues, financial issues, whatever. Election issues. Yet, it always comes back to the relationships with them. That is what holds us together and keeps us strong.” And yet, Superintendent D is wise enough to acknowledge the fact that even the strongest relationships can be broken with the tiniest breach of trust. He noted, “I think that with leadership, it has taken me twenty years to get to here with my staff, but I could lose it tomorrow in a heartbeat. I think it takes a long time to build those relationships, but you could lose them in a second.

In a review of the collective bargaining agreement negotiated by Superintendent D, no words, phrases, or clauses were identified that remotely or directly could be aligned with any of the leadership practices. The vast majority of the agreement was focused on insurance, benefits, and compensation.

Superintendent E – Encourage the Heart

A young-looking and petite woman greeted the researcher as he arrived at the district office. She smiled and asked “would you like a cup of coffee or to hang your coat up?” The researcher hung his coat up and entered the spacious office of Superintendent E. Prior to becoming superintendent in the small suburban school district, Superintendent E served as the principal and was able to have a view of the superintendent’s role while not actively filling that position. Prior to arriving in the district, she served as an administrator in two other school districts, but her real love is in the classroom and she began her career as an elementary school teacher in the northern suburbs of Chicago. At the age of 41, she is close to the average age for all superintendents that responded to the survey and her background as a student at Loyola University in Chicago, a Jesuit-Catholic university plays an important role in the work that she does with the community that has become increasingly diverse during the last ten years. She discussed the things that she had done to help the community members to celebrate Thanksgiving including throwing a large feast for families that were experiencing Thanksgiving for the first time.

At the beginning of her tenure in the school district, she found relationships between the union and the district to be very strong. She noted,

The relationship between the union leadership and myself and our administrative team and board was very good and I will give you an example. In the

summertime, my board president and I would take them out to lunch just to chat and see how things were going and that was very typical. Things have changed a bit over time. But at that time everybody was feeling good about things and this district.

Then, thanks in no small part to several grievances that were filed during the last several years that relationship has eroded. As the district and union enter the process of negotiating a new contract, the climate is much different. Further, when the current contract was negotiated, it was before the collapse of the economy in the United States and so the pay raises during the past several years for the teachers have been substantial. Almost as quickly as the deal between the teachers and the district was reached, the economy collapsed, and the district began to run into financial pressures. These financial pressures hang over the collective bargaining process for the current contract in a negative way and, when combined with the strains that have been put on the relationship thanks to the grievances, Superintendent E has found it tough to continue to keep a positive attitude in the district. However, she did not feel that she had become a different person during her time as the Superintendent and noted,

I think sometimes in these types of positions that egos get in the way and that is not who I am. I am just as happy coming to work in my jeans and bears jersey as I am in my suit. So I think that sometimes titles and roles and big jobs, sometimes people just get a little bit, I don't know, they lose a little bit of focus or maybe a little bit of who they are or what they are about.

In discussing the process that was used to negotiate the contract with the teachers' union, Superintendent E described this approach as an interest-based approach. Specifically, she noted,

I think so I mean it was definitely from the districts point of view, we could have found many things within the contract that we would have liked to be a little bit different or maybe it wasn't accurate or we could have cleaned some things up

from our point of view, but we tried to focus in on and this is why I would consider it Interest-Based Bargaining we tried to focus in on the core issues that were most important and that was salary and benefits and that is really all that we touched.

Superintendent E has a dominant leadership practice of “Encourage the Heart.”

Kouzes and Posner (2012) described those with this dominant practice in the following way:

Accomplishing extraordinary things in organizations is hard work. To keep hope and determination alive, leaders recognize contributions that individuals make. In every winning team, the members need to share in the rewards of their efforts, so leaders celebrate accomplishments. The concept focuses on being sincere, including sincere celebrations devoted to recognizing employee successes. (p. 24)

After discussing this leadership practice with Superintendent E, she felt that it fit her perfectly and remembered the things that she does to give her district a family-like atmosphere.

I really believe that this is a team effort from the bus drivers that we hire as full time employees to the maintenance staff to the kitchen staff that we hire to cook our meals in our own kitchen to the teachers and administrators. I think that it really reflects what I have tried to grow here and that is a sense of family and a sense of we are in this together we care about each other and we like each other most of the time. I think that we try to demonstrate that through the ways that we treat people.

She discussed her leadership style with the researcher by stating “I am a hands on kind of superintendent.” She continued,

I like being involved and I like that we hold doors for kids and I like being able to really be a part of the education that is going on here. I love being able to do things for the teachers and you know we do silly things around here like if it is snowing out and the school day is not over, we dust off their cars for them and stuff like that.

These small things, dusting cars off on a snowy day in an effort to create some sort of esprit de corps, left Superintendent E wondering if she was a “softy.” She worried “...that we are a little bit too easy around here... not that that's a bad thing, but from time to time you wonder if... maybe you are getting taken advantage of.” That might be one of the side effects of being a superintendent who “Encourages the Heart.”

In a review of the collective bargaining agreement that was negotiated by Superintendent E, several words associated with the leadership practices were identified including the word collaborate associated with “Enable Others to Act,” and principle associated with “Model the Way.” Specifically, the negotiated agreement discusses student health care protocols and the process that will be used to develop these protocols.

It states,

The parties shall jointly collaborate in developing student health care protocols which shall seek to establish guidelines for providing necessary student health care services in a manner consistent with maintaining the integrity of the District’s education program. In developing such protocols, the parties agree to adhere to the following principles...

Qualitative Review of Leadership Practices Data

All of the aforementioned superintendents provided the researcher with the ability to audio-record the interview and to access the current copy of the collective bargaining agreement that they had negotiated and discussed during the interviews. While the interview transcripts yielded a significant amount of data related to the leadership practices of the superintendents, the collective bargaining agreements, in general, yielded very little information or key words associated with the leadership practices.

The table below summarizes the number of times that words associated with different leadership practices occurred in the interviews and collective bargaining agreements. It is important to note that several words associated with the various practices (vision, shared) have been excluded from these counts where the definition of the word in context was not associated with the actual leadership practice noted. For example, several districts provide vision insurance and it is discussed in their collective bargaining agreements, but this is not necessarily indicative of practices associated with having a visionary leader.

Table 14

Frequency of Coded Words for Each Practice and Document

		Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
Superintendent A (Model the Way)	Interview	3	0	5	6	1
	CBA	0	0	0	1	0
Superintendent B (Inspire a Shared Vision)	Interview	0	4	0	9	0
	CBA	0	0	0	2	0
Superintendent C (Challenge the Process)	Interview	1	4	11	13	1
	CBA	0	0	3	2	1

Superintendent D (Enable Others to Act)	Interview	3	2	13	26	0
	CBA	0	0	0	0	0
Superintendent E (Encourage the Heart)	Interview	0	1	3	8	0
	CBA	1	0	2	2	0
Frequency of Key Words		8	11	37	69	3
Frequency of Key Words - Interviews		7	11	32	62	2
Frequency of Key Words – Bargaining Agreements		1	0	5	7	1

While all of the superintendents had a leadership profile that “spiked” in their dominant leadership practice, the distribution of the leadership practices in the analysis of the collective bargaining agreements and interview transcripts were not evenly distributed across the five leadership practices. Four of the five superintendents interviewed had words associated with their own dominant leadership practices identified in the interview transcripts. However, all five superintendents spoke words associated with the practice, “Enable Others to Act” during their interview with the researcher. The analysis of the collective bargaining agreements yielded uneven findings of the leadership practices during the coding process. However, the words associated with a leadership practice were identified in a collective bargaining agreement a total of thirteen different times

with slightly over half of those times being the leadership practice, “Enable Others to Act.”

Summary

The researcher set out to identify the dominant leadership practices of superintendents in the State of Illinois as measured by the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* while simultaneously identifying the type of collective bargaining that had been used by that superintendent in the most recent negotiations with the teacher’s union in their district. A response rate of 24% (n=212) was reached and the researcher reviewed these data. An uneven profile of superintendents in the State of Illinois was identified meaning that a plurality (38%) of superintendents that participated in the study had a dominant leadership practice of “Enable Others to Act” followed by superintendents that had a dominant practice of “Model the Way” (12.7%), “Encourage the Heart” (11.8%), “Challenge the Process” (9.4%) and “Inspire a Shared Vision” (6.1%). There was no discernible or statistically significant difference between the dominant leadership practices of all participants in the study and those superintendents that engaged in negotiations using an interest-based approach.

Once these quantitative data were gathered, the researcher performed a profile analysis to identify the superintendents with the most distinct leadership profiles. Distinct leadership profiles are those that have a high range of scores between the five different practices and a large difference between their dominant practice score and the next highest score in the profile. Once the profile analysis was completed, the researcher

contacted five superintendents, one representing each of the five leadership practices, and asked them to participate in phase two of the research study.

Phase two involved the researcher engaging in a semi-structured interview with superintendents. These interviews were recorded and transcribed. Following a review of the transcripts by the superintendents, the researcher coded these data for key words associated with each of the leadership practices. Four of the five superintendents had words associated with their dominant practice identified in their interview transcripts. All five superintendents interviewed during phase two had words associated with the practice “Enable Others to Act” identified in the transcripts. Finally, the collective bargaining agreements that had been negotiated by each of the superintendents was reviewed and coded for the same key words associated with the leadership practices. While the collective bargaining agreements had very few occurrences of the key words associated with any of the leadership practices, the leadership practices that were identified most often in the collective bargaining agreements were disproportionately related to the practice of “Enable Others to Act.” The following chapter will analyze these findings and present implications for the field of educational leadership and provide suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

Overview

This chapter provides an overview of the research methods that were used in this study and a summary and analysis of the research findings from both phase I (quantitative) and phase II (qualitative). The researcher then explores links between the research and the related literature about collective bargaining and superintendent leadership practices. The chapter concludes with a review of the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.

Summary of Rationale and Research Methods

The purpose of this study was to examine superintendent leadership practices and any relationship that they might have to collective bargaining processes, procedures, and outcomes. Specifically, Kouzes and Posner (2012) grouped leadership behaviors into five broad practices including: (1) Model the Way; (2) Inspire a Shared Vision; (3) Challenge the Process; (4) Enable Others to Act; and (5) Encourage the Heart. These five practices have been measured using the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (LPI-Self). Superintendents in the State of Illinois were asked to complete the LPI-Self along with a demographic profile that requested information regarding the bargaining practices that were used in the most recent negotiations with their teachers' union. The gathering of these data constituted phase one of the research project and it is through this

quantitative process that the participants in phase two were identified. Five superintendents, one representing each of the leadership practices as measured by the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* were interviewed. The interviews were then transcribed and coded for the themes and key words associated with each of the five aforementioned leadership practices. Finally, the collective bargaining agreements that had been discussed in each of the superintendents were reviewed and coded for the same leadership practice themes yielding a better understanding of how leadership practices are manifested in collective bargaining processes and procedures.

Research Questions

This study added to the literature on collective bargaining experiences and the research on leadership practices of superintendents through an examination of the following research questions:

1. What dominant leadership practices by superintendents, if any, as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) are reflected in school districts that utilize Interest-Based Bargaining?
2. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) manifested in the collective bargaining process and procedures within each of their school districts, if at all?
3. How are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner's *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013)

evident within the language of the collective bargaining agreements negotiated by each of the superintendents, if at all?

This study utilized a sequential explanatory mixed methods design, which combined quantitative data from a tool called the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (LPI-Self) along with data from a demographic profile about superintendent experiences as they relate to collective bargaining allowed the researcher to identify the dominant leadership practice or practices of each of the study participants while simultaneously gathering information about the collective bargaining approach that was used in negotiating the most recent contract with the teachers’ union. Then, data from the superintendents who indicated that they had utilized an interest-based bargaining approach and who were also willing to meet with the researcher were reviewed. Five superintendents were identified for participation in phase two of the research that included a semi-structured interview with the researcher to further examine the collective bargaining process that was used and to discuss their leadership practices. The interviews with the superintendents were then transcribed and coded for themes found in the LPI-Self. The coding revealed a high number of superintendents that discussed collective bargaining and leadership as it relates to the practice known as “Enable Others to Act.” While other leadership practices were noted in the interviews with the superintendents, this leadership practice was identified most often. Finally, the collective bargaining agreements that had been negotiated by the five superintendents that participated in phase two of the research were reviewed and coded for the same leadership practice themes identified by the LPI-Self. This coding process yielded little data with the exception of

the collective bargaining agreement negotiated by Superintendent C with a total of six words, passages, or phrases that were associated with the leadership practices.

Analysis of Leadership Practices and Collective Bargaining Styles

In phase one of the research, a response rate of approximately twenty-four percent was reached with over 230 superintendents returning the forms. Superintendents that did not complete a demographic profile or superintendents that did not give consent to participate in the study were removed as were those superintendents that indicated they did not wish to participate in the study. Therefore, a total of 212 superintendents were included in phase one of the study which sought to identify the dominant leadership practices of superintendents while narrowing the field of participants for phase two based on the collective bargaining procedures that they had utilized with their teachers union. Eighty-five superintendents indicated that they had utilized an interest-based approach.

Model the Way

Superintendents whose dominant leadership practice was “Model the Way” accounted for a total of approximately thirteen percent of all participants. When this field was narrowed to just the superintendents that had participated in the most recent collective bargaining experience with the teachers’ union in their district and who were also willing to meet, a total of 12 participants in a field of 85 superintendents overall was identified.

Superintendent A was the superintendent with the biggest difference in the range of scores and biggest difference between the dominant leadership practice and the next most prevalent leadership practice was engaged in a semi-structured interview. The

interview had some key words associated with leaders who “Model the Way,” but the practice with the highest number of key words associated with it was “Enable Others to Act.” Specifically, Superintendent A discussed the importance of building solid relationships and how he had built a level of trust and understanding within the district and these themes are strongly associated with leaders who “Enable Others to Act.”

In discussing the collective bargaining practices that had been utilized with Superintendent A, he indicated that he felt that the practices were interest-based and discussed the fact that the teachers had started out the process by discussing what was important to them and then engaging in a series of negotiating session. When compared with the literature around interest-based bargaining, however, the process that Superintendent A used in his district might not be a “pure” form of interest-based bargaining. Patton (2005) laid out seven elements of negotiation including interests, legitimacy, relationships, alternatives, options, commitments, and communication. Most importantly, Patton defined the interests as “a parties basic needs, wants, and motivations” while he defined positions as “a proposed outcome that represents merely one way among many that issues might be resolved” (p. 2). The difference between these positions and interests is where the two different styles of bargaining become important. The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service discusses Interest-Based Bargaining (IBB) as a two part process whereby both parties first seek to understand the problem and then try to understand the underlying interests of the parties involved in negotiations (Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, 2012). Klingel (2003) notes, “the structural differences in an IBB approach are in the composition of the bargaining team, the amount

and type of information used in negotiations, and the involvement of constituents.”

Throughout the process of negotiating, rather than a series of proposals and counter-proposals, those involved with the negotiation of a contract develop a series of problem statements, gather information on a topic together, jointly analyze the information, and share as much information as possible with the other party.

Using the structural differences in the bargaining approach espoused by Klingel (2003) to analyze Superintendent A’s bargaining with the teachers’ union in his district, it is noted that while Superintendent A worked hard to develop a relationship with the union president in his district, the district and the bargaining team did not engage in the development of problem statements followed by gathering information, and did not analyze the information together. Instead, the district began the process by discussing what was important to the teachers and to the district and then exchanged the positions of each of the “sides” until they had reached agreement.

Inspire a Shared Vision

Superintendent B had a dominant practice of “Inspire a Shared Vision.” This leadership practice was shared by a small number of superintendents, just over six percent of all respondents, in the research study and an even smaller percentage, just under six percent, of those that engaged in interest-based bargaining. The experience of Superintendent B at the bargaining table was unique since she represented a district that was recently consolidated and, thus, the ability to develop strong relationships with the members of the union and the union leadership team was limited. However, she united the district around a common vision – salvaging the district – and was able to reach an

agreement with the teachers' union. Superintendent B also described the experience that she had at the bargaining table as "interest-based." When analyzing the experience of Superintendent B through the lens of the interest-based bargaining model, however, it does not appear that this could be classified as such since the teachers and board never united around a common set of agreements or understandings and, further, reached a significant level of disagreement before settling on a contract. It was clear, however, that it was the superintendents "shared vision" was a key factor in settling the teachers' contract.

Challenge the Process

Superintendent C used a more interest-based approach as he bargained the contract with his teachers' union. The culture in the district has been transformed by the open and honest processes that have been created including the innovation grants that are the cornerstones of the collective bargaining agreement. The leadership practice of Superintendent C, "Challenge the Process" is shared with approximately 9.5% of all superintendents that responded and just under 13% of those that use an interest-based approach. In reviewing the collective bargaining practices of Superintendent C, his was more closely aligned with the framework set forth by Klingel (2003). Specifically, the superintendent used an open process where he would discuss thoughts about the contract and what should and should not go in it with the president of the teachers' union, in many cases, before he had even discussed it with the president of the board of education or the schools attorney. With that said, the only common interest that was identified by Superintendent C was improvement of student learning in the district while honoring the

traditions and past practices that had been memorialized in the collective bargaining agreements. However, by his own admission, it is challenging to fully classify the process that was utilized in this district as interest-based because of the fact that he, similar to Patton (2005) views the process of bargaining in a distinctly different manner.

Enable Others to Act

The leadership practice that was manifested in the most superintendents overall in the study and in the targeted group of superintendents that utilized interest-based bargaining was identified as “Enable Others to Act.” Approximately 38% of all study participants and 29% of those that utilized interest-based bargaining had this as their dominant leadership practice. Superintendent D has worked in the district for close to twenty years and has hired almost every staff member that works with him. When his leadership practice was described to him, Superintendent D exclaimed, “nailed it,” as he knew that this was a description of him and his work with others. Indeed, he is focused on building strong and lasting relationships built on trust and understanding. In reviewing the collective bargaining practices that he had utilized, his district most closely aligned with the “pure” form of interest-based bargaining. Specifically, the researcher noticed the first difference when Superintendent D described the bargaining team as being made up of teachers and board members. Other superintendents had first described the members of the board’s negotiating team and then described the members of the teachers negotiating team. These lines were clearly blurred in this district. Then, the negotiating team (united as one unit) met at an off-site retreat center and got to know each other better as individuals as a means of building relationships and beginning to

build trust amongst members of the team. The negotiating team then sat down and outlined the interests that they had and they did this through telling stories. This story telling was followed up with a series of proposals from the entire negotiating team about how the interests could be accomplished. While both the teachers and board needed to concede something in order for the contract to be settled, the fact that the board and teachers appeared to be one cohesive unit operating with the interests of the district was both enlightening and appealing to the researcher. When discussing salaries, a subset of the negotiating team made up of the teachers and of the business manager and superintendent would meet away from the table and would then present the salary and benefit proposal to the rest of the negotiating team. There were no proposals or counter proposals and instead there was a proposal that was adjusted by members of the full bargaining team. This approach has allowed the superintendent to have strong relationships with the members of the teachers union though it is not certain if the relationships came before the bargaining process or if the bargaining process came before the relationships. Superintendent E understands the notion of adaptable leadership as laid out by Heifetz, Linsky, and Grashow (2009) who believe that “the answers cannot come only from on high,” and that true leadership begins with a deep commitment to a cause (Heifetz, Linsky, & Grashow, pg. xi, 2009). Here, the “cause” is the relationships in the district that he serves. Kouzes and Posner (2012) noted that leaders “foster collaboration by building trust and facilitating relationships” and further that they “strengthen others by increasing self-determination and developing competence” (Kouzes & Posner, pg. 21-22, 2012). In the case of Superintendent E, it is clear to the researcher that he has a strong

passion for building trust amongst the stakeholders in the school district. He then facilitates the continued development of this trust and in doing so, helps to build the competence of the teachers in the district for the benefit of the students in the district.

Encourage the Heart

Superintendent E had a dominant practice of Encourage the Heart and she shares this practice with approximately 12% of the superintendents that participated in the study and 12% of those that engaged in interest-based bargaining. The leadership practice of Superintendent E is manifested in a variety of ways in the district including the creation of a meal close to Thanksgiving that allows families from diverse backgrounds who might not have ever experienced a traditional Thanksgiving meal to come together at the school and celebrate the holiday together. At the bargaining table, however, her leadership practices were seen in only small circumstances. Though she would classify the process that was used as interest-based, it is believed that the process was characterized this way is because it was not negotiated in a traditional way. The bargaining agreement was negotiated in a very collegial fashion in a few short meetings and the teams were able to settle the negotiations before the end of the first semester in December. However, the simple absence of the traditional “win-lose” approach to bargaining does not mean that the approach that was utilized should be classified as “interest-based.”

Analysis of Collective Bargaining Styles and Leadership Practices

While the researcher was nervous and somewhat skeptical that a participant pool of superintendents that utilized interest-based bargaining would be able to be identified, a

plurality of superintendents that were included in this study utilized interest-based bargaining. Specifically, of all of the participants in the study (n= 212), 43.9% of them utilized an interest-based approach followed by 31.6% of superintendents that reported using a “win-lose” approach. Seven percent (7.1%) of participants in the study utilized a hybrid approach and approximately 18% of superintendents that were included in the study did not know which approach had been utilized or did not respond to the question on the demographic profile. No statistically significant difference was identified between the groups of superintendents that participated in bargaining using a win-lose approach and those that engaged in an interest-based approach. Similarly, no differences in the age, gender, or experience as superintendent were identified in the review of the quantitative data.

Findings – Research Question One

Research question one asked: What dominant leadership practices by superintendents, if any, as defined by Kouzes and Posner’s *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) (LPI-Self) are reflected in school districts that utilize Interest-Based Bargaining? To answer this question, the researcher sent the LPI-Self to every superintendent in the State of Illinois with the exception of the few superintendents (noted in Chapter III) that would have been biased respondents. Along with the LPI-Self, the researcher sent a demographic profile that asked the superintendents about their background, working experiences, and about the type of bargaining that was utilized in their most recent negotiations with the teacher’s union in their district. Approximately 24% of the superintendents responded (n=212), and of these superintendents, 85 of them

(40%) indicated that they utilized an interest-based bargaining approach. Of the superintendents that identified as using an interest-based bargaining approach, 25 of them (29.4%) had a dominant practice of “Enable Others to Act.” In comparing these data with the data for superintendents that indicated they had utilized another approach (win-lose, hybrid, unknown), the researcher found no statistical difference between the means of those that participated in interest-based bargaining and the rest of the participants in the study. Thus, there is, quantitatively, no dominant leadership practice of superintendents that utilize interest-based bargaining and the null hypothesis is adopted.

With that said, in phase two of the research, the researcher engaged with five superintendents, one each from each of the aforementioned leadership practices and discussed the interest-based bargaining process that they had used in collective bargaining with their respective teacher’s union. While the superintendents each had different dominant leadership practices (Superintendent A, “Model the Way”; Superintendent B, “Inspire a Shared Vision”; Superintendent C, “Challenge the Process”; Superintendent D, “Enable Others to Act”; Superintendent E, “Encourage the Heart”), a review of the interview transcripts for key words associated with each of the leadership practices identified a sharp spike in the number of occurrences for words associated with the leadership practice of “Enable Others to Act.” The key words associated with the practice of “Enable Others to Act” were “relationships” and “trust” and these terms were utilized in the interviews with the five superintendents a total of 62 times. Therefore, while the quantitative data did not identify any one leadership practice that was associated with those superintendents that utilized interest-based bargaining, the

qualitative data gathered from superintendents that engaged in this approach identified the practice of “Enable Others to Act” as the dominant practice amongst this subset of the superintendent population in Illinois.

Findings – Research Question Two

The second research question in this study asked how are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner’s *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) manifested in the collective bargaining process and procedures within each of their school districts, if at all? To answer this question, the researcher interviewed five superintendents who had engaged in collective bargaining with their teachers’ union utilizing an interest-based bargaining approach. Using the structural differences in the bargaining approach espoused by Klingel (2003) to analyze the collective bargaining processes and procedures, the researcher found that, while all of the superintendents felt as though they had engaged in an interest-based bargaining approach, only one of the superintendents, Superintendent D, actually followed the full interest-based bargaining approach. That is to say that, in Superintendent D’s district, the team of negotiators representing the school district and the teacher’s union came together to discuss the interests that they had as they entered the discussion of a new contract. Together, these two parties worked to identify common solutions and significantly blurred the lines that are typically drawn in a collective bargaining experience. There were fewer experiences of the two sides acting “against” each other and more evidence that the two sides had engaged in a collegial conversation around what was in the best interest of the students and school district. Superintendent D had a dominant leadership

practice of “Enable Others to Act.” This finding, that the only bargaining experiences that were fully interest-based were the bargaining experiences in Superintendent E’s district, is significant. They are enlightening given the fact that there was no statistical difference between those participants that engaged in interest-based bargaining and those that engaged in another type of bargaining and had the same dominant practice of “Enable Others to Act.”

Further, it should be noted that all of the superintendents discussed the process that they had utilized to reach agreement with their teachers’ union. Each of the superintendents that were interviewed had a different dominant leadership practice. While four of the five superintendents had key words associated with their dominant leadership practice in their interview, all of the superintendents that were interviewed had words associated with the leadership practice of “Enable Others to Act” identified during their semi-structured interview. Thus, in answering the research question regarding how the leadership practices impacted the collective bargaining process and procedures, if at all, the researcher identified the fact that the leadership practices of most of the superintendents impacted the process and procedures. Further, all of the superintendents had leadership practices associated with “Enable Others to Act.” The superintendent that had this as his dominant practice (Superintendent D) was the only superintendent that engaged in a truly interest-based approach. Therefore, the research indicates that the leadership practices of superintendents have an impact on the process of collective bargaining through the building of trusting and open relationships. Both of these words,

“trust” and “relationships” are closely associated with the practice of “Enable Others to Act.”

Findings – Research Question Three

The final research question asked “how are the leadership practices of school superintendents as defined by Kouzes and Posner’s *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) evident within the language of the collective bargaining agreements negotiated by each of the superintendents, if at all?” To answer this research question, the researcher coded the collective bargaining agreements for words associated with each of the five dominant leadership practices. In doing so, only a few instances (n=13) of key words associated with the bargaining agreements were identified. With that said, of the thirteen instances of key words associated with any of the leadership practices, seven of them were words that were associated with the leadership practice of “Enable Others to Act,” followed by five instances of key words associated with the practice known as “Challenge the Process” being identified. There was no relationship found between the superintendents that had a dominant practice and words associated with that practice being identified in the collective bargaining agreement that they had negotiated. Thus, for this research question, the null hypothesis that there is no qualitative data to suggest that the superintendent’s leadership style influenced any language in the collective bargaining agreement is adopted.

Summation of Data

The researcher set out to identify how the dominant leadership practices, as defined by Kouzes and Posner’s *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment*

(2013) are reflected in school district superintendents that utilize interest-based bargaining. In a review of the quantitative research from phase one of this study, superintendents that utilized interest-based bargaining approaches had a diverse set of leadership practices and there was no statistically significant difference between those that utilized interest-based bargaining and those that utilized other methods. As such, the null hypothesis for research question one is accepted. However, the qualitative data that was gathered around research question one found that there was a strong relationship between those that utilized interest-based bargaining and those the leadership practice of “Enable Others to Act.”

Additionally, the researcher examined whether the leadership practices of school superintendents were manifested in the collective bargaining process. All of the superintendents that participated in phase two of the study identified their leadership practice as having an influence on the process that was utilized in collective bargaining and, in essence, this is true. Each superintendent discussed how his or her leadership practice was manifested in the collective bargaining process and gave significant and detailed examples of how this had occurred. However, underlying each of the messages that were delivered during the interviews with the superintendents were the themes of strong relationships, trusting cultures, and collaborative environments. These practices are most closely associated with the leadership practice of “Enable Others to Act.”

Finally, a review of the collective bargaining agreements from the superintendents that participated in phase two of the research was undertaken as the researcher sought to identify how, if at all, the leadership practices of school superintendents are evident

within the language of the collective bargaining agreement. A review of the five collective bargaining agreements yielded small amounts of data. However, the superintendent with the most number of leadership practices as defined by Kouzes and Posner in his collective bargaining agreement was Superintendent C. Other collective bargaining agreements had only small amounts of language that pertained to any of the leadership practices. As such, the researcher found evidence to support the null hypothesis that the leadership practices of superintendents are not reflected in the language adopted within the new agreement.

Limitations

Every research study that has been completed carries with it some sort of limitations. Key among the limitations for this research study is the fact that the response rate for superintendents was just under 25%. While there is much extrapolation that could be done from these data that were gathered, it is in no way fully representative of the diversity in leadership practices and bargaining styles found in superintendents in the State of Illinois. Further, the researcher asked superintendents to engage in the research study during the month of September in 2013, which could have impacted the number of superintendents that returned the survey and indicated that they were willing to participate since this is a busy time of the school year. During the second phase of the research, those superintendents that were willing to meet further limited the study. It is possible that there are superintendents in the State of Illinois that would not want to meet with a researcher about collective bargaining since this can be an uncomfortable subject

to discuss for some superintendents who have experienced collective bargaining in contentious and litigious situations.

To reduce the possibilities that issues that were made public during the course of data collection could have biased the researcher, the researcher kept a private journal to document situations that arose during the process in an attempt to remain an unbiased researcher. The journal was a place for the researcher to document, among other things, the frustration that came with superintendents who declined to participate and the initial reactions to the data provided by the research participants. These reflections allowed the researcher to document the processes and procedures utilized by each of the superintendents in the study and remain as a neutral data collection “tool” during the process.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study was comprehensive in nature and scope incorporating quantitative and qualitative research methods to examine the intersection of superintendent leadership practices and collective bargaining processes and procedures with teachers’ unions. The research provided an ample view of the superintendent’s role in the process while identifying any influence of specific leadership practices on the procedures and outcomes. With that said, during the course of the research, many other areas for future research were pondered by the researcher. Other scholars in the field of educational leadership might be interested in conducting a similar study with any number of the key players in the collective bargaining process. For example, in four of the five interviews, the superintendent’s discussed the role of the attorney or director (Uni-serve Director for

districts working with the Illinois Education Association) in the bargaining process. A thorough examination of the leadership practices of this group of individuals merits further consideration. Other members of the bargaining team including the attorney for the district and the chief negotiator for the teachers would also provide researchers with a more comprehensive review of the roles that each of these people play with respect to the process of collective bargaining.

Researchers might also consider a more comprehensive case study approach to a review of individual bargaining teams. Each team member from both parties could complete the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* and concurrently, they could complete its partner tool – the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer*. Team members with the most consistent profiles, those with the most inconsistent profiles, or those with multiply dominant practices might be interviewed to examine any relationships that might exist between the leadership practices of members of the bargaining team and the process and procedures used during the process. Similarly, in the semi-structured interview, the researcher asked each superintendent how the members of the teachers union might describe their leadership practices. To formally identify the perceptions of superintendent leadership as noted by the members of the teachers bargaining team would allow for a more direct understanding of any relationships that might exist between superintendent leadership practices and collective bargaining processes, procedures, and outcomes.

Given the significant emphasis by all superintendents on the building of relationships with members of the teachers union, an examination of collective

bargaining practices while concurrently identifying superintendents with the strongest relationships is another area of further research that is suggested. Here, it would be necessary to identify a tool similar to the one used in this study, but that only focuses on practices that are associated with “Enable Others to Act.” For example, identifying the superintendents that built the strongest relationships with teachers or that had worked to develop trusting bonds with the team would be preceded by the identification of superintendents that use interest-based bargaining. The quantitative data that was gathered in the process of examining the relationships could then be examined and explored further through a qualitative process similar to the one undertaken in phase II of this study.

Finally, given the finding that the only superintendent in phase two of the research that had utilized an interest-based approach as defined by Klingel (2003) had a dominant leadership practice of “Enable Others to Act,” it begs the question of whether this finding would hold true in a larger sampling of the superintendents in the study. Future researchers might want to follow the same process for phase one of the research that the researcher did, but then only interview those with the dominant leadership practice of “Enable Others to Act” for phase two. The findings from that research would provide further data to verify the findings of the current study.

Research Implications

The study that has been completed by the researcher presents a number of implications for the field of educational leadership. First and foremost, the researcher has identified the fact that all superintendents must focus on the human piece of human

resources as they engage in a collective bargaining process with their teacher's union. A superintendent that utilizes interest-based bargaining must identify methods for building strong and trusting relationships with the teachers in their respective district. In this study, all of the superintendents that participated in phase two of the research felt that they had utilized interest-based bargaining. However, Superintendent D, with the dominant practice associated with strong and trusting relationships ("Enable Others to Act") was the only superintendent that engaged in a truly interest-based approach. Further, while superintendents will be able to negotiate a contract, the language and document that results is nothing more than a legal document that governs the work and sets parameters for the district and teachers to follow. Indeed, the review of the collective bargaining agreements by the researcher yielded very little data and the null hypothesis that "there is no qualitative data to suggest that the superintendent's leadership style influenced any language in the collective bargaining agreement" was adopted. However, that contract can be utilized for the best interests of the district if, and only if, there are strong and trusting relationships built between the teacher's union and the superintendent in the district. In the most striking example, Superintendent D had engaged in a truly interest-based approach utilizing his strong and relationship-oriented leadership skills. The district worked its way through several daunting tasks including the financial crisis, the termination of a teacher, and new rules around evaluation effortlessly. Conversely, Superintendent B came into a district with almost no relationships and it was not before she convinced the teachers on the bargaining team that she was not a liar that they were able to reach agreement.

While it would be helpful if the superintendent preparation programs in the State of Illinois helped to develop more leaders who could “Inspire a Shared Vision,” so as to ensure a solidly diverse group of superintendents in the state, the real work should be focused on ensuring that superintendents see the bargaining process less as something that they do every two or three years and more as a means of building strong and trusting relationships with the teachers in their district. Superintendents that are successfully engaged in an interest-based approach should have a solid background in developing strong relationships with teachers so that the lines between the teacher’s union and the school district administration disappear. Rather than having a teachers bargaining team and a district bargaining team, these two groups should unite as one bargaining unit focused on the interests of students in the district. Building these relationships will allow the best interests of the students to be served. This will undoubtedly result in fewer adversarial bargaining sessions.

Summary

This study set out to identify the relationship, if any, that existed between superintendent leadership practices as identified by Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment (2013) and collective bargaining processes and procedures. A sequential explanatory mixed methods approach in two phases was utilized. In phase one of the research study, superintendents in the State of Illinois were asked to participate in the study through the completion of a demographic profile and the LPI-Self. Approximately 25% of the superintendents in the state were included in the study (n= 212) and of those that responded, 178 superintendents indicated that they had

participated in the most recent collective bargaining experience. Of these 178 superintendents, 85 of them had participated in the process through an interest-based bargaining approach. In phase two, five superintendents were interviewed – one from each of the leadership practices of “Model the Way,” “Inspire a Shared Vision,” “Challenge the Process,” “Enable Others to Act,” and “Encourage the Heart” – and these interviews were coded for words and themes associated with each of these five practices. This yielded much data, though none of the leadership practices were identified as being closely associated with the superintendents that engaged in interest-based bargaining. However, the words relationship, trust, and collaboration, all words associated with the practice of “Enable Others to Act” were identified in all of the interviews with five superintendents. The final portion of phase two was a review and coding of the collective bargaining agreements that had been negotiated by the superintendents being interviewed. The only significant outcome of this portion of the research was that the superintendent with the leadership practice of “Challenge the Process,” had the most words associated with this dominant leadership practice identified in the collective bargaining agreement that he negotiated with the teachers’ union.

When this study was first undertaken, the researcher believed that the superintendent must build strong relationships with the teachers union in order to keep the interests of students at heart. This idea is focused on the fact that there are two “sides” coming to the table. As the research continued, it was possible for the researcher to see that the relationships and trust that are built between these parties (teachers and school district) allow for the two sides to become one cohesive bargaining unit focused

on the best interests of the children in the district. It is the hope of this researcher that the lessons learned from this study will resonate with superintendents so that the traditional view of collective bargaining (a one-time event that occurs every few years) dissipates. This will allow the superintendent to focus on the relationships that she or he develops in an effort to unite the district around a common vision for students and fewer disputes between districts and teachers at the bargaining table.

APPENDIX A
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT REQUEST

Kevin David Rubenstein
7094 S. Stratton Lane
Gurnee, IL 60031

Freedom of Information Officer
Illinois State Board of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777 – 0001

Dear FOIA Public Liaison:

This request comes to you pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act. I request that a copy of the following documents (or documents containing the following information) be provided to me:

A listing of names and contact information for individuals holding the title of Superintendent of Schools within public school districts that serve students in grades kindergarten through twelve. Contact information should include first and last name, public school district, county, mailing address, phone number, and e-mail address.

In order to help determine my status to assess fees, you should know that I am affiliated with Loyola University Chicago, an educational institution, and this request is being made for a scholarly purpose.

Please notify me if the fees will exceed \$25.00. This information can be e-mailed to me at krubenstein@luc.edu

Thank you for your prompt consideration and attention to this request.

Sincerely,

Mr. Kevin David Rubenstein

APPENDIX B

REQUEST FOR USE OF THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES

INVENTORY (LPI) – SELF ASSESSMENT

RESEARCH REQUEST FORM

We welcome interested academicians and scholars to request permission to use The Leadership Challenge or the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in empirical research studies. We consider permission requests from faculty members at accredited institutions of higher learning who are interested in using the LPI in research projects they are conducting; students at those institutions are also invited to apply. We do not provide such permission for

researchers connected with other institutions outside of higher education. Receiving permission to use The Leadership Challenge or the LPI in your research project does NOT include free copies of the instrument, books, or any Leadership Challenge-related resources. All products are available for purchase.

Please provide information about you and your proposed study in the form below. **ALL** fields must be completed in full. Click the “Submit” button below to submit your completed form electronically. You may also print out this Research Request Form and fax your completed document to Pfeiffer Editorial at 415-433-1711.

If you are interested in using the **Student LPI** in your research on undergraduate college students or youth, please complete the form [here](#).



INFORMATION ABOUT YOU

*** Required Fields**

First Name *

Last Name *

Gender *

Street_Address *

City *

State *

Zip *

Country *

Phone *

Company

Fax

Email *

Use the pulldown menus to indicate your current professional/educational status and then complete the corresponding fields. Choose all that apply.

Select a Status *

Major/Position *

Name of
Institution/Company *

INFORMATION ABOUT THE STUDY

Title of Study/Research *

Number of Participants *

Population Being Studied *

Institution Where Study is Occurring *

Scope of Project *

Superintendent's in the State of Illinois will be asked to participate in a study about their leadership practices as measured by the LPI-Self. Superintendent's who choose to participate in this study will complete the LPI-Self version and then this quantitative data will be combined with qualitative data gathered through a Superintendent's Demographic Profile. Finally, a selected group of superintendent's who utilize specific styles in collective bargaining with their teacher's unions will be interviewed. Results will be analyzed to determine any relationships that might exist between leadership practices and collective bargaining processes, procedures, and outcomes. Finally, the collective bargaining agreements of the chosen superintendent's will be analyzed and coded based on the five leadership practices.

Anticipated Start Date *

Anticipated End Date *

DO YOU PLAN TO USE LPI PRODUCT "SELF" OR "OBSERVER" FORMS (PURCHASED SEPARATELY) FOR THIS RESEARCH? :

Choose Your Option *

IN WHAT LANGUAGE DO YOU WISH TO USE THE LPI FOR YOUR RESEARCH?

Please fill in *

I would like more information about the forms ☒ yes

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF APPROVAL FOR USE OF THE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES

INVENTORY – SELF ASSESSMENT

JOSSEY-BASS™
An Imprint of **WILEY**

News

June 25, 2013

Kevin Rubenstein
7094 S. Stratton Lane
Gurnee, Illinois 60031

Dear Mr. Rubenstein:

Thank you for your request to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your dissertation. We are willing to allow you to **reproduce** the instrument in written form, as outlined in your request, at no charge. If you prefer to use our electronic distribution of the LPI (vs. making copies of the print materials) you will need to separately contact Lisa Shannon (lshannon@wiley.com) directly for instructions and payment. Permission to use either the written or electronic versions requires the following agreement:

- (1) That the LPI is used only for research purposes and is not sold or used in conjunction with any compensated management development activities;
- (2) That copyright of the LPI, or any derivation of the instrument, is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement is included on all copies of the instrument: "Copyright 8 2003 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission",
- (3) That one (1) **electronic** copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data be sent **promptly** to our attention; and,
- (4) That you agree to allow us to include an abstract of your study and any other published papers utilizing the LPI on our various websites.

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you indicate so by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it to me either via email or by post to; 1548 Camino Monde San Jose, CA 95125. Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,



Ellen Peterson
Permissions Editor
Epeter4@gmail.com

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed) Kevin D. Rubenstein Date: 06/25/2013

Expected Date of Completion is: May 30, 2014

WILEY

989 Market Street, Fifth Floor • San Francisco, CA 94103-1741

APPENDIX D
LETTER OF COOPERATION

Subject: Leadership Practices of Superintendents – Research Study

Dear Colleague,

You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Kevin David Rubenstein, a Doctoral candidate in the department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Loyola University in Chicago. The study is being conducted as a part of the research being completed for a dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Marla Israel, an Associate Professor in the School of Education.

You are being asked to participate because you currently hold the position of Superintendent of Schools in Illinois.

This study is being conducted in two phases. The first phase of the study is to identify the dominant leadership practices of Superintendents through the administration of the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) developed by James Kouzes and Barry Posner and to gather demographic information through the use of a demographic profile. After completing phase one, the researcher will attempt to interview five superintendents, one superintendent for each practice, who are representative of each of the dominant practices in an attempt to understand the collective bargaining processes, procedures, and outcomes in your district.

If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to:

- Complete the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) and a brief demographic profile about your district. The demographic profile will also include information about whether or not you wish to participate in phase two of the study. The *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* should take no more than 15 minutes to complete.
- Sign a copy of the consent agreement.

If you are chosen as one of the five superintendents that will be interviewed, the interview could last approximately one hour. Your participation in the study would be much appreciated. Should you wish to participate, please complete the attached letter of consent, demographic profile, and the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment*. Then return these three items to me using the self-addressed stamped envelope that I have enclosed. Please note that even if you indicate that you are willing to participate in this study by completing the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* and the Demographic Profile, you may opt out at any time by contacting me using the information provided.

I appreciate your assistance with this process. Should you have any questions or concerns in the meantime, please let me know.

Thank you,
Kevin

APPENDIX E

SUPERINTENDENTS' DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Name: _____

School District: _____

County: _____

Educational Background:

Age: _____ **Gender:** _____

Please mark the most appropriate answer:

1. *For how long have you been a superintendent in this school district?*

2. *Have you been a superintendent in any other districts?*
 - 2A. *If so, for how long did you serve in those districts?*

3. *Were you involved in the negotiation of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement with your teachers' union within the district that you are currently superintendent?*

4. *In which type of bargaining did you engage during your most recent negotiations?*

Interest-Based Bargaining *Win-Lose* *Unknown*

5. *Would you be willing to meet with the researcher to discuss your leadership style as it relates to the contract negotiations?*

Preferred Methods for Contacting You:

E-Mail: _____

Telephone: _____

APPENDIX F

CONSENT LETTER FOR PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH

Consent for Participation in Research

Project Title: Superintendent Leadership and Collective Bargaining Styles and Outcomes: A Sequential Explanatory Mixed Methods Approach

Researcher: Kevin David Rubenstein

Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Marla Israel

Introduction:

You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Kevin David Rubenstein, a Doctoral student in the department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Loyola University in Chicago. The study is being conducted as a part of the research being completed for a dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Marla Israel, an Associate Professor in the School of Education.

You are being asked to participate because you currently hold the position of Superintendent of Schools in Illinois.

Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

Background Information:

This study is being conducted in two phases. The first phase of the study is to identify the dominant leadership practices of Superintendents through the administration of the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013) developed by James Kouzes and Barry Posner and to gather demographic information through the use of a demographic profile. After completing phase one, the researcher will attempt to interview five superintendents, one superintendent for each practice, who are representative of each of the dominant practices in an attempt to understand the collective bargaining process and outcomes in your district.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in the study, you will be asked to:

- Complete the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (2013). The LPI should take between 15 and 20 minutes to complete.
- Complete a brief demographic profile about your background and your District. The demographic profile should take no more than five minutes to complete.
- Mail your completed *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment*, your demographic profile, and a signed copy of this consent agreement using the enclosed envelope.

- Upon receipt of your *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment*, the researcher will score the inventory using the procedures mandated by the publisher.
- If you indicated that you would be willing to participate in phase two of the research study and you represent a dominant leadership practice group, you may be asked to participate in phase two of the study which involves a semi-structured interview with the researcher.
- If you are asked to participate, you will then receive notification requesting that you participate in a semi-structured, in-person interview that could last up to an hour. During the interview, you will be asked to provide the researcher with a copy of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement that governs the relationship of your district and the teachers' union. The interview will be recorded and after the interview, you will receive a transcript of the interview so that you may verify the accuracy of your words.

Risks/Benefits:

This study has minimal risks to you as a participant. Your *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* protocol will be kept confidential from the public, but not anonymous to the researcher. Your identity as a research participant will not be disclosed and will not be included in the dissertation.

You may directly benefit from this study by completing the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment*. The LPI is an assessment that identifies the practices of leaders and is based on over thirty years of research in a wide variety of fields. Indirectly, your participation adds to the body of research in education, leadership, and the superintendency. It is hoped that the research cited in this study will be of use to current and future superintendents, boards of education, leaders, and scholars. Additionally, those superintendents who complete the demographic profile and the LPI will receive a personalized feedback report at no cost to you. At the conclusion of the study, you will receive information about the results of the study in aggregate form.

Compensation:

You will not receive direct compensation for your participation. However, if you participate, you will receive the *Leadership Practices Inventory* and customized feedback booklet about your leadership style at no cost to you.

Confidentiality:

Any information obtained in connection with this research study that can be identified with you will be disclosed only with your permission; your results will be kept confidential to the public, but not anonymous to the researcher. In any written reports or publications, no one will be identified or identifiable and only group data will be presented.

The inventories, transcripts of the interview, interview notes, and collective bargaining agreements will be kept confidential and the recordings of the interview will be kept in a

locked file cabinet with access only being provided to the researcher and his advisor. Upon completion of the dissertation, the researcher will destroy all original reports and identifying information that can be linked back to you.

As part of the approval for the use of the *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment*, the publisher of the tool requires the researcher to submit an electronic copy of the report to them for publication on their website. Nonetheless, none of your information will be personally identifiable.

Voluntary Participation:

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you do not want to be in this study, you do not have to participate. Even if you decide to participate, you are free not to answer any question or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

Contacts and Questions:

If you have questions about this research study, please feel free to contact me, Kevin David Rubenstein, at krubenstein@luc.edu or my faculty advisor, Dr. Marla Israel, at misrael@luc.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Loyola University Office of Research Services at (773) 508-2689

You may keep a copy of this form for your records.

Statement of Consent:

You are making a decision whether or not to participate. Your signature indicates that you have read this information and your questions have been answered. Even after signing this form, please know that you may withdraw from the study at any time.

I consent to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant

Date of Consent

Signature of Researcher

Date

APPENDIX G

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY – SELF ASSESSMENT



BY JAMES M. KOUZES & BARRY Z. POSNER

INSTRUCTIONS

Write your name in the space provided at the top of the next page. Below your name, you will find thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully, and using the rating scale below, ask yourself:

“How frequently do I engage in the behavior described?”

- Be realistic about the extent to which you actually engage in the behavior.
- Be as honest and accurate as you can be.
- DO NOT answer in terms of how you would like to behave or in terms of how you think you should behave.
- DO answer in terms of how you typically behave on most days, on most projects, and with most people.
- Be thoughtful about your responses. For example, giving yourself 10s on all items is most likely not an accurate description of your behavior. Similarly, giving yourself all 1s or all 5s is most likely not an accurate description either. Most people will do some things more or less often than they do other things.
- If you feel that a statement does not apply to you, it's probably because you don't frequently engage in the behavior. In that case, assign a rating of 3 or lower.

For each statement, decide on a response and then record the corresponding number in the box to the right of the statement. After you have responded to all thirty statements, go back through the LPI one more time to make sure you have responded to each statement. *Every statement must have a rating.*

The Rating Scale runs from 1 to 10. Choose the number that best applies to each statement.

RATING SCALE	1-Almost Never	3-Seldom	5-Occasionally	7-Fairly Often	9-Very Frequently
	2-Rarely	4-Once in a While	6-Sometimes	8-Usually	10-Almost Always

When you have completed the LPI-Self, please return it to:

Thank you.

Copyright © 2013 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved.

LPI: LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY SELF

Your name: _____

To what extent do you engage in the following behaviors? Choose the response number that best applies to each statement and record it in the box to the right of that statement.

1. I set a personal example of what I expect of others.	<input type="text"/>
2. I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.	<input type="text"/>
3. I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.	<input type="text"/>
4. I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.	<input type="text"/>
5. I praise people for a job well done.	<input type="text"/>
6. I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.	<input type="text"/>
7. I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.	<input type="text"/>
8. I challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.	<input type="text"/>
9. I actively listen to diverse points of view.	<input type="text"/>
10. I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities.	<input type="text"/>
11. I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.	<input type="text"/>
12. I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.	<input type="text"/>
13. I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.	<input type="text"/>
14. I treat others with dignity and respect.	<input type="text"/>
15. I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.	<input type="text"/>
16. I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people's performance.	<input type="text"/>
17. I show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.	<input type="text"/>
18. I ask "What can we learn?" when things don't go as expected.	<input type="text"/>
19. I support the decisions that people make on their own.	<input type="text"/>
20. I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.	<input type="text"/>
21. I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.	<input type="text"/>
22. I paint the "big picture" of what we aspire to accomplish.	<input type="text"/>
23. I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.	<input type="text"/>
24. I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.	<input type="text"/>
25. I find ways to celebrate accomplishments.	<input type="text"/>
26. I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.	<input type="text"/>
27. I speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.	<input type="text"/>
28. I experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.	<input type="text"/>
29. I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.	<input type="text"/>
30. I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.	<input type="text"/>

Copyright © 2013 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved.

LPI: LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY SELF

APPENDIX H

FIRST FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Dear Colleague,

I am writing to follow-up with you as I seek several documents that I mailed to you on September 11, 2013. These documents were sent to you because you currently hold the position of superintendent in the State of Illinois.

If you have not already done so, please take some time today to complete the consent agreement, Leadership Practices Inventory, and the demographic profile that were sent to you. These should take no more than 15 minutes to complete and, as a reminder, your participation is completely voluntary. If you have misplaced your materials, please contact me via e-mail at krubenstein@luc.edu so that I may send to you an additional copy of the packet of materials.

Additionally, if you no longer wish to participate in this research study, please contact me at krubenstein@luc.edu so that I may remove your name from the list of participants.

Should you have any questions or concerns in the interim, please let me know.

Thank you,

Kevin

Kevin David Rubenstein
Researcher

APPENDIX I

SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

IMPORTANT - SECOND NOTICE

Dear Colleague,

This is the second letter I have sent to you as I follow-up on a packet of materials that I sent to you three weeks ago. These documents were sent to you because you agreed to be a participant in a research study about the leadership practices of superintendents as they relate to collective bargaining procedures and outcomes.

Your participation in this study remains voluntary. However, your participation in this study is crucial to the success of my research project and your assistance would be much appreciated. Please take some time today to complete the consent agreement, Leadership Practices Inventory, and the demographic profile that were sent to you. These should take no more than 15 minutes to complete and, as a reminder, your participation is completely voluntary.

If you have misplaced your materials, please contact me via e-mail at krubenstein@luc.edu so that I may send to you an additional copy of the packet of materials.

Additionally, if you no longer wish to participate in this research study, please contact me at krubenstein@luc.edu so that I may remove your name from the list of participants.

Should you have any questions or concerns in the interim, please let me know.

Thank you,

Kevin

Kevin David Rubenstein
Researcher

APPENDIX J

THIRD FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

IMPORTANT - FINAL NOTICE

Dear Colleague,

Around one month ago, you received a packet of materials from me asking that you participate in a research study as I attempt to understand the leadership practices of school superintendents in Illinois as they relate to collective bargaining processes and outcomes. You were sent this packet of information because you serve as a superintendent in one of the districts that fall within these counties and because you indicated that you would complete the inventories.

Your participation in this study remains voluntary. However, your participation in this study is crucial to the success of my research project and your assistance would be much appreciated. Please take some time today to complete the consent agreement, Leadership Practices Inventory, and the demographic profile that were sent to you. These should take no more than 15 minutes to complete and, as a reminder, your participation is completely voluntary.

I have enclosed an additional copy of the materials that I sent to you and would appreciate it if you could help me out by completing these materials and returning them to me in the self-addressed, stamped envelope that I have enclosed with this letter.

Additionally, if you no longer wish to participate in this research study, please contact me at krubenstein@luc.edu so that I may remove your name from the list of participants.

Should you have any questions or concerns in the interim, please let me know.

I look forward to receiving your materials.

Thank you,

Kevin

Kevin David Rubenstein
Researcher

APPENDIX K

SCRIPT FOR CONTACTING SUPERINTENDENTS IN

PHASE II RESEARCH BY PHONE

Good afternoon, may I please speak with _____?

Hi, _____ my name is Kevin Rubenstein and I am a doctoral candidate at Loyola University in Chicago. I am calling you today because you recently, completed a demographic profile and The *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (LPI) (2013) as a part of my dissertation study that is being completed at Loyola University in Chicago. Did I catch you at a good time?

(Wait for Response from Participant)

– If YES, Continue with script below.

- If NO, I am sorry to bother you, when would be a good time for you and I to speak about your participation in this study?

I am calling you today because I wanted to thank you for your participation in this study and to inform you that, after completing an analysis of your LPI – Self Assessment, you appear to meet the criteria for Phase II of the research. During Phase II, you will be able to meet with me in-person to discuss your leadership practices and the collective bargaining agreement that you have with your teachers' union. The face-to-face interview will take between 60 and 90 minutes.

As you know, your participation in this study remains voluntary. However, your participation in this study is crucial to the success of my research project and your assistance would be much appreciated. Would you be willing to meet with me for a face-to-face interview at some point in the near future?

(Wait for Response from Participant)

– If YES, Continue with script below.

- If NO, Thank you so much for your assistance, I will take your name off of the list of participants.

When would be a good time for us to meet?

(Arrange a time that is convenient for the participant)

Where would you like to meet?

(Arrange a location for the meeting that is convenient for the participant)

Before you go, I wanted to make sure that you knew that if you no longer wish to participate in this research study, please contact me at krubenstein@luc.edu so that I may remove your name from the list of participants. Further, if you wish to opt-out at any time, you have the right as a participant to do so. Do you have any questions for me at this time?

Great, I am looking forward to meeting with you on (RECONFIRM DATE, TIME, AND LOCATION).

Thank you so much for your time. I look forward to seeing you soon.

APPENDIX L

SCRIPT FOR CONTACTING SUPERINTENDENTS FOR PHASE II

RESEARCH VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Dear Colleague,

Recently, you completed a demographic profile and The *Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Assessment* (LPI) (2013) as a part of a dissertation study that is being completed at Loyola University in Chicago. Thank you for your participation in this study. After completing an analysis of your LPI – Self Assessment, you appear to meet the criteria for Phase II of the research. During Phase II, you will be able to meet with me in-person to discuss your leadership practices and the collective bargaining agreement that you have with your teachers' union. The face-to-face interview will take between 60 and 90 minutes.

Your participation in this study remains voluntary. However, your participation in this study is crucial to the success of my research project and your assistance would be much appreciated. Would you please take a moment to let me know of some good times and dates where I could meet with you to complete this interview? I would be happy to meet with you at a time and location that is convenient for you.

I have attached a copy of your signed consent that you completed at the beginning of the study as evidence that your participation in this study remains voluntary. If you no longer wish to participate in this research study, please contact me at krubenstein@luc.edu so that I may remove your name from the list of participants.

Further, if you wish to opt-out at any time, you have the right as a participant to do so.

I look forward to hearing from you soon regarding dates and times for our meeting.

Should you have any questions or concerns in the interim, please let me know.

Thank you,

Kevin

Kevin David Rubenstein
Researcher

APPENDIX M

PROTOCOL FOR INTERVIEWS WITH THE SUPERINTENDENTS

Demographic Questions

Let's talk about your background:

How long have you been a superintendent?

What did you do before becoming a superintendent?

Have all of your school leadership experiences been in Illinois?

Questions about the contract with the teachers' union

What was your role in the negotiations?

Who else from your district was involved in negotiating this contract for the district?

Why were these people chosen to negotiate the contract?

How long is this contract in effect?

How long did it take to negotiate the agreement?

Describe the process for reaching the agreement with the teachers.

How was this process determined?

Would you categorize this process as Interest-Based Bargaining? If so, why?

What issues were in dispute during the bargaining process?

What was most important in the negotiation of this contract with the teachers?

Is there a portion of the contract that you are particularly proud of?

If you were to have another chance at negotiating this contract, what would be the one thing that you would want to be sure went differently?

Questions about superintendent leadership

How would you describe your leadership style?

How would the teachers from the bargaining team describe your leadership style?

If different: What do you think accounts for these different descriptions?

If same: Why do you think your description and their description of your leadership style are so similar?

Do you think that your leadership style had an impact on the process of negotiating this contract?

Your dominant leadership practice was found to be (identify his/her dominant leadership practice). Kouzes and Posner noted that people who are dominant in this leadership practice often (identify what Kouzes and Posner identify as key ideas in this practice). Do you feel this is descriptive of you and your leadership style?

Now knowing your dominant leadership practice, how do you think your leadership style impacted the process of negotiating this contract? Please be specific.

Is there anything else that you would like to share about how your leadership practices are demonstrated in your school district?

APPENDIX M
CONFIDENTIALITY AGREEMENT FOR TRANSCRIBER(S)

An examination of the leadership practices of superintendents in the State of Illinois as they relate to collective bargaining practices, procedures, and outcomes.

This research is being undertaken by Kevin David Rubenstein, candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education in the Department of Administration and Supervision at Loyola University in Chicago.

The purpose of the research is to explore leadership practices of school superintendents as they relate to collective bargaining practices, procedures, and outcomes.

As a transcriber of this research, I understand that I will be hearing recordings of confidential interviews. The information on these recordings has been revealed by interviewees who agreed to participate in this research on the condition that their interviews would remain strictly confidential. I understand that I have a responsibility to honor this confidentially agreement.

I agree not to share any information on these recordings, about any party, with anyone except the Researcher of this project. Any violation of this and the terms detailed below would constitute a serious breach of ethical standards and I confirm that I will adhere to the agreement in full.

I, _____ agree to:

1. Keep all the research information shared with me confidential by not discussing or sharing the content of the interviews in any form or format (e.g. WAV files, CDs, transcripts) with anyone other than the Researcher.
2. Keep all research information in any form or format (e.g. WAV files, CDs, transcripts) secure while it is in my possession.
3. Return all research information in any form or format (e.g. WAV files, CDs, transcripts) to the Researcher when I have completed the transcription tasks.
4. After consulting with the Researcher, erase or destroy all research information in any form or format regarding this research project that is not returnable to the Researcher (e.g. CDs, information stored on my computer hard drive).

Transcriber:

(Printed Name)

(Signature)

(Date)

Researcher:

Kevin David Rubenstein
(Printed Name)

(Signature)

(Date)

REFERENCE LIST

- AFL-CIO. (2013). *Collective bargaining*. Retrieved from <http://www.aflcio.org/Learn-About-Unions/Collective-Bargaining>
- Avena, E. (2005). *The experience of responsibility-based management in decision making: A grounded theory study*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Available from The Leadership Challenge research.
- Barnes, L. B., & Kriger, M. P. (1986). The hidden side of organizational leadership. *Sloan Management Review*, 28(1), 15-25.
- Barnett, K. (2012). Leadership and team dynamics in senior executive leadership teams. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 40(6), 653.
- Bird, J. J., & Wang, C. (2013). Superintendents describe their leadership styles: Implications for practice. *Management in Education*, 27(14), 14-18.
- Birnbaum, R., & Inman, D. (1984). The relationship of academic bargaining to changes in campus climate. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 55(5), 609-620.
- Cain, M. E., & Gunter, H. (2012). An investigation into primary school leadership practice: Introducing the PIVOT framework of leadership. *Management in Education*, 26(187), 187-191.
- Chinwah, L. (2012, November 05). Why so many teachers unions threaten to strike. *Daily Herald*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailyherald.com/article/20121105/news/711059944/>
- Clark, R. T., & O'Brien, D. (2001). Illinois public sector collective bargaining legislation: the first fifteen years. In J. Najita, & J. Stern (Eds.), *Collective bargaining in the public sector: The experience of eight states*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Cooper, B., & Sureau, J. (2008). Teacher unions and the politics of fear in labor relations. *Educational Policy*, 22(1), 86-105.
- Craffey, A. (2006). *A study of the leadership practices of charge nurses*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Available from The Leadership Challenge research.

- Creswell, J.W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed method research*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Crum, K. S., & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating high achievement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(5), 562-580.
- Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J., McKersie B., & Walton, R. E. (1995). *Pathways to change: Case studies of strategic negotiations*. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.
- Daresh, J. C., & Aplin, N. D. (1987). Educational leadership and the suburban superintendent. *Education*, 107(4), 447.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1-29). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ding, C. S. (2001). Profile analysis: Multidimensional scaling approach. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, 7(16). Retrieved August 6, 2013 from <http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=16>
- Espe J.A. (2007). *Effect of Baldridge award process on leadership practices*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Available from The Leadership Challenge research.
- Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. (2012). *A timeline of events in modern American labor relations*. Retrieved from Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service website: <http://www.fmcs.gov/internet>
- Fields, D. L., & Herold, D. M. (1997). Using the leadership practices inventory to measure.. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57(4), 569.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (1981). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in* (1st ed.). New York: Penguin Group USA.
- Foor, J. (2004). *Leader behavior effect on staff nurse empowerment*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Available from The Leadership Challenge research.

- Green, J. (2012). *A study of the leadership behaviors of women in local government*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Available from The Leadership Challenge research.
- Green, R. L., & Etheridge, C. P. (1999). Building collaborative relationships for instructional improvement. *Education*, 120(2), 388-397.
- Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(3).
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness* (1st ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Greenlee, D. (2002). *Leadership practices of industry leaders in northeast Tennessee*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Available from The Leadership Challenge research.
- Grosso, M. Geneva School District 304 Board of Education. (2012). *Geneva Community Unit School District 304 Board of Education's final offer to the Geneva Education Association, IEA-NEA*. Retrieved from website: <http://www2.illinois.gov/elrb/Pages/acts.aspx>
- Harvey, A. (2004). *A study of the leadership practices of police officers*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Available from The Leadership Challenge research.
- Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2004). When leadership spells danger. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 33-37.
- Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009) *The practice of adaptive leadership: tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Boston, MA.: Harvard Business Press.
- Hulpia, H., & Devos, G. (2010). How distributed leadership can make a difference in teachers' organizational commitment? A qualitative study. *Teaching and Teacher Leadership*, 26(2010), 565-575.
- Illinois Administrative Code, Part 23, Chapter I, Section 29.130, (2004).
- Illinois General Assembly. (1983). *House transcript for May 18, 1983*. Retrieved from Legislative Information System website: <http://www.ilga.gov/house/transcripts/htrans83/HT051883.pdf>
- Illinois Education Labor Relations Act (1983). ILCS 5/1 Chapter 48

- Illinois State Board of Education. (2012, October 15). *Fall enrollment counts*. Retrieved from http://www.isbe.net/research/htmls/fall_housing.htm
- Illinois State Board of Education. (2013, July 01). *2012 Illinois state board of education teachers' salary study*. Retrieved from http://www.isbe.net/research/pdfs/teacher_salary_12-13.pdf
- Illinois Policy Institute. (2010). *Bargaining for better schools an introduction to collective bargaining in Illinois public education*. Chicago, IL: DOI: www.illinoispolicy.org/uploads/files/collectivebargainingprimer.pdf
- Ireh, M., & Bailey, J. (1999). A study of superintendents. *Secondary Education*, 27(4), 23-32.
- Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. S. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1, 112-133.
- Joiner Jr., C.W. (1987). *Leadership for change*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- Kahlenberg, R. D. (2006). The history of collective bargaining among teachers. In J. Hannaway, & A. Rotheram (Eds.), *Collective bargaining in education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Karen, L. S., Sherman, W. H., & Clayton, J. (2011). Leadership practices of successful middle school principals. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(1), 31-45.
- Kearney, R. C. (2009). *Labor relations in the public sector* (4th ed., Vol. Chapter 5). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Kellner, S. (2012). *Superintendent leadership and student achievement in suburban high schools: A sequential explanatory mixed methods analysis*. (Doctoral dissertation), Available from ProQuest (3549440).
- Klingel, S. (2003). *Interest based bargaining in education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2007). *Exploring leadership, for college students who want to make a difference* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley and Sons.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2008). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2012). *The leadership challenge* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. (2013). *The Leadership Practices Inventory: Self* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Larson, S., & Nissen, B. (1987). *Theories of the labor movement*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Leithwood, K. (2005). *Educational leadership: A review of the research*. Philadelphia, PA: The Laboratory for Student Success.
- Mack, K. (2011, July 22). Emanuel sending kids to private school. *The Chicago Tribune*. Retrieved from http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2011-07-22/news/ct-met-rahm-emanuel-childrens-school-20110722_1_selective-enrollment-schools-catholic-schools-high-schools
- Malin, J. (1985). Implementing the Illinois educational labor relations act. *The Chicago Kent Law Review*, 61(1), 101-122.
- McAdams, R. P., & Zinck, R. (1998). The power of the superintendent's leadership in shaping school district culture. *ERS Spectrum*, 16(4), 3-10.
- Mendez-Morse, S. (1992). *Leadership characteristics that facilitate school change*. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/change/leadership/history.html>
- Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Murphy, M. (1990). *Blackboard unions: The AFT and the NEA, 1900-1980*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Obama, B. (2008, November 03). *Barack Obama, the last rally – Manassas, Virginia*. Retrieved from <http://obamaspeeches.com/E-Barack-Obama-Speech-Manassas-Virgina-Last-Rally-2008-Election.htm>
- Orr, M. T., & Orphanos, S. (2011). How graduate-level preparation influences the effectiveness of school leaders: A comparison of the outcomes of exemplary and conventional leadership preparation programs for principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(1), 18-36.

- Ortiz, F., & Hendrick, W. (1987). A comparison of leadership styles and organizational cultures: implications for educational equity. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership*, 7(2), 146-160.
- Patton, B. (2004). *Building relationships and the bottom line: The circle of value approach to negotiation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Negotiating Project.
- Patton, B. (2005). Negotiation. In M. Moffitt & R. Bordone (Eds.), *The handbook of dispute resolution*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Posner, B. Z., & Kouzes, J. M. (1988). Psychometric properties of the Leadership Practices Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 48(1), 483.
- Pugh, A. G., Fillingim, J. G., Blackburn, J. M., Bunch, D., & Thomas, C. (2011). Faculty validation of the leadership practices inventory with secondary school principals. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 28(3), 4-11.
- Richards, L. (2005). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide* (1st ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Ristow, W. (1999). *The impact of selected education labor relations decisions on the policies and practices of selected public school districts in Illinois*. (Doctoral dissertation), Available from Dissertations and Theses @ Loyola University Chicago ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (PQDT).
- Roelle, R. J. (2009). *Better school superintendents, more effective principals? A study of superintendent leadership practices and principal job satisfaction*. (Doctoral dissertation), Available from ProQuest (340764).
- Rubin, B., & Rubin, R. (2006). Labor-management relations: Conditions for collaboration. *Public Personnel Management*, 35(4), 283-298.
- Sayre, C. W. (2007). *The superintendent's maintenance and influence on classroom instructional capacity: A mixed method study*. (Doctoral dissertation), Available from ProQuest. (3351664).
- Schachter, R. (2010). Toward a more perfect union. *District Administration*, 46(3), 28-33.
- Schmoker, M. (2001). *The results fieldbook*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The Sage dictionary of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2007). *Rethinking leadership. A collection of articles* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- State of Illinois. (2013, January 27). *Impasse final offers*. Retrieved from <http://www2.illinois.gov/elrb/Pages/FinalOffers.aspx>
- Strunk, K. O, & McEachin, A. (2011). Accountability under constraint: The relationship between collective bargaining agreements and California schools' and districts' performance under no child left behind. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(4), 871-903.
- Trochim, W. M. (2006, October 10). *The research methods knowledge base*. Retrieved from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/>
- U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistic. United States Census Bureau, (2012). *Union members in 2010*. Retrieved from website: <http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2012/tables/12s0665.pdf>
- Varkados, A. D. (2012). *Washington state superintendents: Experiences with and perspectives on the collective bargaining process*. (Doctoral dissertation), Available from ProQuest. (3517461).
- Walton, R., & McKersie, R. (1965). *A behavioral theory of labor negotiations: an analysis of social interaction system* (2nd ed., pp. 11-13). Ithaca, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Wasonga, T. A. (2009). Leadership practices for social justice, democratic community, and learning: School principals' perspectives. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19(2), 200-224.
- Waters, J. T., & Marzano, R. J. (2006). *School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Wilson, D. B. (2010). *Practices that constitute successful school superintendent leadership: Perceptions from established rural school superintendents*. (Doctoral dissertation), Available from ProQuest (3488899).
- Witwer, D. S. (2000). Unionized teamsters and the struggle over the streets of the early-twentieth-century city. *Social Science History*, 24(1), 183 - 222.

VITA

Kevin David Rubenstein is the son of David and Kathy Rubenstein. He was born on November 4, 1977 at Northwest Community Hospital in Arlington Heights, IL and currently resides in Gurnee, IL.

After attending elementary and secondary schools in Buffalo Grove, IL, Rubenstein attended Illinois State University in Normal, IL and earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Political Science in 1999. In 2002, Rubenstein earned a Master of Science from the University of Southern Maine in Adult and Higher Education. In 2005, Rubenstein earned a Master of Arts in Teaching in Special Education from National Louis University; and in 2009, Rubenstein earned a Master of Science in Education in Educational Leadership from Northern Illinois University. He holds a Professional Educator License in the State of Illinois with endorsements as a Learning Behavior Specialist I (PK-21), General School Administrator, Director of Special Education, and Superintendent.

Rubenstein has held the position of teacher, Student Services Coordinator, and currently serves as the Director of Student Services and Curriculum in Lake Bluff School District 65. He has also held positions with Deerfield Public Schools District 109, Lincolnshire-Prairie View School District 103, Lake Zurich Community Unit School District 95, Adlai E. Stevenson High School District 125, The George Washington University, and the University of Southern Maine.

In 2013, Rubenstein joined the Golden Apple Foundation selection team and will serve as its chair in the 2014- 2015 selection cycle. He is also an active member of the Illinois Alliance of Administrators in Special Education (IAASE) and is the moderator of the #iledchat, a weekly Twitter chat for educators in the State of Illinois.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

The Dissertation submitted by Kevin David Rubenstein has been read and approved by the following committee:

Marla Israel, Ed.D., Director
Associate Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

Meng-Jia Wu, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago

Harry Rossi, Ed.D.
Part-Time Lecturer, School of Education
Loyola University Chicago