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The purpose of this study was to examine the power and competing value profiles of directors of education in the Province of Saskatchewan. The objectives were: (1) to identify the power and competing value profiles of directors; (2) to examine the affects of the directors’ context on their perceived use of power and value; (3) to determine how the power and competing value profiles were related; and (4) to identify the characteristics of power and value that directors considered important to their practices as educational leaders.

Quinn’s (1988) Competing Values Framework of Power and Influence was adopted as the conceptual framework. This model integrated the underlying power and value characteristics of leadership behaviour with the different organizational forms in theory. The Richardson Power Profile (Richardson & Thompson, 1981) and Quinn’s (1988) Prism 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment questionnaires were employed as the primary data gathering sources. In addition, semi-structured interviews were used as a supplementary data source.

Sixty-five directors of education responded to the RPP and the CV questionnaires for a 72.2 percent response rate. In addition, eight of the respondents were randomly selected and interviewed.

Heckscher (1994) suggested that the two fundamental shifts in the contemporary work place are from the use of power to influence and from bureaucracy to human accomplishment. This study showed that education
systems in Saskatchewan are moving toward more contemporary models of management. The data analyses found that directors preferred to use relational power and mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour. Furthermore, the study found that directors preferred to use relational power and mentor values to break down the traditional hierarchical structure of their education systems in order to move toward a team structure.

The findings from the study highlight the vital role directors play in organizing their school divisions. The findings call into question the traditional uses of power and value to maintain a hierarchical organizational structure. Rather, they suggest that educational leaders are using power and value to promote a team atmosphere in their school divisions. As such, directors are exerting their power as a source of energy for achieving shared goals and purposes, and are promoting organizational values that allow employees to maximize their individual potential within a mutually dependent environment.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the power and competing value profiles of directors of education in the Province of Saskatchewan. The objectives were: (1) to identify the power and competing value profiles of directors; (2) to examine the affects of the directors' context on their perceived use of power and value; (3) to determine how the power and competing value profiles were related; and (4) to identify the characteristics of power and value that directors considered important to their practices as educational leaders.

Quinn's (1988) Competing Values Framework of Power and Influence was adopted as the conceptual framework. This model integrated the underlying power and value characteristics of leadership behaviour with the different organizational forms in theory. The Richardson Power Profile (Richardson & Thompson, 1981) and Quinn’s (1988) Prism 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment questionnaires were employed as the primary data gathering sources. In addition, semi-structured interviews were used as a supplementary data source.

Sixty-five directors of education responded to the RPP and the CV questionnaires for a 72.2 percent response rate. In addition, eight of the respondents were randomly selected and interviewed.

Heckscher (1994) suggested that the two fundamental shifts in the contemporary work place are from the use of power to influence and from bureaucracy to human accomplishment. This study showed that directors of education in Saskatchewan are moving toward more contemporary models of management. The data analyses found that directors preferred to use relational power and mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour. Furthermore, the study found that directors preferred to use
relational power and mentor values to break down the traditional hierarchical structure of their education systems in order to move toward a team structure.

The findings from the study highlight the vital role directors play in organizing their school divisions. The findings call into question the traditional uses of power and value to maintain a hierarchical organizational structure. Rather, they suggest that educational leaders are using power and value to promote a team atmosphere in their school divisions. As such, directors are exerting their power as a source of energy for achieving shared goals and purposes, and are promoting organizational values that allow employees to maximize their individual potential within a mutually dependent environment.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Education systems across North America are facing increased criticism from both the public and the private sectors of society. The critics purport that our education systems are refractory and therefore incapable of meeting the demands of today's rapidly changing environment (Pal, 1992; Luke, 1991; Reich, 1988; Deal, 1990; Louis & Miles, 1990). Specifically, they suggest that students are ill prepared to contribute to a workforce that is technologically advanced and rapidly changing (Young, 1986; Wright, 1988; Farrell, 1991; Hunter, 1990). On the other hand, educators recognize the formidable challenges of delivering quality services to students amid an educational scene that is bereft of resources and public participation (Walker, 1993; McCabe, 1990).

Education systems are facing many problems, and are continually adapting in an attempt to better meet the demands of the contemporary workplace. Heckscher (1994) argues that the current changes in organizations can best be understood as part of a long term shift with two basic characteristics. "The first is that a type of organization is being invented centered on the use of influence rather than power. The second is that this type of organization is not merely different from bureaucracy but is an evolutionary development beyond it, generating a greater capacity for human accomplishment" (p. 14). Heckscher's comments reflect the emergence of the interactive model of organization, where
power is a shared resource that is used toward the accomplishment of organization-wide aims and goals, and the culture of the organization is embedded with a higher level value system that emphasizes the collective good of the whole over the self-interest of the individual. In addition, Heckscher’s description of the interactive model is representative of the postmodern movement in organizational studies (Heckscher & Donnellon, 1995; Reed and Hughes, 1992).

There is considerable debate over which organizational form can best meet the challenges and needs in education. Walker (1993) identifies the dual, and often contradictory, role of education systems and their leaders who "must ensure that schooling preserves and communicates the values of society and yet also be on the forefront of educational, social, and technological change" (p. 3). There are researchers who believe that the predominant closed community model of organization is superior and therefore can continue to meet the current educational challenges (Krackhardt, 1994; Gergen, 1992; Davis, 1984; Kets de Vries, 1980; Turner, 1978). Other people believe that the interactive model of organization is the only organizational form that can adapt to the immense demographic, political, and economic changes of recent years (Heckscher, 1994; Donnellon & Scully, 1994; Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994; Gergen, 1992; Burrell, 1992).

The emergence of the interactive model of organization has served to further expand the spectrum of administrative philosophy into the postmodern domain. Hodgkinson (1991) states:

The spectrum of administrative philosophy is very large; it begins in the dirt and ends in the stars. It aspires to the highest ideals of the species, builds nations and empires, seeks
honor, glory, posterity and at the same time encompasses all the flaws and defects that the human condition is heir to, including malevolence, hatred, envy, greed, lust and rage. Even its greatest achievements are limited to some measure of perversity and corruption, yet always, somehow, it places the whole above the part, the greater against the lesser interests, the nomothetic over the ideographic, ends in advance of means. Great organizations are always in some sense ideological or educational; they seek to change their members, make them conform to their own ideal, subscribe to their culture. So leaders become educators, and educators become leaders, and the moral burden is inescapable. (p.84)

Hodgkinson's comments are important for two reasons. First, he threatens the very core of the bureaucratic structure within which education predominates (Gordon, 1994; Heckscher, 1994), and he represents a transformation from a traditional top-down, management controlled hierarchy to a true collaborative process that opens up information and public dialogue across all levels of the organization (Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994). Second, he postulates that leaders must apply a moral philosophy to "curb the natural tendency of organizational members to over emphasize individual spiritedness, or emphasis on self" (p.85).

Within this context, a particular emphasis is placed upon the educative role of the leader. Here, leaders engage with followers in such a way as to raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality in an attempt to enhance the achievement of shared goals and purposes (Burns, 1978). To do so, relations are established based on the problems at hand rather than predetermined by the structure of the organization. In addition, an environment of unconstrained dialogue is encouraged to maximize the use of intelligence found throughout all
levels of the organization. Therefore, the contemporary educational leader must alter his/her use of power and redistribute it more fairly throughout the collectivity (Heckscher, 1994; McClelland, 1975).

The postmodern principles of the interactive organization raise some troublesome questions in the field of educational administration. Do educational systems and their leaders need or want to align their practices with the interactive model's transformational principles? If so, can they successfully change given the overbearing bureaucratic system within which they operate? These questions suggest that, even if there is a need for educational leaders to alter their practices, a successful transformation may be difficult. In recent years, researchers have not only identified a crisis in educational leadership and hence, a need for educational reform (Weick, 1982; Reich, 1987; Luke, 1988; Pal, 1992; Burns, 1978; Sergiovanni, 1992), they have assessed the limited successes of transformational attempts within a larger bureaucratic structure (Adams & Ingersol, 1990; Burrell, 1992; Donnellon & Scully, 1994; Foster, 1986; Gergen, 1992; Heckscher, 1994; Heckscher & Applegate, 1994; Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994). Furthermore, researchers have indicated that strong leadership is critical to the success of any organizational reform movement (Hodgkinson, 1991; Gordon, 1994; Vaill, 1991; Barth, 1994; Louis & Miles, 1990).

In education systems, the chief executive officer is recognized for having the potential to considerably influence the organization. For example, Leithwood & Musella (1991) suggest that Directors of Education heavily influence organizational aims and goals, resource acquisition, staff relations, communication within groups, organizational
vision, and team building. Other researchers have identified the educational leader as someone who changes and shapes the culture of the organization (LaRocque & Coleman, 1991; Firestone & Wilson, 1985; Weick & Daft, 1983; Smirich & Morgan, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1982).

Though Directors of Education have considerable power and, therefore, the greatest potential to influence the values, norms, and expectations that underpin the culture of the organization, little is known about the practices of these chief executive officers. Gronn (1987) states there are few "systematic attempts to describe, analyze, and explain everyday administration as it [is] experienced by people, let alone to seek to learn from those experiences" (pp.105-106). Leithwood & Musella (1991) and Leithwood & Steinbach (1992) add that very few studies on the superintendent exist, and that past studies have paid little attention to the leader’s internal processes, attitudes, values, and beliefs.

In recent years, the works of Sergiovanni (1990, 1992), Leithwood & Musella (1991), Hodgkinson (1991), Maxy (1991), Ashbough & Kaston (1991), Smyth (1989), and Foster (1986) have addressed the ethical and affective domain in educational research. However, Walker (1995) states, past researchers have studied general leadership behavior and practices "without sufficient content, depth of insight, or grounds for developing meaningful understandings of the nature of the educational leader's work" (p. 214). These comments reflect the study of educational administrators, specifically their motives in thought and action, as a highly untapped field of research. Furthermore, they signify the need to better understand the nature of educational administration, particularly
the underlying power and values that influence the practices of educational leaders.

The Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education in the Province of Saskatchewan. The basic purpose of the study was addressed through the following questions:

1. What are the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education in the province of Saskatchewan?

2. What are the differences between groups of Directors and their perceptions of power and competing values based on their context (experience, location, gender, education, and size of the organization)?

3. To what extent does the Director's context (experience, location, gender, education, and size of organization) affect his/her power and value orientations?

4. How are the power and competing value profiles related?

5. What characteristics of power and values do Directors consider to be important in their practices as educational leaders?

Significance of the Study

The study of Director perceptions of power and competing values within the organization may be of considerable significance to the province of Saskatchewan. In recent years, theorists have called for educational leaders to recognize the inescapable moral burden of
leadership (Foster, 1986; Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977; Hodgkinson, 1991, 1983). Heckscher (1994) and Adams and Ingersol (1990) argue that administrators must transform their practices away from the traditional bureaucratic orientation in order to successfully administrate the emerging forms of organization. In this study, Quinn's (1988) Competing Values Framework of Power and Influence is introduced with the intent of providing educational leaders the means to examine the competing values that affect their administrative endeavors.

A second point of significance for this study is the identification of the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education in the province of Saskatchewan. Educational leaders are facing a number of environmental pressures to ensure the delivery of quality educational services. McCoy (1985) suggests the escalation of human problems and the increasing power and complexity of organizations are two fundamental changes to the environment that leaders work in. Because of these emerging problems, Hodgkinson (1991) and McClelland (1975) recognize the need for leaders to study value and power to gain a better understanding of organizational activity. For example, Hodgkinson (1991) states that it is necessary for educational administrators to study values to gain self-knowledge and understanding, to gain a greater understanding of others, and to make progress with problems of division, antagonism, and conflict. McClelland (1975), on the other hand, states "leadership and power appear as two closely related concepts, and if we want to understand better effective leadership, we may begin by studying the power motive in thought and action" (p.254).
leadership (Foster, 1986; Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977; Hodgkinson, 1991, 1983). Heckscher (1994) and Adams and Ingersol (1990) argue that administrators must transform their practices away from the traditional bureaucratic orientation in order to successfully administrate the emerging forms of organization. In this study, Quinn's (1988) Competing Values Framework of Power and Influence is introduced with the intent of providing educational leaders the means to examine the competing values that affect their administrative endeavors.

A second point of significance for this study is the identification of the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education in the province of Saskatchewan. Educational leaders are facing a number of environmental pressures to ensure the delivery of quality educational services. McCoy (1985) suggests the escalation of human problems and the increasing power and complexity of organizations are two fundamental changes to the environment that leaders work in. Because of these emerging problems, Hodgkinson (1991) and McClelland (1975) recognize the need for leaders to study value and power to gain a better understanding of organizational activity. For example, Hodgkinson (1991) states that it is necessary for educational administrators to study values to gain self-knowledge and understanding, to gain a greater understanding of others, and to make progress with problems of division, antagonism, and conflict. McClelland (1975), on the other hand, states "leadership and power appear as two closely related concepts, and if we want to understand better effective leadership, we may begin by studying the power motive in thought and action" (p.254).
highest function of the executive and requires a deep understanding of human nature which includes motivation, but reaches beyond into the domain of value possibilities (Hodgkinson, 1983).

2. **Morality**: the set of values that have to do with how humans cooperate and coordinate their activities in the serving of human welfare, and how they adjudicate conflict among individual interests (Figurski, 1992).

3. **Collaborative processes**: the processes of engaging organizational members in making decisions and generating aims and goals of the organization regardless of official position.

4. **Motivation**: the strength toward some behavioral act or behavioral pattern which an individual has at any point of time. It is the result of inner motive strength, channeled by values and patterns of preferred behavior arising out of identity, and affected by the person’s perceptions of external forces (Gibson, 1980).

5. **Power**: the potential to influence other people (Bass, 1981). Quinn (1988) identifies the four major types of power used by leaders as: legitimate power, based on followers' feelings of "oneness" with the leader; expert power, based on the perception that an administrator possesses insight or expertise; relational power, based on the leader's use of power to form and sustain relationships that tend to the needs of followers; and reward power, based on the ability to reward.

6. **Power-over**: the technical rational concept of power that is designed to control what people do, when they do it, and how they do it. Power, in this sense, facilitates the development of asymmetrical power relations in groups and, therefore, adopts a negative connotation.
7. **Power-to**: the positive side of power that is used for the achievement of shared goals and purposes. Power, in this sense, does not rest in the hands of top management, it is shared among the collectivity.

8. **Interactive organizations**: the models of organization that symbolize a transformation away from the bureaucratic-rational definition of offices to a true collaborative process that opens up information and public dialogue across boundaries in a context of consensus on basic organizational directions and principles (Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994).

9. **Closed Community Organizations**: The models of organization where the coordination of activity is controlled by forging a consensus around goals and aims that are formulated and promulgated by the top management (Gordon, 1994).

10. **Perception**: the manner in which people view the world around them, the process by which sensory inputs are received and organized into useful concepts (Middlemast & Hilt, 1981).

11. **Ethics**: those principles of honor and morality, or the moral principles of the individual.

12. **Values**: the collective conscience that serves to guide the ethical and moral actions of individuals within a group or organization.

13. **Competing Values**: The competing set of values that integrate conflicting leadership behaviors with different organizational perspectives (Quinn, 1988). For example, in a cooperative team, the leader may adopt the role of a mentor or facilitator. In a hierarchy, the leader may be a monitor or coordinator. In a rational firm, the leader may act as a director.
or producer. And finally, in an adhocracy, leadership behavior may reflect that of an innovator and a broker.

14. Director of Education: in Saskatchewan, the individual appointed by the board of education as the chief executive officer of that board of education. The power and duties of a Director are prescribed by the board of education in accordance with Sections 107(1-6), 108(1-2), and 109(1-2) of the Education Act, 1995 in Saskatchewan, and in Section 2 (h) of the LEADS Act, 1991.

Assumptions

The study made the following assumptions:

1. It was assumed that the concepts of power and competing values may be accurately assessed through the perceptions of the participants in the social environment.

2. It was assumed that the measurement tools chosen for the purposes of this study were sufficiently reliable and valid.

3. It was assumed that the respondents responded honestly, accurately, and voluntarily to the questionnaire and interview, and were representative of the population.

4. It was assumed that Directors of Education heavily influence the aims, goals, and achievements of the education system in Saskatchewan.

Delimitations of the Study

This study was delimited to the study of power and competing values at the level of Director of Education in the Province of
Saskatchewan. It was further delimited to Directors of Education and the perceptions they hold about their power and competing value profiles. The study was also delimited to the research questionnaires and interviews designed to measure these constructs. As a result, the study was delimited to the measurement of power as outlined by Richardson & Thompson (1981), and the measurement of competing values as outlined by Quinn (1988). Finally, the study was delimited to the study of the population of directors in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Limitations of the Study

This study has all the limitations of survey research. In exploring power and values from the Directors' perspective, some of the important investigation of interpretations held by such individuals may have been overlooked. In addition, the study was limited to the perceptions of Directors; board members, principals, teachers, and students were not included in the study.

Moos (1979) and Walberg (1976) identify the succinct nature of soliciting the perceptions of actual participants as an advantage over observational methods. On the other hand, Oppenheim (1966) suggests that a lack of awareness of unconscious motives, faulty perceptions, and deliberate or accidental errors may reduce the overall validity and reliability of the research.

The study was also limited to the use of pooled perceptions. Randhawa & Fu (1974) suggest that individual personality factors influence perceptions and, therefore, tend to obscure individual
differences. Finally, the data for the study were collected through questionnaires and interviews, and therefore had the limitations associated with the human being as the research instrument.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter 1 provided a statement of the problem to be studied and the background to the problem. In addition, research questions, the significance of the study, definition of terms, and assumptions, delimitations, and limitations of the study were provided. Chapter 2 provides a detailed review of the relevant literature pertaining to organizational forms, power, and competing values, and discusses their relationship to Directors of Education. Chapter 3 includes a description of the research methodology for the study and Chapter 4 provides the analysis of the data collected. In Chapter 5, the results of the study are discussed. Chapter 6 provides a summary of the study, and the implications for theory, practice, and research.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In much of the contemporary organizational literature, there has been a transformation away from the traditional top-down, management controlled hierarchy to a true collaborative process that opens up information and public dialogue across all levels of the organization (Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994). Many scholars support the traditional closed community model of organization, where the formulation and promulgation of organizational aims and goals are the exclusive responsibility of top-management (Krackhardt, 1994; Gordon, 1994; Wardell, 1994; Kets de Vries, 1980). Other writers argue that an interactive model of organization is superior. Here, the leader’s role is to develop unconstrained dialogue among all group members to generate cultural consensus. Pivotal to the success of this challenge is the leader’s application of a moral philosophy to action and the alteration of the use of power throughout the organization, moving towards teamwork that is coordinated by influence and dialogue (Heckscher, 1994; Heckscher & Applegate, 1994; Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1994, 1992, 1987; Hodgkinson, 1991, 1983; Burns, 1978).

The transformational principles of the interactive model redefine the role of organizational leadership and challenge the traditional nature of administration, thereby creating a malaise in the field of organizational studies. As a result, scholars are challenging the infallibility of
bureaucracy and revisiting questions about the nature of administration: What is leadership? Is the leader a definer of values? What are the underlying internal processes, attitudes, and beliefs that govern leadership behaviour and practice? Specifically, how do power motives and competing values affect the nature of administration? The remainder of the chapter is intended to provide the basis to answer these questions. To begin, organizational forms are discussed, followed by an outline of Directors as educational leaders. Then, the concepts of power and competing values in administration are examined. Finally, a conceptual framework is proposed that integrates power and competing values with the organizational forms outlined in this study.

Organizational Forms

Throughout history competing organizational forms have emerged that represent the general frames and perspectives people have about administration. Quinn (1988) states, "these are far more than simple abstractions about organizing; in fact we can call them powerful moral positions that influence every aspect of organizational life" (p. 38). Quinn categorizes the organizational literature into four notions of organizing: the Hierarchy, the Firm, the Adhocracy, and the Team.

The Hierarchy is described as the oldest and most pervasive notion of organization that began with Max Weber's writings on bureaucracy. A well established hierarchy was thought to provide stability and predictability by emphasizing the processes of measurement, documentation, and information management. The leader's role within such a system was to monitor the general behavior and administration,
and to coordinate this activity by maintaining the structure and flow of the organization.

Quinn described the Firm as the most common notion of organizing. Here the system is a rational economic tool that emphasizes profit or the bottom line. The Firm assumes that people must be clearly instructed by a decisive authority figure that relies on financial rewards for good performance. In this sense, the leader’s role as a producer and director is to clarify expectations through processes such as planning and goal setting, decisive initiation of problem solving, and the setting of organizational aims and goals.

The organizational notion of the Adhocracy has emerged in the last fifteen years. Terms such as "organic system, flat system, loosely-coupled system, matrix, and temporary system have been used to describe this way of organizing" (Quinn, 1988, p. 40). The Adhocracy’s strength is in its ability to foster adaptation and change within a collective environment. The leader is perceived to be politically astute, persuasive, influential, and powerful. His/her role as an innovator and broker serves to garner the appropriate resources to fuel creative problem solving.

Finally, the Team approach to organizing is based on the principles of Japanese management (Ouchi, 1981) and stresses consensus, cohesion, and teamwork. Human resources and the development of commitment are emphasized through information sharing and participative decision making. The leader’s role within the Team is to facilitate group problem solving while acting as a mentor to help people grow and develop.

Quinn’s four notions of organizing are representative of the bureaucratic and closed community forms of organization. The central
characteristic of these organizational forms is their maintenance of a centralized power base, where organizational aims and goals are formulated and promulgated by the top management (Heckscher & Applegate, 1994). Quinn's four notions of organizing have varying degrees of control (the Hierarchy and the Firm) and flexibility (the Adhocracy and the Team), however, they assume that strong leadership is necessary to maintain clear organizational goals and purposes.

In recent years, the interactive model of organization has emerged to challenge the bureaucratic principles that underpin these existing forms of organization. The interactive model symbolizes a transformation beyond bureaucracy by redistributing the resource of power more fairly throughout all levels of the organization. In this sense, leadership becomes decentralized and facilitates the development of true collaborative processes that open up information and public dialogue across all levels of the organization. As a result, increased demands are being placed on organizational leaders to bring their practices more in line with the interactive model of organization. The following section will compare the closed community and the interactive models of organization, and discuss the implications they have for Directors of Education.

The Closed Community Model

The closed community model of organization is based on the coordination of activity by forging a consensus around goals and aims that are formulated and promulgated by the top management. Gordon (1994) describes the closed community as a competing, less bureaucratic, and less formally structured model that predominates in
Japanese industry and in almost all large U.S. corporations. A central theme of the closed community model is the necessity of strong leadership and its role in creating and perpetuating a homogeneous company culture (Krackhardt, 1994). The communication of culture is accomplished by a linear cascade approach that serves to explicitly separate top management from the rank and file, thereby delimiting the access to power to those holding office in the upper echelons of the organization (Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994).

The rationale for a centralized power-base is the belief that democratic participation about basic organizational direction does not work and, therefore, should not be tried. Kets de Vries (1980) reflects this opinion by suggesting that democratic participation of this nature results in a "highly ambiguous and uncertain organizational environment in which boundaries delineating interpersonal relationships are extremely hard to determine" (p. 49). On these grounds, it is assumed that leaders are the ones who set and reset organizational beliefs, and that the rank and file are the ones who are relegated to the role of effecting change rather than causing it (Davis, 1984). As a result, "top management restricts the domain of participation by reserving to itself the role of formulating and promulgating organizational values and aims" (Gordon, 1994, p. 196) in order to "portray shop-floor activity and the organization of the workforce as being shaped almost entirely by the efforts of managers who respond to the problematic environment" (Wardell, 1992, p. 144).

The top-down management approach of a closed community is reported to have many advantages over a bureaucracy and the interactive model. Gordon (1994) and Heckscher (1994) identify the advantages of closed communities as: (1) having a relatively high level of trust and
cooperation; (2) an improvement on bureaucracy by recognizing and organizing the informal elements of human groups around the good of the whole; (3) developing a strong sense of community; and (4) providing a greater ability to adapt flexibly through informal cooperation, without the clumsy restructuring of a bureaucratic environment. Thus, the potential for teamwork is enhanced because the lower levels of the organization have a clearer sense of their responsibilities in relation to organization-wide aims and goals.

Many researchers have delineated the shortcomings of closed communities. For example, Heckscher (1994) suggests the value systems of closed communities are relatively narrow and specific to the company and serve as barriers to change. As a result, organizations of this form have a tendency to close-off to the outside and provide promises of security that introduce major rigidities into the system. Another criticism identifies the closed community's dependence on the leader as a potentially destructive force in the event that he/she leave the organization. Finally, closed communities are criticized for wasting the intelligence of the rank and file by limiting their participation in developing and changing organizational direction and goals. These criticisms explicate why many do not agree with the closed communities premise that top management plays an autonomous role in organizing the workplace (Wardell, 1994). Specifically, the proponents of transformational organizational models argue that the power wielded by top management must be altered and redistributed more fairly among all levels of the organization, and utilized towards the accomplishment of shared goals and purposes rather than the maintenance of hierarchical processes.
The Interactive Model

The interactive model of organization symbolizes a transformation from the bureaucratic-rational definition of offices to a true collaborative process that opens up information and public dialogue across boundaries in a context of consensus on basic organizational directions and principles (Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994). Like closed communities, interactive models recognize the importance of corporate cultures and attempt to establish a consensus on organizational aims and goals. However, unlike closed communities that rely on top management to formulate and promulgate organizational aims and goals downward to the rank and file, interactive models establish an unconstrained dialogue among all group members to generate cultural consensus. Heckscher (1994) describes the interactive model as an ideal type of organization in which everyone takes responsibility for the success of the whole. He states, "the challenge is to create a system in which people can enter into relations that are determined by problems rather than predetermined by structure" (p. 21). Pivotal to the success of this challenge is the alteration to the use of power throughout the organization, moving towards teamwork that is coordinated by influence and dialogue (Heckscher & Appellate, 1994; Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994; Beyer & Trice, 1988). In this sense, interactive models are decentralized; communication is horizontal and structures are cellular rather than pyramidal. Units control and regulate themselves. They thrive on fluidity, change, and the creative use of chaos. Energy is directed outwards rather than towards the internal sustenances of a fixed structure (Burrell, 1992).
Despite reporting that this emerging form of organization has yet to exist (Heckscher & Appellate, 1994; Gordon, 1994; Gergen, 1992), the proponents of interactive models herald their transformation qualities and hence, superiority to bureaucracies and closed communities. For example, Heckscher (1994) describes interactive models to have enhanced decision making abilities due to a thorough mixing of intelligence found throughout the organization. Therefore, responsiveness to environmental changes and innovation are heightened, and commitment is given a more effective way to manifest itself through the development of relations based on informed consensus rather than on hierarchy and authority. Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice (1994) suggest these attributes generate a collaborative change process that increases unity, decreases dysfunctional politics, and facilitates organizational learning. These transformational qualities challenge the core of the bureaucratic structure by redistributing power more equally throughout the organization to enhance the achievement of shared goals and purposes.

Despite its strengths, the interactive model of organization faces a substantial set of problems and difficulties. It is commonly believed that a lack of strong leadership (compared to closed communities) results in disorientation and confusion among the rank and file (Gordon, 1994). As a consequence, many people suspect that sub-groups may emerge and develop in-group bias and out-group prejudice that promote zero-sum competition among groups (Turner, 1978; Gergen, 1992; Gordon, 1994). It is competition of this nature that erodes organization-wide goals and purposes and facilitates faction among the collectivity. Thus, the critics of interactive models recommend that this form of organization be limited to
small face-to-face organizations, or preferably, held within the control of a greater bureaucratic structure in the form of development teams or skunkworks (Heckscher, 1994; Peters & Waterman, 1982).

To this point, a description of closed communities and interactive models has been provided. Each model is recognized to have strengths and weaknesses, however, a contentious debate has flourished over which form of organization is better than the other. On the one hand, closed communities purport to be superior by combining the mechanical properties of bureaucracies with the organic properties of transformational organizations. Here, "top management, with varying degrees of sensitivity to the values, aims, and customs, and sensibility of organizational members, defines values and aims that are then promulgated downward forming what is hoped to be an effective consensus" (Gordon, 1994, p. 197). In this sense, closed communities develop teamwork within a flexible environment, but maintain a centralized power-base by encouraging participation with certain limitations, beyond which lies leadership authority which is accepted as legitimate.

On the other hand, interactive models claim their attributes are evolutionary to closed communities and bureaucracies. "The transformation we are talking about challenges the core of the bureaucratic structure: It consists in an alteration in the use of power throughout the organization, moving towards a system coordinated by influence and dialogue" (Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994, p. 129). Interactive models represent a shift to relations of influence rather than relations to power. Therefore, leadership becomes a function of managing relations not tasks, organizational politics are brought to the
forefront not pushed under the carpet, and relationships develop based on informed consensus not hierarchy and authority (Heckscher, 1994).

In sum, the primary difference between closed communities and interactive models is the means by which they achieve consensus of organizational culture. The former model considers culture a top-down, management controlled responsibility, whereas, the interactive model promotes the development of culture by decisions made through a mixing of intelligence found throughout the organization in the form of unconstrained dialogue. Upon further examination, the true difference between the two models can be reduced to their application of power to the organization. Closed communities reserve the resource of power for top management, and interactive models redistribute power more fairly throughout all levels of the organization.

In the following section, Directors of Education will be discussed. Specifically, a brief history of the school superintendency will be provided, followed by a description of the organizational context within which they operate. Finally, the existing research on Directors of Education will be summarized.

**Directors of Education as Leaders**

In recent years, the system of school administration has changed considerably in Canada. From the mid-nineteenth century until the 1960s, the context and operation of schools were directly regulated by strong departments of education to ensure a standardized socialization of students for the industrialized workplace (Kowalski, 1995). As such, superintendents or directors of education were, for the most part, provincially appointed. Today, however, much of the responsibility of
school administration, including the appointment of directors of education, has been pushed down to the school board level (Lawton & Scane, 1991; McGuire, 1975). Allison (1991) states, "virtually all chief superintendents... are now employed by local boards of education and - although not specifically authorized in some jurisdictions - virtually all act as the chief executive officer for their boards" (p. 210).

Recent studies have identified the demographic characteristics of Directors of Education in an attempt to better understand their administrative practices. The findings of such studies have depicted the educational chief executive officer as being white, male, of European origin, having similar age and education, and of the centres of any political, religious, or ideological map (Holmes, 1991; Allison, 1991; Kowalski, 1991). Because of their similar characteristics (race, gender, ethnicity etc.), there have been few significant effects on the administration of Directors of Education attributed to demographic characteristics. Scholars and practitioners have, therefore, refocused their research toward the study of the organizational context and the internal processes, attitudes, values, and beliefs of educational administrators.

The organizational context within which Directors of Education operate has been described as bureaucratic. Hummel and Nagle (1973) referred to the educational organization and its management as a "closed system in which rational decision making and authoritarian control might be imposed on all the variables" (p. 36). In addition, Payne (1984) applied the term "pathological bureaucracies" to describe how educational organizations use traditions, structures, and operations to subvert normal and expected missions.
The evolution of the school superintendency within the bureaucratic structure explains much of the perceived inadequacies of our current educational leadership and the ever expanding gap between real educational needs and the failed traditional approaches to schooling. Kowalski (1995) describes the evolution of the superintendency amid a scene of rapidly expanding urban centres during the industrial revolution. Consequently, bureaucratic ideals were embraced, and school administrators sought recognition as professionals by portraying themselves as stable, capable, and respectable managers. He further suggests that despite immense demographic, political, and economic changes, many observers believe that school divisions have remained organized as they were in the early 1920s. These statements have profound implications for those who assume the top administrative position of school divisions.

Leithwood and Musella (1991) describe the enigmatic role of directors of education. They suggest that many parents consider the local school principal to be the final court of appeal on matters concerning their child’s education. Furthermore, teachers view the director as a distant authority figure that stimulates a flurry of previsit tidying-up on the part of the principal. Finally, they depict the principal's view of the director as someone who is preoccupied with politics not the fundamental educational problems to which they devote their efforts. Despite this lack of clear understanding, Leithwood and Musella (1991) state, "the work of (directors) has consequences... these consequences are often substantial, touching the lives of many within the organization and often outside, as well" (p. 3).
Many scholars believe that the chief executive officer of school systems is capable of exerting considerable influence on educational organizations. For example, Musella and Leithwood (1991) found that directors have a significant effect on setting priorities, acquiring resources, staff relations, accountability, delegation, communication within various groups, organizational vision, goal setting and planning, and team building. LaRocque and Coleman (1991) add that superintendents who are effective organizational leaders create an organizational ethos based on values of service to clients and of mutual respect. "Such leaders attempt to shape the norms and practices (ethos) of the organization in which they work to reflect congruent values" (p. 96). In short, the contemporary literature suggests that an important function of educational leaders is their ability to change the culture of an organization (Firestone & Wilson, 1985; Weick & Daft, 1983; Smirich & Morgan, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1982).

Though Directors of Education hold considerable power and authority, Rossler (1994) reports that "little is known about the practices of central office administrators" (p. 2). Leithwood and Musella (1991) identified only thirty eight studies on the superintendency and suggest that these studies focused primarily on leader practices in relation to goals, culture, and roles, while paying little attention to the leader's internal processes, attitudes, values, and beliefs. Gronn (1987) adds that few attempts have been made to describe, analyze, and explain the norms and practices of administrators. Furthermore, Walker (1995) states, "the context of individual educational leaders' ethical, personal, internal and external values sets and their mediating frameworks have, consequently, been largely ignored" (p. 214).
In Saskatchewan, the League of Educational Administrators, Directors, and Superintendents (LEADS) and the Saskatchewan Schools Trustees Association (SSTA) have recognized the importance of educational leadership and its impact on delivering quality educational services. For example, the LEADS' membership has "implicitly expressed their view that enhanced educational leadership will positively effect the quality of education in, and for the people of, Saskatchewan" (Walker, 1993, p. 1). However, a review of the literature showed few studies have addressed the nature of the practices of educational leaders in Saskatchewan. In relation to this study, there has not been an assessment of the use of power by Directors of Education, and a limited number of studies describing the underlying values and beliefs of senior educational leaders (Walker, 1995a, 1995b, 1993).

In review, it has been suggested that Directors of Education operate within a bureaucratic organizational structure. Furthermore, that because the school directorship evolved within such an organization, they have been unable to adapt to the immense demographic, political, and economic changes of recent years. As a result, many scholars have recognized the shortcomings of the traditional role of directors, and have called upon them to transform their administrative practices to meet the demands of today's education systems. Specifically, it is becoming expected of directors to utilize their leadership powers in creative ways to influence and change the culture of their organizations to better reflect the demands being placed on the contemporary workplace. Despite the recent ethical studies by Walker (1995a, 1995b, 1993), we have a limited understanding of the practices of educational leaders in terms of their underlying power motives in thought and action, and their internal and
external value sets. The following sections will discuss the concepts of power and values, and integrate them with the organizational forms outlined earlier.

Power

For hundreds of years people have attempted to identify the nature of the relationship between power and leadership. A common theme that emerged during that time is that the two concepts are not mutually exclusive. Muth (1989) identifies power as a basic element of human relations and suggests, "the usefulness of the concept of power for the study of social life is indisputable - it is ubiquitous in social relations of all kinds, a central element of organizations, and fundamental to schooling - even though what power is and what power includes are subjects of considerable debate" (p. 125). Despite its polemic nature, the modern basis of power is rooted in bureaucracy and technical rationality. Consequently, a technical rational hegemony over research, theory, and practice has served to place a negative light on power and its relationship to leadership.

Power: Its Negative Side

There can be little debate that the word power carries with it a negative connotation. McClelland (1975) makes the analogy that in general, individuals are proud of having a high need for achievement, but dislike being told that they have a high need for power. He states, "the negative and personal face of power is characterized by the dominance-submissive mode: If I win, you lose" (p. 263). It is, therefore, natural to ask how did power become a negative concept? To answer this question
requires that we take an historical look into how technical rationality has dominated the field of organizational studies.

The functionalist paradigm has dominated organizational research and theory in the twentieth century. Burrell & Morgan (1979) state, "the functionalist paradigm has provided the dominant framework for academic sociology in the twentieth century and accounts for by far the largest proportion of theory and research in the field of organizational studies." (p.48). More specifically, Adams & Ingersol (1990) suggest that the modern age of technical rationality has resulted from a confluence of two streams of thought. The first was the analytic mindset, and the second was the product of the technological process characteristic of industrialization. As a result, the archetypal organization became enmeshed in scientific principles and defined in ways to maximize production and efficiency. Given that a technical rational mindset has dominated modern organizational research and theory, it then becomes necessary to explain how this approach has influenced the development of a negative concept of power.

Louis & Miles (1990) suggest that "the dominant perspective on how to organize - whether it be a manufacturing plant or a school - has been a bureaucratic one since roughly the turn of the century" (p. 21). In recent years, the term bureaucracy has developed a negative disposition. It has become characterized by a clear division of labour and role definition, a clear hierarchy, standard operating procedures, a focus on efficiency and production, and a focus on maintaining the status-quo. Perhaps more importantly, bureaucracy has been associated with the development of asymmetrical power relations in groups (Forsyth, 1990). Foster (1986) states, "bureaucracy distributes power unequally and
creates centers of power and powerlessness in organizations" (p. 182). Hodgkinson (1991) elaborates this notion when he describes the dialectic of power as the struggle between the apex and the base of the organization, or more specifically, a struggle between leaders and followers.

Under the guise of bureaucracy, Muth (1989) identifies two incommensurable views of power which serves to further highlight its negative side. The structural-functionalist view as portrayed by Durkheim, Weber, and Parsons, considers power as necessary and beneficial to the maintenance of order and the regulation of processes. In comparison, the conflict theorists such as Marx, Mills, and Dahrendorf, see power as an oppressive force that deprives some of just rewards and precipitates conflict between power holders and the powerless. It is important to recognize these opposing views for two reasons. First, they highlight the considerable debate surrounding what power is and what power includes. Second, they demonstrate a negative concept of power; one that is associated with asymmetry and the dichotomization of the power holders and the powerless. In my view, the latter reason represents the crucial area that needs to be explored if one is to understand why power is negative and how reconceptualizing power in a positive light may further explain the nature of administration. To reinforce this argument, I turn to examples of technical rational approaches to the concept of power.

Weber (1947) defined power as "the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance" (p. 47). Simon (1957) stated, "power is the manifestation of an asymmetry in a relationship between A and B" (p. 32).
French & Raven (1959) identify power as "the capacity to cause another person to behave in a certain way, no matter what the person's desires or differences" (p. 114). Buckley (1967) suggests power is "the control or influence over the actions of others to promote one's goals without their consent, against their will, or without their knowledge or understanding" (p. 186). Finally, Wrong (1979) said, "power is the capacity to produce intended and foreseen effects on others" (p. 21). The common theme of these definitions reflect a technical rational approach to theory and research and serves to create an ethos of power embedded in asymmetry and negativism.

Sergiovanni (1992, 1987) has labeled the technical rational concept of power as power-over, due to its emphasis on controlling what people do, when they do it, and how they do it. Muth (1989) and French & Raven (1958) use the term coercion to describe power when it is used to promote asymmetrical relationships in groups. Owens (1991), on the other hand, suggests that bureaucratic power based on hierarchical structures, such as power-over, has become synonymous with official position. Within this context, the use of power has been criticized for having a negative or destructive effect on organizational relations. For example, Foster (1986) states, "the modern organization, with its rules and hierarchies, develops a technological rationality that lumps autonomy and freedom of action and shudders vision and critical spirit" (p. 148). Oakley & Krug (1991) suggest another shortcoming of power-over is that "control-based structures actually create separation between organizational functions dependent upon each other. They create and perpetuate barriers that limit the ability to work well across department lines" (p. 217). Bass (1981) believes coercive power becomes disruptive
to the development of a community atmosphere in group dynamics. As a result, many researchers believe there is a need to recognize the limited reach of a total or coercive power in its application to organizational studies (McClelland, 1975).

In summary, the modern concept of power has become synonymous with its role to create asymmetrical relationships within groups and organizations. The dominance-submissive mode: If I win, you, lose, is characteristic of the concept of power and has served to shed a negative and personal face on power. Many scholars have suggested that the technical rational hegemony over research and theory is responsible. More specifically, the bureaucratic approach to organizational studies and its roots in structural-functionalism and technological process have further precipitated a dogmatic approach to the use of power. However, in recent years, we have began to recognize that the modern approach to power is woefully inadequate. Researchers and practitioners are beginning to identify the many shortcomings of power-over and are searching to expand on the current approaches and applications of power to organizational studies.

**Power: Its Positive Side**

There has been much lament on the modern approach to the concept of power and its current application to leadership and organizational studies. Greenleaf (1977) suggests that "a fresh and critical look is being taken at the issue of power and authority, and people are beginning to learn, however haltingly, to relate to one another in less coercive and more creatively supportive ways" (p. 9). Clearly, it has become apparent that the technical rational view of power inadequately
describes leadership and organizational studies. As a result, many have sought to reconceptualize power and identify alternative approaches to its use. The most noticeable characteristic of the contemporary approaches to power is the shift from viewing it as an individual possession to that of a group asset, or from a negative perspective to a positive one, or from power-over to power-to.

In 1939, Lewin identified three social climates of group behavior which he characterized as authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire. The implications of his work were far reaching in that they provided the framework for which power could be administered outside the technical rational framework and in a context of collegiality, collective decision making, and consensus. Hodgkinson (1991) suggests that Lewin's work highlights the central issue facing leadership today; the concept of power and the individual versus the group.

Barnard (1938) was a leader in recognizing that ultimately power rests with followership. Unlike the technical rational approach, where power is in the hands of the leader and is used to coerce individuals into desired states of behavior, power does have another dimension. In 1959, French & Raven expanded the traditional definition of power to include referent power, expert power, reward power, and legitimate power. They were instrumental in realizing the many faces of power, whether it be power derived from expertise of a specific area or subject, or power given to leaders by followers out of respect, or the legitimate power that arises from the norms and expectations held by the group. In 1988, Quinn adapted French and Raven's definition of power to form his Competing Values Framework for Power and Influence. The framework consists of four types of power (reward power, legitimate power, expert power, and
relational power) and integrates them with the four models of organizations (the Adhocracy, the Firm, the Hierarchy, the Team) that have been popular in the last hundred years of organizational theory and practice. Reward power is based on the ability to reward and forms the basis of the Adhocracy. Legitimate power is based on followers' feelings of "oneness" with the leader and flourishes in the Firm. Expert power is based on the perception that administrators posses unique insight or expertise and is associated with the Hierarchy. Finally, relational power is based on the growth and development of people and underpins the Team. Central to Barnard, French and Raven, and Quinn, is the categorization of power with many faces and applications to organizational studies.

At this point, it seems only fitting to revisit the work of Sergiovanni. Earlier, I suggested that he had labeled the technical rational approach to power, power-over. However, Sergiovanni (1992) also identified the concept of power-to, where power is viewed as a source of energy for achieving shared goals and purposes. He distinguished power-over from power-to by stating, "only those with hierarchically authorized authority can practice power-over; anyone who is committed to shared goals and purposes can practice power-to" (p. 33). Power-to represents a positive perspective of power; one that does not rest in the hands of the few and elite, but is shared among the group.

Many have recognized the positive side of power. For example, Hodgkinson (1991) used the term cultural power to identify the collective influences of values and desires and suggests we need to manifest cultural power to balance the individual side of power-over. Oakley & Krug (1991) elude to the need for shared power by stating, "the bureaucratic
approach is to hold onto power. You cannot drive responsibility downward without providing power and authority - letting go of some of the control - at the same time" (p. 229). McClelland (1975) states, "the positive or socialized force of power is characterized by a concern for group goals, for finding those goals that will move people, for helping the group to formulate them, for taking the initiative in providing means for achieving them, and for giving members the feeling of competence they need" (p. 263). Finally, Burns (1978) views power as a mutual relationship between the leader and follower; one where leaders can mobilize the power of their followers, and followers can grant or deprive their power to the leader.

These works provide a compelling argument for the need to recognize the positive side of power. The authors bring to the forefront the notion that the traditional technical rational approach to power, embedded in an aura of individualism, is only partially capable of explaining organizational activity. Furthermore, they suggest that power must be understood to have a positive side and that it can be used as a source of energy for achieving shared goals and purposes. Finally, the authors recognize the individual aspect of power, but explicate the potential of power as a group asset.

Power: How It Can Be Used By Leaders

Identifying the nature of the relationship between power and leadership has proven to be a daunting task for philosophers, researchers, and practitioners. Little consensus has emerged beyond the agreement that the two concepts are not mutually exclusive. For example, Burns (1978) suggests that "to understand the nature of
leadership requires understanding the essence of power, for leadership is a special form of power" (p. 12). He further explains that power and leadership are relationships among persons and that together they form part of a system of social causation. Burns' reference to social causation reflects his belief that both leadership and power are rational, collective, and purposeful. In comparison, Bass (1981) identifies leadership and influence as functions of power. Here, power is the potential to influence and is based on the person and his/her position. He states, "power is the potential to lead, and therefore, power is a fundamental principle of leadership" (p. 174). Forsyth (1990) adds that, "nearly all groups have leaders, but the power and the duties of leaders within specific groups varies greatly" (p. 2). Clearly, it can be concluded that power and leadership are interrelated within the realm of group dynamics.

Having argued that the modern concept of power is negative due to its roots in technical rationality, and that it has been primarily applied to establish asymmetrical relationships in groups, I turn to examples that reflect the relationship between power and leadership in this nature. Machiavelli (1953) exemplifies the negative application of power to leadership. He suggests the leader's sole concern is the maintenance of power and is governed by an ethic of success. Such a leader uses strength, boldness and amoral acts such as treachery, trickery, guile, and corruption as means to justify the ends. In a less dramatic fashion, the most common modern application of power to leadership is from the technical rational perspective of bureaucracy. Here, leadership applies "its formal and actual authority to organize and reorganize employees in hierarchical relations for its continuing and its changing purposes" (Burns, 1978, p. 295). Blau (1964) refers to the bureaucratic relationship
of power and leadership as a negative force whereby leaders manipulate followers into desired behavioral roles. Bass (1981), on the other hand, concludes that, "one of the most consistent findings is the general tendency for those higher in status in an organization to wield more power to influence those lower in status" (p. 174). The main characteristic of a power-over leadership relationship is the use of power in a negative light to create asymmetrical relationships between the power-holders or leaders and the powerless or followers. As a result, it is of little surprise that the true essence of leadership has been displaced or confused with official position. McClelland (1975) states, "we have confused leadership regularly with the more primitive exercise of personal power" (p. 269).

Burns (1978) advocates McClelland's notion that the true essence of leadership has been obscured by its association with, and use of, a negative exercise in personal power. He states, "we must recognize the limited reach of a total or coercive power. We must see power and leadership as nothing but a relationship" (p. 11). By recognizing the negative relationship between power and leadership that we commonly endorse, we focus on the central issue facing leadership today; how to reconcile the divergent power interests of the individual with those of the group.

To recapture the true essence of leadership, we must understand that leadership and power are interrelated, that power does have a positive side, and that the way in which leaders utilize power is dependent upon their motives in thought and action. To expand the notion of power motive, let me suggest that an essential component of power is the purpose behind its use. Scholars are beginning to recognize that when discussing leadership, they have for the most part, attempted to
understand power, but have neglected to associate the purpose behind
the use of power in leadership (Burns, 1978; McClelland, 1975). To
describe the power motive concept, I turn to McClelland's (1975)
classification of power orientation. Figure 1, categorizes power into four
modalities across two dimensions. The two dimensions of power are
based on whether the source of power is outside or inside the self, and
whether the object of power is the self or someone other than the self.

The four quadrants are arranged to reflect stages of ego
development based on the works of Freud and Erikson. Quadrant 1
consists of power whose source comes from outside the self and whose
object is to strengthen the self. It is representative of how an infant draws
strength from others, particularly the mother. In Quadrant 2, the source
and object of power are the self and can be characterized by the
accumulation of prestige possessions. Quadrant 3, represents power
whose source is the self and whose object is other people. People who
are characteristic of a Quadrant 3 power motive recognize and utilize the
fact that they have an impact on others. This behavior may include the
use of power to persuade, manipulate, bargain, and maneuver to control
the behavior of others. Finally, in Quadrant 4, the source and object of
power are outside the self. It is here where organizational membership
belongs because joining makes the person feel part of a higher power
which acts through him/her. The person becomes, "an agent of another
source of strength, acting to influence and serve those in the
organization" (McClelland, 1975, p. 13). For the scope of this study, I will
concentrate my discussion on Quadrants 3 and 4. Quadrant 3 is
representative of the modern technical rational concept of power. It is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT OF POWER</th>
<th>SOURCE OF POWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self (to feel stronger)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition:</td>
<td>It (God, Mother) strengthens me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Correlate:</td>
<td>Power-oriented reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Stage:</td>
<td>Oral: being supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology:</td>
<td>Hysteria, drug taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations:</td>
<td>Client, mystic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folk Tale Themes:</td>
<td>Eat, take, leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I strengthen, control, direct myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accumulating prestige possessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anal: autonomy, will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obsessive compulsive neurosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychologist, collectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I, he, have, go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Others (to influence)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It (Religion, laws) control me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principled assertion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Messianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager, scientist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We, they ascend, fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have an impact on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitive sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assertive action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criminal lawyer, politician, teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hunt, can</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. A classification of power orientations (McClelland, 1975, p.14)*
based in individualism and serves to develop asymmetrical relations between the power holders and the powerless. However, Quadrant 4 refocuses power from an individual possession to that of a group asset. It reflects the positive side of power that can be used by leaders to serve the collectivity.

McClelland's (1975) classification of power motivations is quintessential to understanding how leaders need to move beyond the dominant application of power that is negative and individual such as in Quadrant 3, and refocus their efforts on utilizing the positive group dynamic of power that can be found in Quadrant 4. When leaders use a Quadrant 4 power motive, they become an instrument of higher power which is beyond the self. Their goal becomes to act for others on behalf of this authority. More practically, the actions of leaders become directed towards the benefit of the collectivity or organization. Plato's (1992) description of a leader as a person who accepts his/her responsibility out of duty to the Republic perhaps best represents the application of the Quadrant 4 power motive. Furthermore, it is in this nature that power becomes positive and that leadership can be reformed.

In review, it has been suggested that the relationship between power, as power-over, and leadership has served to displace or confuse leadership with that of official position. In addition, in order to better understand how power and leadership are interrelated, we need to recognize the positive side of power. Finally, we must establish a new relationship between power and leadership, one that is based on the concept of power-to and the duty to serve the organization not the individual.
A Review of Power

Earlier, it was suggested that power is a central element of organizational studies. Therefore, in order to understand the nature of administration, one must examine the roles of power in administration.

Traditionally, power has been viewed as a negative connotation and used by leaders to control follower behaviour. Bureaucratic principles such as hierarchical structures, official position, and authority have facilitated the predominant use of power in the form of power-over. The dogmatic approach to power, in this sense, has served to limit our understanding of the nature of administration.

In recent years, the concept of power has been recognized to have many faces and applications to organizational studies. Scholars and practitioners have identified a positive side of power, where leaders adopt a more flexible approach to the achievement of organizational-wide aims and goals. Here, power in the form of power-to, moves toward the use of trust and faith in follower behaviour.

Expanding the concept of power and its application to administration has had profound implications on leadership in organizational studies. The work of French and Raven (1959), McClelland (1975), and Quinn (1988) have pioneered the integration of the different applications of power with the different types of organizations. Primarily, these authors suggest that administrators rely on combinations of several different power bases when exercising influence (Richardson, 1989). In addition, Quinn (1988) suggests that different applications of power are representative of specific organizational types. For example, he associates the use of relational power with the Team, reward power with
the Adhocracy, legitimate power with the Firm, and expert power with the Hierarchy (see Organizational Forms section).

Research of this nature has expanded our understanding of the nature of administration. We are beginning to realize that the underlying power motive of the leader's thoughts and actions can heavily influence the organization. The following section will examine the importance of values to leadership and organizational studies.

Values

Ethics, morals, and values are three closely related terms that have historically resurfaced in the leadership literature. Hodgkinson (1991) states, "values, morals, and ethics are the very stuff of leadership and administrative life, yet we have no comprehensive theory about them and often in the literature they receive very short shrift" (p. 10). Websters' dictionary defines ethics as those principles of honor and morality or the moral principles of an individual. In addition, it defines morals as the distinction between right and wrong. Central to both ethics and morals are values; concepts of the desirable. Figurski (1992) suggests that morality refers to "the set of values that have to do with how humans cooperate and coordinate their activities in the service of furthering human welfare, and how they adjudicate conflict among individual interests" (p. 1310). In this sense, values become embedded in the concept of the common good. Walker (1993) states:

The concept of the common good has its roots in ancient Greek political thought, revitalized during the renaissance. The notion is associated with a vision of society as community whose members are joined in the shared pursuit of values and goals that they hold in common. A community comprised of individuals whose own good is extricably bound up in the good
of the whole. The common good therefore refers to that which constitutes the well-being of the community, its safety, the integrity of its basic institutions and practices and the preservation of its core values. It refers to the end toward which members of the community cooperatively strive to flourish. (p. 20)

Here, values are placed in a community or group setting and represent the collective concepts of the desirable. They are culturally dependent and, therefore, represent an integral part of leadership and organizational studies.

Durkheim (1964) discusses our basic need to belong, to be connected with others, and to identify with a set of norms that give directions and meanings to our lives. He coined the term anomie: a sense of normlessness and disconnectedness, to describe how, when we are without values, goals, and norms or the collective conscience of the community, we become alienated from ourselves, from others, and ultimately from society. Sergiovanni (1987) relays a similar message by stating, "people are bonded to one another as a result of their mutual binding to shared values, tradition, ideals, and ideas" (p. 61). As a result, values become a collective conscience that serves to guide the ethical and moral actions of individuals within an organization.

Burns (1978) suggests that there are three types of values; end values, modal values, and instrumental values. End values represent the desirable or preferred end-states or collective goals of which specific criteria are established and choices made among alternatives. Modal values are those such as prudence, honour, courage, civility, honesty, and fairness that denote the means by which practical and or other human enterprises should be conducted. Intrinsic or instrumental values are those that "are both ends in themselves - intrinsic values - and the
means for achieving further end-states" (p. 75). Burns' portrayal of values as deep internalizations that define personality and behavior as well as consciously and unconsciously held attitudes, is concomitant with the notion of values as the collective conscience of the community.

To this point, I have provided a superficial definition for values. Specifically, I have suggested that values are culturally dependent and that they represent the deeply internalized collective conscience of an organization that governs the moral and ethical behavior of individuals. Within this context, I turn to Hodgkinson's (1991) Analytic Model of the Value Concept to provide a detailed explanation of values.

**Values: Their Relationship to Leadership**

To say that values and leadership are related is to understate their importance to one another. Sergiovanni (1987) suggests that, "the heart of leadership rests in a person's beliefs, values, dreams, and commitments" (p. 7). Copeland (1944) adds that leadership is the act of dealing with values. And Walker (1993) states, "leadership, is at its roots, a context dependent set of rules grounded by seminal value-commitments" (p. 2). These definitions reflect values and leadership in a state of interdependency. Hodgkinson (1991) expands this notion by saying, "leadership is always a function of value and of commitment to organizational value and purpose" (p. 27). Furthermore, he states that it is necessary for leaders to study values to: (1) gain self-knowledge and understanding; (2) gain a greater understanding of others to empathy, sympathy, and compassion; and (3) make progress with problems of division, antagonism, and conflict. The latter issue of leadership and conflict resolution is, at its roots, an issue of leadership (Burns, 1978).
Therefore, it becomes clear that a better understanding of values is needed to address the nature of administration.

Hodgkinson (1991) alleviates our confusion over what values are by categorizing different value types for the resolution of conflict. He suggests that values are based in two components; those that are 'right' and those that are 'good'. 'Good' values are part of our "biological make-up and are essentially hedonistic, summed up in the elemental psychology of seeking pleasure and avoiding pain" (p. 97). Furthermore, 'good' values do not give rise to internal value conflict, but create the potential for general competition for satisfactory resources (see Figure 2).

In comparison, 'right' values represent a moral dimension or sense of collective responsibility and conscience. As a result, Hodgkinson suggests that, "this gives rise to a kind of internal conflict - two desirables warring within the bosom of a single self - as we feel on one side the pull of affect and on the other, demands of the situation and what ought to be done" (p.98). In short, 'right' values cause us to forego our self-interests and desires in favour of the group or nomothetic interests.

After establishing the differences between 'good' and 'right' values, Hodgkinson hierarchically grounds values into three categories; Type 111, Type 11, and Type 1 values. Type 111 values are at the bottom of the hierarchy and are self-justifying and emotional. They are grounded in what is 'good' for the individual and are, therefore, considered primitive because they denote individual preference. Type 11 values move up the hierarchy into the realm of what is 'right'. Here, there are Type 11a and Type 11b values that are grounded in conscience and consensus,
Figure 2. Analytical Model of the Value Concept (Hodgkinson, 1991, p.97)
respectively. Specifically, Type 11b values rely on methods such as counting heads and reasoning to establish the will of the majority or collectivity. Type 11a values, on the other hand, analyze consequences to establish a future desired state. In general, Type 11 values are rational and employ the cognitive function. Finally, Type 1 values are those that are metaphysically grounded. As a result, these values are guided by deep-rooted ethical and moral principles, and are not verifiable by scientific technique or logical argument. Therefore, Type 1 values have an air of absoluteness and are considered transrational, and represent a collective conscience that extends beyond the culture of the group and into the broader context of the social culture.

Hodgkinson's model of values provides a key understanding of the different types of values that permeate the cultural ethos of an organization. Therefore, understanding the different types of values will enhance our understanding of the nature of administration. In other words, if administrators are to improve their practices, then they must understand how values govern individual behaviour within organizations. Furthermore, leaders must distinguish between those values that are 'good' and facilitate behavior out of self-interest, from those values that are 'right' and cause individuals to forego their self-interests in favour of those of the organization.

In sum, I have tried to establish that the concept of values represents an integral part of leadership and organizational studies. Furthermore, the study of values is required to improve the practices of administrators. Hodgkinson facilitates administrative learning by identifying the different types of values and how they govern individual behavior within organizations. The next section will discuss how leaders
must alter the way they address and develop values within the organization in order to balance individual interests with those of the organization.

Organizational Values

Central to Hodgkinson's (1991) concept of values is that 'good' or subrational values are at the bottom of the hierarchy. He implies that leaders have a natural tendency to resolve value conflicts at the lowest level of the hierarchy possible, or most commonly, from values of self-interest. Sergiovanni (1994) adds that, "self-interest is assumed to be the prime motivator in negotiations" between leaders and followers and that the general rule of thumb in organizations is, "what gets rewarded gets done" (p. 3). Walker (1993), Burns (1978), Forsyth (1990), and Bogue (1985) support these notions and suggest that our obsession with value negotiations based in self-interest is antithetical to leadership because it depersonalizes relationships among people, lessens reciprocity, and erodes common purpose and direction.

Recognizing that leader-follower relations have been predominantly focused on negotiation of lower level values represents another important step towards gaining an understanding of the nature of administration. It becomes apparent that organizational cultures based on 'good' values facilitate individual behavior out of self-interest. As a result, leadership becomes inherently more difficult because individual self-interests become disproportionately more powerful than the interests of the group. Therefore, if the primary goal of leadership is to balance individual self-interests with those of the group, then it would seem necessary for leaders to refocus their relationships with followers
on higher level values; 'right' values that cause individuals to forego their self-interests in favour of the interests of the organization.

In recent years, there has been much literature to suggest that leaders need to refocus the way in which they resolve value conflicts. Burns (1978) was the first to identify the concept of transformational leadership, whereby, leaders break away from their traditional exchange-based negotiations with followers and strive to create a mutual basis of shared motives, values, and goals with followers. Sergiovanni (1992) introduced the term covenantal leadership to describe how leaders and followers can exist in a consensual relationship that represents a value system for living together via shared decision making and common purposes. Walker (1993) suggests that leaders need to develop a "pervasive commitment to mission and values of the organization, especially the values of professionalism and integrity, service and quality" (p. 8). The common theme of these authors is that leaders need to shift their predisposition with 'good' values to that of 'right' values if they are to successfully balance individual interests with those of the collectivity.

Perhaps more importantly, leaders must be aware of the role values play in the distribution of organizational culture and become critically aware of the social purposes served by their actions (Walker, 1993). In other words, leaders need to be aware of their power and ability to directly influence the type of values that permeate the cultural ethos of an organization. For example, if a leader chooses to establish relationships with followers that are transactional and based on lower level 'good' values, they should not be surprised to see follower behavior that serves the interests of the individual. If, on the other hand, leaders promote higher level values based on what is 'right', then they can expect
to see follower behavior that serves the interests of the organization. Therefore, values become a critical component of leadership that can not be ignored. Leaders must understand how values govern individual behavior and break away from the natural tendency to employ low level affective values, and move towards the promotion of high level cognitive and conative values.

These comments are reflected in Hodgkinson's (1991) suggestion that leaders should strive to establish conative values that evoke the will of the people. Burns (1978) adds, at this level of values, "persons are guided by near universal ethical principles of justice such as equality for human rights and respect for individual dignity. This sets the stage for rare and creative leadership" (p. 42).

Competing Values

To this point, I have tried to establish the importance of values to the study of leadership and organizational studies. Furthermore, I have suggested that leaders must become aware of the role values play in the distribution of organizational culture. The notion of competing values was developed by Quinn (1988) to describe the beliefs and assumptions that people hold when they think about what 'good' administration is. In other words, the term competing values describes how contradictory values may challenge the particular beliefs an administrator has about organizing. The primary assumptions of competing values are that "because values tend to be implicit, most people are unaware that they carry around an ideal set of preferences about organizing and that there may be advantages to be gained in directly opposite preferences" (Quinn, 1988, p. 44). Therefore, the competing values literature suggests that
administrators must explore opportunities to discover the contradictory nature of organizing, and become aware of the biases they have toward their administrative practices. Furthermore, it suggests that it is difficult to recognize that there are weaknesses in our own perspective and advantages in opposing perspectives, and most importantly, that the various organizational perspectives must be understood, juxtaposed, and blended in a delicate, complex, and dynamic way in order to improve administrative practice.

In review, Quinn proposes that the study of competing values may facilitate our understanding of the nature of administration in several ways. First, administrators will become aware of the alternative perspectives of organizing and the advantages and disadvantages of each. Second, competing values explicate the role values play in shaping administrative behaviour. Third, competing values integrate leadership behaviour with different organizational forms and, therefore, represent a valuable means to understanding the internal processes, attitudes, values, and beliefs of administrators.

A Review of Values

Earlier, I suggested that values are culturally dependent and that they represent the deeply rooted internalized collective conscience of the organization that governs moral and ethical behavior. Then, Hodgkinson's concept of value was reviewed to identify the different types of values that may permeate the cultural ethos of an organization.

Hodgkinson's work describes values and their fundamental importance to administration. Specifically, he suggests that, within organizations, there exists a constant antagonism between individual
and group interests. Furthermore, he posits that the leader's role in the organization is to balance these two divergent interests by creating a mutual basis of shared motives, values, and goals.

Quinn's notion of competing values was reviewed as a possible means to understanding the internal processes, attitudes, beliefs, and values of administrators, and to compare the alternative perspectives of organizing and the advantages and disadvantages of each.

In sum, values represent an important facet of the administrative process. Leaders must become more active in shaping the values that permeate the cultural ethos of the organization. Finally, by examining the competing values of leaders, we can better understand their beliefs and assumptions about organizing.

In the following section, Quinn's (1988) Competing Values Framework of Power and Influence will be introduced to provide the conceptual framework for the study. The conceptual framework will outline the relationship between power and value, and integrate them with the organizational forms discussed earlier.

Competing Values Framework of Power and Influence

In recent years, scholars have realized the need to study the underlying power motives and values that guide the practice of administrators. The contemporary workplace has experienced fundamental shifts from the use of power to influence and from bureaucracy to human accomplishment (Heckscher, 1994). These changes in organizations have brought to our attention the different perspectives of organizing and the advantages and disadvantages of each. Quinn's (1988) Competing Values Framework of Power and
Influence integrates the underlying power and value characteristics of leadership behaviour with the different organizational forms in theory. The model is shown in Figure 3.

The first distinction drawn in the model is to categorize power and values into four modalities across two dimensions. The dimensions range from flexibility to control, and from internal to external focus. The four quadrants are arranged to reflect the four major forms in organizational theory. The lower right quadrant (the Firm) stresses criteria such as planning, goal setting, productivity, and efficiency. Here, the leader uses the legitimate power of his/her position to provide structure, give directions, and initiate action. As a result, the underlying values of the administrator centre around productivity and accomplishment. The lower left quadrant (the Hierarchy) stresses information management, communication, stability, and control. A leader within the Hierarchy would use his/her expert power and influence to control the flow of information and organizational activity. Consequently, stability and control underpin the values the administrator has about organizing. In the upper right quadrant (the Team), criteria such as cohesion, morale, and human resource development are stressed. Here, the leader develops a more flexible relational power base that facilitates participative decision making, concern, and support among people. Group values primarily influence individual behaviour, while cohesion and morale are viewed as a means of increasing the values of human resources. The upper right quadrant (the Adhocracy) stresses flexibility, growth, innovation, and external support. The leader uses his/her power to acquire, control, and allocate resources, while
developing an underlying value system in the organization that supports growth and entrepreneurialism.

Note that each quadrant has a polar opposite. For example, the Team, which emphasizes flexibility and internal focus, stands in stark contrast to the Firm, which stresses control and external focus. In addition, the Adhocracy, which is characterized by flexibility and external focus, runs counter to the Hierarchy, which emphasizes control and internal focus (Quinn, 1988). Quinn's model also draws parallels among the organizational forms. The Team and the Adhocracy emphasize flexibility. The Adhocracy and the Firm stress external focus. The Firm and the Hierarchy are characteristic of control. Finally, the Hierarchy and the Team reflect an internal focus.

The scheme is called the competing values framework because the criteria seem to initially carry a conflictual message. Quinn (1988) states, "we want our organizations to be adaptable and flexible, but we also want them to be stable and controlled. We want resource acquisition and external support, but we also want tight information management and formal communication. We want an emphasis on the value of human resources, but we also want an emphasis on planning and goal setting" (p. 49). Quinn's comments suggest that oppositions can exist within the organization, however, that their underlying values are oppositions in our minds.

In sum, this conceptualization of leadership discusses the relationship of power and values to organizations. Its postulates that the use of power by leaders and the values that form the way people think about organizing are interdependent. For example, if an administrator uses power, in the form of power-over, to control the work environment,
Figure 3. Competing values framework of power and influence (Quinn, 1988).
then he/she may create and perpetuate barriers that disrupt human accomplishment (Oakley & Krug, 1991; Foster, 1986; Bass, 1981). In addition, leadership of this nature fosters an aura of competition, whereby power becomes a scarce and highly coveted resource (McClelland, 1975) that is used to maintain structure and authority. As a result, a primitive value system is established within the organization that is grounded in what is 'good' for the individual and that promotes self-justifying behaviour (Hodgkinson, 1991). If, on the other hand, a leader adopts a power-to approach in relationships with his/her followers, then power becomes a shared resource and a source for achieving shared goals and purposes (Sergiovanni, 1992). Therefore, a more advanced value-system is established within the organization that is based on what is 'right'. These values promote a collective conscience or duty to the group and result in individual behaviour that serves the interests of the organization.

The implications of this conceptualization of power and competing values on Directors of Education are immense. At the beginning of the literature review, it was suggested that directors of education operate within a bureaucratic organizational structure. Kowalski (1995) suggests that because of the bureaucratic orientation of educational systems, directors have, for the most part, governed divisions of operation on the basis of assumed expertise and legitimate authority. Leadership of this nature is frequently confused with official position and the use of hierarchical structures to maintain a centralized power base within the organization. As a result, many scholars believe that our current educational leadership is woefully inadequate, and that directors of education need to better utilize their leadership power in creative ways to
influence and change organizational cultures to better reflect the interactive model of organization.

The conceptualization of power and competing values in this study not only recognizes the inherent problems 'bureaucratic' leaders face, it explicates how Directors can reflect on power and values, and perhaps improve their leadership practices to meet the demands of the contemporary workplace. It does so by providing a means for Directors to examine their power and competing value profiles, and hence, gain a better understanding of the impact of power and competing values on the culture of the organization.

The Usefulness of the Concept

The model of power and competing values is intended to be used to diagnose and intervene in actual organizations. It does this by examining the underlying power motives and competing values of administrators and integrates them with the different forms of organizations in theory. The study of power and competing values is thought to be quintessential to understanding leadership (Burns, 1995, 1978; Greenleaf, 1995, 1977; Sergiovanni, 1994, 1992, 1987; Hodgkinson, 1991, 1983). By doing so, the organization gains a better understanding of the roles of power and competing values that are espoused by its most influential members, its leaders. Finally, the model provides a means for leaders to recognize the different organizational perspectives and the advantages and disadvantages of each. If these ideas presented here lead Directors of Education to better their leadership practices or provide some insights into how better practices could be achieved, then the concept is a valid one to study.
One major drawback is the ambiguous connection between the model and the realities of organizational life. Much of the writing on emerging organizational forms are theoretical in nature and absent from practical application. Many researchers report that interactive models of organization have yet to exist (Heckscher & Applegate, 1994; Gordon, 1994; & Gergen, 1994), and others suggest that leadership within these organizations would be self-destructive (Gordon, 1994; Willower, 1993; Davis, 1984; & Kets de Vries, 1980). Furthermore, given the predominance of the closed community organization, scholars question whether a transformational leadership style could succeed within a broader bureaucratic structure (Heckscher, 1994; Krackhardt, 1994).

Summary

In this chapter, literature and research related to organizational studies, power, and values have been reviewed. The main points made in the chapter have been summarized below.

Quinn (1988) identifies the four predominant models of organization in theory: the Firm, the Hierarchy, the Team, and the Adhocracy. However, in recent years, the interactive model of organization has emerged to challenge the bureaucratic principles of these models.

The contemporary literature suggests that our current understanding of the nature of administration is limited due to it being studied predominantly within the field of organizational studies and our pedantic adherence to technical rationality. For example, educational administrators operate within a bureaucratic structure that heavily influences their practices. In recent years, scholars have criticized educational leaders for their inability to adapt to the immense
demographic, political, and economic changes. Therefore, they recommend that educational leaders transform their practices to better meet the demands of the contemporary workplace.

Power and value have been identified to be of fundamental importance to the study of administration. Traditionally, administrators have relied on the use of power to control others and to maintain structure in the workplace. In terms of values, administrators have a natural tendency to resolve value conflicts at the lowest, fundamental level possible. As a result, lower level value systems permeate the cultural ethos of the organization and erode common purpose and direction.

The study of the power motive and competing values underlying administrative practice may provide a means by which leaders can identify the alternative perspectives of organizing and the advantages and disadvantages of each. Quinn's (1988) Competing Values Framework of Power and Values integrates the different faces and applications of power and values with the different forms of organizations outlined in this study.

Finally, it has been suggested that educational leadership will positively effect the quality of education in, and for the people of, Saskatchewan. However, a review of the literature provided a limited number of studies that examined the norms and practices of educational administrators.
CHAPTER THREE
THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The correct theory and method for the study of educational administration, then, is dependent upon the nature of the question being asked. If one wishes to know, for example, how pay scales are related to teacher retention, one may select a quantitative methodology. If, however, one wishes to investigate the retention of teacher/victims of student violence, one might do well to choose a qualitative approach. What is important is that the question being asked is not twisted so that it will "fit" a particular research methodology and that the methodology selected is used properly.
(Dolmage, 1992, p.110)

Dolmage's words identify the nature of the relationship between research and methodology. He suggests that the purpose of the study governs the kind of data that must be considered, which in turn determines the selection of appropriate methods. Allison (1990) warns, "if the process is reversed or data are allowed to determine the questions being studied, then freedom of inquiry is curtailed and scholarship held hostage by ideology" (p.6).

The intent of this study was to identify the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education in Saskatchewan. This chapter outlines the methodology for the present study, the concept of perception, the sample, the data collection instruments, and the associated procedures for the data analyses.
Triangulation

Messick (1993) describes validity as an integral evaluation judgment of the degree to which empirical evidence and theoretical rationales support the adequacy and appropriateness of inferences and actions based on test scores or other modes of assessment. Therefore, as Shepard (1993) points out, validity is not a property of the test itself, rather it pertains only to the test-based inferences.

Traditionally, valid knowledge was considered a product of experimental and quasi-experimental research designs (Campbell & Stanley, 1958). However, in recent years, researchers have advocated the use of multiple research methods to increase the validity of test-based inferences (Eisenhart & Howe, 1992; Merriam, 1991; Berg, 1989; Mathison, 1988; Denzin, 1989, 1970). This process is known as triangulation.

Triangulation is the use of multiple data gathering techniques and procedures to measure the same phenomena (Miles & Huberman, 1984). As such, triangulation is grounded in the belief that quantitative and qualitative research methods should be viewed as complementary rather than as rival camps (Renihan, 1985). This belief stems from the recognition that any one methodology carries with it a set of strengths and limitations (Merriam, 1991; Denzin, 1970). Therefore, the value of triangulation lies in its ability to refine, broaden, and strengthen conceptual linkages (Berg, 1989) through the employment of multiple research methods. Denzin (1970) states, "the flaws of one method are often the strengths of another, and by combining methods, observers can achieve the best of each, while overcoming their unique differences" (p. 308).
The present study, which examined the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education adopted such a research approach. In order to examine power and competing values, the perceptions of Directors were solicited via questionnaires and interviews. To this end, quantitative and qualitative data were gathered for triangulation. Before describing these techniques, a brief description of the concept of perception is provided.

**Perception**

In this study, the Directors' perceptions of their power and value orientations was identified and discussed. Murch (1973) describes perception as an individual's constant interaction with the environment and the associated mental processes of interpreting the impact and import of external events. Therefore, perception involves the manner in which the observer relates to the environment or the way in which information is gathered and interpreted by the observer. For the purposes of this study, perception can be defined as "the manner in which people view the world around them, the process by which sensory inputs are received and organized into useful concepts" (Middlemast & Hiit, 1981, p. 51).

Renihan (1985) identifies three distinct phases of perception: "sensing" various information about an object or person; "selecting" from the information those facts that will be useful in forming the concept; and "organizing" the information into useful concepts or views pertaining to the object or person. Consequently, perception becomes an important process in the formation of concepts that influence our behaviour. Casey (1976) states, "perception is viewed both as the critical point at which the
external world first impinges upon the perceiver and as the way in which these data are assimilated by the perceiver to become the basis for subsequent cognitive activities" (p. 128).

Bourne (1966) suggests that the major factor controlling the perceptual activities of an individual is their attention or orientation to the stimulus. Middlemast and Hilt (1981) point out that the perception process may be influenced by several factors involving the nature of the perceiver. These factors include: the general nature of the other person; the intentions of the other person; the importance of the other person; and the emotional state of the perceiver.

The phenomenological nature of perception has led to considerable debate regarding the study of the concept. Murch (1973) states, "if we consider perception to be dependent on the interaction of effective stimuli and the sum total of all previous experiences of the individual, then each individual's perception of an effective stimuli would be unique and different from those of another individual" (p. 4). Therefore, many scholars point to the individual and subjective nature of perception to criticize studies of this nature. Specifically, problems of lack of awareness, faulty perceptions, the effects of group norms, mind set, and social desirability have been proposed as sources of errors in the study of perception (Oppenheim, 1966; Edwards, 1957; Asch, 1956; Cronbach, 1946). On the other hand, scholars advocate the study of actual participant's perceptions because of the succinct nature of the research methodology and the variety of social reality that is provided by different individual's interpretations (Meighan, 1981; Moos, 1979; Walberg, 1976; Silverman, 1970; Rosenshine, 1970).
The concept of perception is of particular importance to this study because through the perception process we frame ideas and attitudes that influence our behaviour (Renihan, 1985). These ideas and attitudes, then, become the basis of the beliefs and assumptions that people hold when they conceptualize their power and competing value profiles within the organization (Quinn, 1988). Therefore, the study of perceptions of Directors of Education about their power and competing value profiles may provide a means to gain a better understanding of the Directors' underlying beliefs, feelings, and attitudes that govern their leadership.

The Population

The population for the study included all 91 of the Directors of Education in the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Questionnaires

For this study two questionnaires were administered to identify the perceptions of Directors of Education about their power and competing value profiles.

The Richardson Power Profile

A review of the literature on power provided the researcher with the Richardson Power Profile (Richardson & Thompson, 1981). The questionnaire was designed to measure the use of power within organizational settings. The questionnaire is shown in Appendix A.

The use of power is fundamental to every organization. Richardson (1989) states, "as organizations become more complex, managers increasingly need power to influence the people on whom they depend."
Leaders may exert their power in a positive, democratic manner or in a negative, authoritarian or Machiavellian style" (p. 1). The Richardson Power Profile (RPP) was developed to measure perceptions of a leader's use of seven power bases: coercion, connection, reward, legitimate, referent, information, and expert (Hersey, Blanchard & Natemeyer, 1979). However, the RPP does not contain a measure for relational power as outlined in the conceptual framework for the study. As a result, the author expanded the original RPP to include a measure of the perception of relational power.

The expanded RPP consisted of 47 test items that were randomly ordered. Directors were asked to rate the extent to which they utilized the approach presented in each item; ratings were indicated by marking through disagree-agree continua (Thompson, 1981).

PRISM 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment Questionnaire

A review of the literature on organizational values provided the researcher with the PRISM 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment questionnaire (Quinn, 1988). The questionnaire was designed to help leaders gain an understanding of the competing values that affect their leadership behaviour within the organization. The questionnaire is shown in Appendix B.

The conceptualization of leadership for this study posits that low level affective value systems are predominant in traditional organizational forms. As a result, the culture of such organizations are embedded with values that denote personal preference and that facilitate behaviour out of self-interest. In comparison, the emerging interactive forms of organization maintain higher level cognitive and conative value systems.
Here, organizational cultures reflect values that promote organizational membership and behaviour out of collective interests. The PRISM 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment questionnaire provides a means to assess the competing value profiles of Directors, and then, integrates these profiles with the different organizational forms cited in the literature review.

All Directors were asked to complete the questionnaire which contained 32 statements about their current performance. Each item in the questionnaire was responded to on a seven point scale which ranged as follows: Almost never, Very seldom, Seldom, Occasionally, Frequently, Very frequently, and Almost always.

**Validation of the Questionnaire Instruments**

**The Richardson Power Profile:**

There have been several studies designed to assess the validity of the Richardson Power Profile. In 1981, Richardson and Thompson performed a factor analysis of RPP data to address questions of construct validity. The seven factors of power accounted for 61.9 percent of the variance of the 41 test items. In addition, factor adequacy coefficients were computed to compare the actual results to theoretically expected results. These findings indicated that the RPP was a reasonably valid measure of perceived influence.

In 1981, another study by Richardson investigated the relationship between power orientation and ego development of school principals. A canonical factor analysis was performed to solve for a maximum likelihood estimate of the factor structure in the population. Richardson
(1981) states, "although the seventh factor was statistically significant, the factor was a singlet (a factor defined by only one item) which did not clarify the solution. Therefore, six factors were extracted... that accounted for 59.8 percent of the variance of the RPP's 41 items" (p. 4). The power factors identified were: expert/legitimate, connection, reward, coercion, information, and referent.

Miller (1983) performed a subsequent study where four factors were extracted instead of the six identified in the Richardson (1981) study. These four factors accounted for 55.5 percent of the variance among the questionnaire items. The power factors identified were: expert/legitimate/referent, connection, reward, and coercion.

The findings of these studies suggested that the power bases were not all independent or discreet. Specifically, they found that legitimate power tended to be correlated with expert power. Richardson (1989) added that, "studies in school settings (McGee, 1964; Rengrose, 1977; Zirket & Gauditus, 1979) indicate that teachers consider legitimate and expert power to be the preferred basis for leadership" (p. 5). Finally, the studies indicated that the number of significant power factors may be affected by the sample or population being studied.

For this study, the RPP was expanded by one factor of power, relational power. To improve its construct validity, the expanded RPP was given to five faculty members of educational administration to examine the added test items to the original RPP. After revisions were made, the expanded RPP was given to fifteen people including faculty members, former Directors of Education, educational administrators, and graduate students for further review.
To support the construct and discriminant validity of the Richardson Power Profile and the PRISM 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment questionnaires, the statistical procedures of Principle Component (PC) Factor Analysis and Alpha-Reliability Analysis were used. The PC Analysis was employed to summarize the patterns of correlations among the sixteen subscales of power and value. To determine the number of underlying factors, eigenvalues of greater than 1.0 and Cattell's Scree Plot (Stevens, 1990) were used. The Reliability Analysis was employed to support or refute the internal reliability of each power and value subscale. A minimum alpha-Cronbach value of .70 was used for the purposes of reliability.

Quinn's Competing Values Framework:

Denison, Hooijberg, and Quinn (1993) applied the statistical procedure of multidimensional scaling to test the geometric and spatial validity of Quinn's (1988) Competing Values Framework. From their study, the results showed good support for the quadrant model, but little support for the circumplex model. Specifically, the data from the study scaled well across the two dimensions of flexibility and stability, and internal focus and external focus. However, the data did not support the order of the leadership roles within the circumplex model. Upon further analyses, it was found that by reordering the roles on the left side of the model, the data showed a good fit with the circumplex model.

In terms of convergent-descriptive validity, the results provided clear support and demonstrate that the measures of each of the eight roles are separate and distinct, and have been measured with "some" accuracy (Denison, Hooijberg & Quinn, 1993).
Collection of the Questionnaire Data

Each Director of Education received a Richardson Power Profile and a PRISM 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment questionnaire to be self-administered. As well, instructions were included for completing and returning the questionnaires. The Directors' responses were recorded directly into the questionnaire booklets.

All questionnaires outlined the purpose of the study and assured anonymity of response. Self-addressed, stamped envelopes were included to facilitate a high rate of return, and follow-up letters were sent to all sample participants requesting completed returns of the questionnaires from those who had not already done so.

Interviews

The second research method used in this study involved the interviewing of respondents. Best and Kahn (1993) suggest that the interview is often superior to other data gathering devices. The advantages of interviews include: respondents are usually more willing to talk than to write; the interviewer can explain more explicitly the investigation's purpose and just what information he/she wants; and the interview has the flexibility to probe further into complex issues and to clarify data (Berg & Gall, 1983). On the other hand, the subjective nature of the interview, interview bias, and the rapport between the interviewer and the interviewee may reduce the reliability and validity of the results (Best & Kahn, 1993).

In this study, a ten percent sample of the respondents were interviewed for the purposes of triangulation. The purpose of conducting the interviews was to better understand the perceptions of Directors.
about their power and value orientations on their leadership. The interview format was designed to probe further into the research questions raised and addressed in the questionnaires. Therefore, the interviews were intended to increase the validity of the test-based inferences.

**Interview Format**

The purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in or on someone else's mind. Best and Kahn (1993) suggest that interviews range from quite informal and completely open-ended to very formal with the questions predetermined and asked in a standard manner. A semi-structured interview format was used in this study. As such, specific questions were asked in a systematic and consistent order (Berg, 1989), while leaving the character of the response open (Bouchard, 1976). By doing so, the intent was to gain a better understanding of the interviewee's current work situation and the relevant variables affecting his/her performance in the situation (Dexter, 1970). Renihan (1985) states, "such a format is considered superior to the closed interview wherein the respondent is restricted to one of several pre-planned responses" (p.73).

A copy of the interview questions is provided in Appendix E. However, because of the semi-structured nature of the interviews, supplementary questions were also asked to probe further into more complex issues. The flexibility of the interviews is seen to be another advantage over restricted interviews, for, as Mishler (1986) states, revisions during the interview process elicits greater understanding of meanings between the interviewer and the interviewee.
The duration of the interview in this study ranged from thirty to eighty minutes. Renihan (1985) indicated that one hour and hour-and-a-half time frames predominate in the literature, despite there being very little research on the optimal length of interviews. Permission was requested to tape record the interviews. This was to ensure that the information was transcribed accurately. As well, the tapes provided a means to revisit the interview responses.

**Pilot Test of the Interview**

The interview was given to five faculty members of the department of Educational Administration. After revisions, the instrument was redistributed to fifteen people including faculty members, former directors of education, educational administrators, and graduate students for further review.

The interview was then administered to three former directors of education. The purpose of the data gathering and the voluntary nature of their participation was explained. In responding, each participant was asked to consider each item in relation to their former school divisions and encouraged to make suggestions for improvements at the completion of the interview.

**Treatment of the Research Data**

The data were analyzed as follows:

**Question One:** What are the self-perceived power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education in the Province of Saskatchewan? This question was addressed in several ways. First, frequency distributions were constructed from the responses to the test items on
the Richardson Power Profile and the PRISM 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment questionnaires. Then, the range, mean and standard deviation for each item on both questionnaires were calculated and ranked. In addition, a profile for power and competing values was generated using the mean score for each factor of power and competing values. Finally, responses from the interview questions provided additional description about the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education.

Question Two: What are the differences between groups of Directors of Education and their perceptions of power and competing values based on their context (experience, location, gender, education, and size of the organization)? Using the demographic information, differences between subgroups were examined through the statistical procedures of T-test (for comparisons of two means) and one-way analysis of variance (for comparisons of more than two means). For the purposes of this study, any test statistic value having a probability of less than .05 was ruled statistically significant. The respondents were regrouped based on the number of respondents in each group.

Question Three: To what extent does the Director's context (experience, location, education, and size of organization) affect his/her power and competing value profiles? In order to address this question, the statistical procedure of multiple regression was used. The multiple regression analyses determined which contextual variables contributed to the explanation of the variance in the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education. A .05 level of significance was used to determine statistical significance of difference among means.
Question Four: How are the power and competing value profiles related? Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to measure the strength of the relationships among the power and competing value variables.

Question Five: What characteristics of power and value do Directors consider important to their practices as educational leaders? Responses from the interview questions provided a description of the desired uses of power and competing values by Directors of Education.

Summary

This chapter described the triangulation methodology for the collection and analysis of data. In addition, the specific research procedures regarding the administration of the questionnaires and the interviews, and their validity and reliability were outlined. The population included all 91 directors of education in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Richardson Power Profile and the Competing Values Self-Assessment questionnaires were administered as the data collection instruments for the mail survey. Means, ranges, and standard deviations were used to analyze the quantitative data and to generate a power and competing value profile for Directors of Education. In addition, the statistical techniques of T-test, analysis of variance, and multiple regression were used to examine the relationship among directors and their context. Interviews were administered as a means to complement or refute the data evident from the analyses of the questionnaire data.
Finally, the data analysis was outlined according to the conceptual framework of the study and the research questions.
CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSES OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND INTERVIEW DATA

The chapter provides the quantitative analysis of the questionnaire data and the qualitative analysis of the interview data. The questionnaire data begins by examining the characteristics of the respondents to the Richardson Power Profile (RPP) and the PRISM 1: Competing Values Self Assessment (CV) questionnaires. The demographic make-up of the respondents is examined, followed by principal component factor analyses and alpha-scale reliability analyses to address the issue of multicollinearity among the test variables. Finally, the findings of the statistical analyses are explained in terms of research questions one to four. The interview data will be explained in terms of research question five.

Characteristics of the Respondents

In January of 1997, a copy of the RPP and the CV questionnaires were distributed to 91 directors of education in the Province of Saskatchewan. One set of questionnaires were returned by a school division because the director was out of the country and unable to participate in the study. Therefore, the effective mail-out was 90 sets of questionnaires. Sixty-five sets of questionnaires were returned for a 72.2 percent response rate. The returned questionnaires were numerically coded for the purposes of anonymity. The first response was received on
January 17, 1997 and the final response was received on March 27, 1997.

**Demographic Data**

The first section of the RPP asked each respondent to answer demographic data pertaining to their experience, location, level of education, size of school division, and gender. Table 1 displays the distribution of respondents according to the demographic data.

**Table 1**
**Distribution of Respondents by Demographic Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 Years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Years</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 25 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large urban</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small urban</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGD</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters (not in Education)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters plus additional work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters plus Doctoral work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>89.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Doctorate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of School Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000-3999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000-4999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of the low frequencies in many of the demographic values, the data was recoded for statistical purposes. Table 2 presents the recoded data that was used in the subsequent statistical analyses.

Table 2
Reverted Demographic Data and the Distribution of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 Years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 Years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Masters</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Masters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of School Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000-1999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>76.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 2000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the respondents answered the item on director experience. Forty percent had less than five years experience, whereas 29.2 percent had five to nine years experience, and 30.8 percent had ten or more years of director experience. The mean experience category was 5 to 9 years as a director of education.
Table 2 indicates the distribution of respondents by location. Fifteen of the respondents were directors of urban school divisions, while 49 respondents were directors in rural school divisions.

In terms of education, 30.8 percent of the respondents indicated they had completed a bachelor's degree. Of this group, all but one respondent had obtained their post graduate diploma (PGD). Thirty-two (49.2%) of the respondents had a masters degree and thirteen (20.0%) had continued their education beyond the master level. Seven respondents within the final group had obtained a doctorate. The mean category of education was a masters degree.

Of the respondents, 32.3 percent worked as directors of education in school divisions with less than 1000 students, 44.6 percent worked in school divisions with a student population between 1000 and 1999, and 23.1 percent worked in school divisions with greater than 2000 students. The average size of school division among the respondents was between 1000 and 1999 students.

Finally, Table 2 indicates the distribution of respondents by gender. Fifty-eight (89.2%) of the respondents were male and seven (10.8%) were female.

Examination of the Questionnaire Subscales

The subscales for the RPP and the CV are outlined in Appendix G. The RPP consisted of eight subscales of power: reward, coercion, legitimate, referent, expert, information, connection, and relational. Each subscale of power contained six test items. The CV consists of eight subscales of values: innovator, broker, producer, director, coordinator,
monitor, facilitator, and mentor. Each subscale of value contained four test items.

In total, there were sixteen subscales employed in this study; eight subscales of power and eight subscales of value. Principal component factoring of these sixteen subscales generated factors which were used to support the discriminant validity of the test items. To determine the underlying number of factors, the criteria of eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and Catell’s Scree Plot were used. In addition, alpha-scale reliabilities were considered to test the homogeneity of the test items in each subscale in order to support the construct validity of the questionnaires. Alpha-Cronbach values of greater than .70 were used to determine internal reliability.

The 47 questions of the RPP were coded B1 to B47 and the 32 questions of the CV were coded C1 to C32. The possible score for each item in the RPP ranged from one to fifteen. The possible score for each item in the CV ranged from one to seven.

The means and standard deviations for the variables of the RPP and the CV are presented in Table 3. Principal component factoring was performed on the total sums of the responses to the questions for each subscale, using SPSS, option PC.

The Pearson product-moment correlations for the factor analyses are presented in Appendix H. Briefly, the findings indicated that relational power was most highly positively correlated to expert power (.70). Legitimate power was most highly positively correlated to connection (.60) and coercive (.50) power. Information power was most highly positively correlated to connection (.54) power. Finally, referent power was most highly positively correlated to expert (.54) power.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>1 - 12</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>7 - 15</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>8 - 15</td>
<td>12.22</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>1 - 13</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>3 - 15</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>10 - 15</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>2 - 15</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>3 - 15</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>1 - 13</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>6 - 15</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>2 - 15</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B16</td>
<td>4 - 15</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B17</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B18</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B19</td>
<td>9 - 15</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B21</td>
<td>1 - 14</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B22</td>
<td>5 - 15</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>1 - 14</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B25</td>
<td>1 - 14</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B26</td>
<td>1 - 14</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B28</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B29</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B30</td>
<td>3 - 15</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B31</td>
<td>1 - 13</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B32</td>
<td>1 - 14</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B33</td>
<td>1 - 14</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B34</td>
<td>1 - 14</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B35</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B36</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B37</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B38</td>
<td>4 - 15</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B39</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B40</td>
<td>1 - 12</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B41</td>
<td>1 - 13</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B42</td>
<td>1 - 15</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B43</td>
<td>7 - 15</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>2 - 7</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30</td>
<td>3 - 7</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C32</td>
<td>4 - 7</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of competing values, producer value was most highly positively correlated to facilitator (.68) and director (.63) value. Monitor value was most highly positively correlated to coordinator (.60) value. Mentor value was most highly positively correlated to facilitator (.55) value. Finally, innovator value was most highly positively correlated to producer (.56) value.

The correlation matrix suggested that there were strong relationships between the power and value subscales. For example, relational power was positively correlated to facilitator (.61), producer
(0.63), innovator (0.56) and mentor (0.45) values. Expert power was positively correlated to producer (0.59), facilitator (0.49) and coordinator (0.47) values. Finally, coercive power demonstrated a negative correlation to mentor (-0.35) value. A detailed analysis of the Pearson product-moment correlations of the sixteen subscales of power and competing values is provided later in the chapter.

Employing the criterion of eigenvalues greater than one to determine the number of factors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996), produced three factors in the analysis. However, Cattell's scree plot (Stevens, 1990) indicated that a further reduction to two factors should be considered. Consequently, a two factor solution was generated from the total sums of the sixteen subscales. A comparison of the factor loadings of each of the subscales for power and value is included in Table 4. The two factors accounted for 56.3 percent of the common variance.

In this analysis, the factor loadings revealed that two primary factors were being measured; one for power and the other for value. For example, all the subscales for value, with the exception of broker, loaded on factor one. The subscale of broker demonstrated ambiguity between power and value by loading fairly evenly on both factors. In terms of power, five of the subscales (coercion, connection, information, legitimate, reward) loaded on factor two. The subscale of referent power loaded fairly evenly on both factors, whereas the subscales for expert and relational power loaded on factor one. These findings indicated that there were two main factors being measured: power and value. The factors were, however, not completely independent of one another. The fairly even loading of the broker and referent subscales on both factors
Table 4
Results of the Principal Component Factoring on the 16 Subscale Sum Totals From the RPP and CV Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Communality</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial eigenvalues 5.76 3.25

showed that some ambiguity exists, while the loading of the power subscales, relational and expert, on factor one revealed their strong value base.

After establishing support for the existence of the two factors of power and value, alpha-scale reliabilities were employed to test the internal reliability of the test items in each subscale. The results of the reliability analysis are presented in Table 5. The alpha-reliabilities for the subscales of power and value were high. The larger values of these reliabilities suggested that each of the subscales for power and value demonstrated a high level of internal reliability.
Table 5
Results of the Reliabilities Analyses on the 18 Subscales From the RPP and CV Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Alpha-Reliabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td>(B5,B7, B18,B28,B33,B46) .75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>(B1,B21,B22,B26,B35,B38) .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td>(B4,B11,B15,B23,B47) .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>(B12,B17,B24,B29,B39,B43) .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>(B3,B9,B10,B19,B31,B37) .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td>(B2,B8,B16,B30,B36,B45) .71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>(B6,B13,B20,B27,B34,B42) .83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>(B14,B25,B32,B40,B41,B44) .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>(C2,C10,C18,C26) .61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>(C5,C13,C21,C29) .59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>(C4,C12,C20,C28) .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>(C7,C15,C23,C31) .70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>(C1,C9,C17,C25) .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>(C8,C16,C24,C32) .83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>(C6,C14,C22,C30) .74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>(C3,C11,C19,C27) .80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this study, the RPP was expanded by one subscale of power, relational power. As a result, a closer examination of relational power is provided in Table 6.

Relational power is characterized by a leader’s use of power to establish meaningful relationships with other people. These relationships are based on trust and faith, and serve to foster human accomplishment. The six items of relational power reflect the leader’s willingness to share power, to develop an open atmosphere for unconstrained dialogue, to engage in participative decision making, to rely on group values to influence behaviour, and to encourage problem-based relations. The six items are provided in Appendix G.
Table 6
Data Summary for Relational Power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relational Power Items</th>
<th>Alpha-Reliabilities If Item Deleted</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B6 Shared Power</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>13.02</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13 Open Climate</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20 Participative</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27 Group Values</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B34 Problem-based Relations</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B42 Rely on Others</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Alpha-Reliability</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>Avg.</td>
<td>12.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 6 revealed that the alpha-reliabilities for the six items were high. Therefore, it was concluded that the subscale of relational power had a high level of internal reliability. The six items of relational power had an average mean of 12.02 and a range of means from 10.56 to 13.02, on a scale of one to fifteen. The high average mean and the narrow range of means indicated that the respondents consistently, positively perceived their use of all six items. Finally, the principle component factor analysis revealed that relational power loaded heavily on factor one (.81). This result demonstrated the strong value base upon which relational power is defined.

A closer examination of the added subscale of relational power to the RPP provided evidence of a high level of internal reliability. Coupled with the measures taken to ensure the construct validity (see Chapter Three) of the expanded RPP, it seems reasonable to state that relational power is a reliable and valid addition to the examination of director power profiles.

To this point, the characteristics of the respondents has been examined, the demographic data has been reviewed and recoded, and
the statistical procedures of principal component factoring and alpha-reliability analysis have been employed to support the discriminate and construct validity of the test variables.

The reliability analyses supported the internal reliability of the sixteen subscales of power and value used in the study. Furthermore, the principal component factoring confirmed two underlying factors, power and value. The following section will explain the findings of the statistical analyses in terms of the research questions.

**Answers to the Research Questions**

This section describes the techniques that were applied and the results that were generated to answer the five research questions.

**Research Question 1**

*What are the self perceived power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education in the province of Saskatchewan?*

**Power Profile**

In order to generate a power profile for the directors of education, a final score was calculated for each of the subscales of power. Table 7 presents the mean of the responses for each test item for each subscale of power. The means for each test item were then summed and averaged to generate a score for each subscale.

The final scores for each subscale indicated that relational (12.17) and expert (12.05) power had the highest average means, followed by
legitimate (9.33), referent (8.87), reward (6.76), connection (5.40) and coercive (5.55) power. The means of the final scores ranged from a high of 12.15 (relational power) to a low of 5.55 (coercive power).

Additional information about the final scores was obtained by examining the range of the responses within each subscale (see Table 3). For example, the responses to the relational power subscale questions (B6, B13, B20, B27, B34, B42) ranged from two to fifteen. The responses to the expert power questions (B4, B11, B15, B21, B47) ranged from five to fifteen. Finally, the responses to the remaining power subscales, reward (B14, B25, B32, B40, B41, B44), legitimate (B3, B9, B10, B19, B31, B37), coercion (B5, B7, B18, B28, B33, B46), information (B12, B17, B24, B29, B9, B43), connection (B1, B21, B22, B26, B35, B38) ranged from one to fifteen. The wide range of responses to the questions in each subscale of power indicated that the RPP discerned perceptual differences among directors toward their use of power in their administrative endeavours.

In keeping with Quinn's conceptual framework, only the subscale final scores (overall mean) for relational, reward, legitimate and expert power were transferred to the power profile in Figure 4. The power profile suggested that directors of education, in the Province of Saskatchewan, most favored the use of relational and expert power within their school divisions, and least preferred the use of reward power. However, the final subscale scores further indicated that directors of education also favored the use of legitimate and informational power over the use of coercive, referent and connection power.
Table 7
Subscale Scores for the Power Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Relational Mean</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Reward Mean</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Legitimate Mean</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Expert Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>B14</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td>12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>B25</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>B11</td>
<td>12.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>B22</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>B15</td>
<td>11.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B27</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>B40</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>B19</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>B23</td>
<td>11.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B34</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>B41</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>B31</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>B47</td>
<td>12.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B42</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>B44</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>B37</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>73.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>12.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 includes the subscale scores for the Power Profile, with the highest scores in the relational power category.

In relation to the conceptual framework for the study, the directors who responded to the questionnaires identified their preference to use power to facilitate a Team (relational power) and Hierarchical (expert power) organizational structure.
Figure 4. A power profile for directors of education in the Province of Saskatchewan.
Competing Value Profile

In order to generate the competing value profile, an average score for innovator, broker, producer, director, coordinator, monitor, facilitator and mentor value was calculated. Table 8 shows the mean for each test item for each subscale of value. A score for each subscale of value was generated by summing the test item means and then averaging their scores. The final scores of the subscales indicated that mentor value (6.07) had the highest mean, followed by producer (5.77), innovator (5.58), director (5.54), facilitator (5.53), coordinator (5.50), monitor (5.32) and broker (5.31) values, respectively. The means of the final scores for the value subscales ranged from a high of 6.07 (mentor) to a low of 5.31

Table 8
Subscale Scores for the Competing Value Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Innovator</th>
<th>Broker</th>
<th>Producer</th>
<th>Director</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>C10</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>C11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>C18</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>C19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>C26</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>C27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sum  | 22.32     | 21.22  | 23.08    | 22.57    |

| Score| 5.58      | 5.31   | 5.77     | 5.54     |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>C6</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>C7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>C15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>C22</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>C23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>C30</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>C31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sum  | 21.94      | 21.26   | 22.13      | 24.30   |

| Score| 5.50      | 5.32    | 5.53       | 6.07    |
(broker). Table 3 provides additional information about the range of responses to the questions in each subscale of value. For example, the responses to the producer (C3, C11, C19, C27) and innovator (C1, C9, C17, C25) subscale questions ranged from three to seven. The responses to the broker (C2, B10, C18, C26), director (C4, C12, C20, C28), coordinator (C5, C13, C21, C29) and monitor (C6, C14, C22, C30) subscale questions ranged from two to seven. Finally, the responses to the facilitator (C7, C15, C23, C31) and mentor (C8, C16, C24, C32) subscale questions ranged from one to seven and four to seven. The range of responses to the questions within each value subscale indicated that the CV discerned perceptual differences among directors toward their use of values to guide their managerial behaviour.

The final scores for each subscale of value were then transferred to the competing value profile shown in Figure 5. The competing value profile suggested that directors of education, in the Province of Saskatchewan, most preferred the use of mentor values to guide their managerial behaviours, and least preferred to use broker values.

In relation to the conceptual framework for the study, the results indicated that directors preferred to use values that facilitate a Team (mentor) structure within the organization. In addition, the results suggested that directors least preferred to use values that facilitate a Hierarchy (monitor and coordinator).
Figure 5. A value profile for directors of education in the Province of Saskatchewan.
Research Question 2

What are the differences between groups of Directors and their perceptions of power and competing values based on their context (experience, location, gender, education, and size of the organization)?

To examine the differences between groups of directors and their perceptions of power and competing values based on their demographic context, the statistical procedures of t-test (for comparison of two means) and one-way-analysis of variance (for comparison more than two means) were employed (see Appendix I).

In total, eighty t-tests or one-way-analyses of variance for significant mean differences were conducted. There were only two significant differences ($p<=.05$) found. First, a significant difference existed in how directors perceived their use of legitimate power between those who work in rural school divisions with those who work in urban school divisions. Rural directors of education had a more positive perception of the use of legitimate power than their urban counterparts. Second, there was a significant difference of means in the use of innovator values between directors who worked in urban school divisions to those who worked in rural school divisions. In this case, directors of urban school divisions had a more positive perception of the use of innovator values than did directors of rural school divisions.

In conclusion, the directors' demographic context did not make a difference in their use of power and value in their school divisions. Only the directors' location (urban or rural) affected their perception of how they used legitimate power and innovator values in their school divisions.
Research Question 3

To what extent does the director's context (experience, location, education, and size of the organization) affect his/her power and competing value profile?

Initially, standard multiple regression analyses were employed to evaluate what each demographic variable (education, size of school division, gender, experience) added to the prediction of each subscale of power and value. The results of these analyses indicated that none of the demographic variables significantly contributed to the regression equation.

To further examine the predictability of demographic variables on the subscales of power and value, stepwise, backward deletion regressions were employed. In backward deletion procedures, the regression equation starts out with all independent variables entered and then deletes them one at a time if they do not contribute significantly to regression (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). The findings of the stepwise regression are shown in Table 9 (see Appendix H for the complete analyses).

Table 9
Results of the Backward Stepwise Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Student Sig</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>3.915</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>2.029</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>3.836</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>4.254</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>2.062</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings of the stepwise regression revealed that the demographic variable, education, had a significant positive association with the value subscale monitor (T-test value = 2.029, .05 T-sig = .045) and the power subscale, information (T-test value = 2.072, .05 T-sig = .043). In addition, the demographic variable, location, had a significant positive association with the power subscale, legitimate (T-test value = 2.062, .05 T-sig = .043). However, the R square values indicated that only a small amount of the total variance in the dependent variables (monitor .114, information .112, legitimate .064) can be attributed to the independent variables (education and location). Therefore, despite showing a significant positive association with the subscales of monitor, information and legitimate, the amount of variance that can be attributed to the independent variables was minimal.

In conclusion, context did not make a difference in how directors perceived their use of power and value. The positive association of education and location to the information and legitimate power subscales and the monitor value subscale was weak.

Research Question 4

To what extent are the power and competing values related?

In order to examine how the power and competing value profiles are related, the sixteen subscales for power and value were subjected to correlation analyses. The Pearson product-moment correlations produced by SPSS for the sixteen subscales are presented in Appendix F. Many of the significant correlations which were of particular interest are
presented in this section. The correlations for the power subscales are presented first, followed by the value subscales.

**Power Subscales**

Relational power was significantly positively correlated to the expert \( r = .74, p < 0.01 \) and referent \( r = .41, p < 0.01 \) power subscales. In addition, relational power was significantly positively correlated to the facilitator \( r = .61, p < 0.01 \), producer \( r = .60, p < 0.01 \), innovator \( r = .55, r < 0.01 \), director \( r = .51, p < 0.01 \), mentor \( r = .49, p < 0.01 \), monitor and coordinator \( r = .37, p < 0.01 \) value subscales.

The results indicated that the more directors used relational power, the more they were likely to use expert, informational and referent power in their school divisions. In support of the conceptual framework for the study, relational power was positively correlated with the facilitator and mentor value subscales. In general, relational power correlated highly with all the value subscales.

Reward power was significantly positively correlated to the coercion \( r = .65, p < 0.01 \), legitimate \( r = .63, p < 0.01 \), connection \( r = .60, p < 0.01 \) and information \( r = .40, p < 0.010 \) power subscales. Reward power was also significantly positively correlated to the value subscale, broker \( r = .40, p < 0.01 \).

These results showed that the more directors used reward power, the more likely they were to use coercion, legitimate, connection and informational power in their school divisions. In support of the conceptual framework for the study, reward power was positively correlated to the director's use of broker values to guide his/her managerial behaviour.
Unexpectedly, reward power was not significantly correlated to the innovator value subscale.

Legitimate power was significantly positively correlated to the connection (r = .64, p < 0.01), reward (r = .63, p < 0.01), coercion (r = .57, p < 0.01), referent and information (r = .39, p < 0.01) power subscales. Legitimate power was also significantly positively correlated to the value subscale, broker (r = .34, p < 0.01).

The directors' perceived use of legitimate power was positively correlated to their perceived use of connection, reward, coercion and informational power. According to Quinn's (1988) conceptual framework, legitimate power should have been most positively correlated to the value subscales of producer and director. However, these results showed that legitimate power was most positively correlated to the broker value subscale.

Expert power was significantly positively correlated to the relational (r = .74, p < 0.01), referent (r = .50, p < 0.01) and information (r = .42, p < 0.01) power subscales. Expert power was also significantly positively correlated to the producer (r = .56, p < 0.01), innovator (r = .53, p < 0.01), facilitator (r = .50, p < 0.01), coordinator and director (r = .45, p < 0.01) and mentor (r = .38, p < 0.01) value subscales.

The results showed that the more directors used expert power, the more likely they were to use relational, referent and informational power. The conceptual framework for the study suggested that expert power should be most positively correlated to the monitor and coordinator value subscales. The results showed that expert power was significantly correlated to coordinator values at the p < 0.01 level, and to monitor values at the p < 0.05 level. However, the results also showed that expert
power was positively correlated to innovator, coordinator, facilitator and mentor value subscales.

Coercion was significantly positively correlated to the reward \( (r = .65, p < 0.01) \), connection \( (r = .61, p < 0.01) \), legitimate \( (r = .57, p < 0.01) \), and information \( (r = .36, p < 0.01) \) power subscales. Coercion was significantly negatively correlated to the value subscale, mentor \( (r = -.33, p < 0.01) \).

The correlations for coercion suggested that the more directors used coercive power, the more they were likely to use reward, connection, legitimate and information power. Coercion power was most highly correlated to connection and legitimate power. The results also showed that the more directors used coercive power, the less likely they were to use mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour.

Informational power was significantly positively correlated to the referent \( (r = .58, p < 0.01) \), connection \( (r = .54, p < 0.01) \), reward \( (r = .49, p < 0.01) \), relational \( (r = .47, p < 0.01) \), expert \( (r = .41, p < 0.01) \), coercion \( (r = .37, p < 0.01) \) and legitimate \( (r = .31, p < 0.01) \) power subscales. Informational power was also significantly correlated to the monitor \( (r = .39, p < 0.01) \), innovator \( (r = .37, p < 0.01) \), broker \( (r = .32, p < 0.01) \) and director \( (r = .32, p < 0.01) \) value subscales.

These results showed that directors used informational power with all of the remaining power subscales. In terms of values, directors used informational power in conjunction with innovator, broker, monitor and director value subscales. Therefore, according to Quinn’s (1988) conceptual framework, directors’ use of informational power was correlated to the value subscales that are characteristic of the Adhocracy, Firm and Hierarchy.
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Referent power was significantly positively correlated to the information \((r = .51, p < 0.01)\), expert \((r = .50, p < 0.01)\), relational \((r = .41, p < 0.01)\), legitimate \((r = .39, p < 0.01)\) and connection \((r = .38, p < 0.01)\) power subscales. Referent power was also significantly positively correlated to the value subscale, director \((r = .36, p < 0.01)\).

The correlations for referent power indicated that the more directors used referent power, the more likely they were to use information, expert, relational, legitimate and connection power. The findings also indicated that director use of referent power was correlated to the use of director values.

Connection power was significantly positively correlated to the reward \((r = .65, p < 0.01)\), legitimate \((r = .63, p < 0.01)\), coercion \((r = .61, p < 0.01)\), information \((r = .54, p < 0.01)\) and referent \((r = .38, p < 0.01)\) power subscales. Connection was also significantly positively correlated to the value subscale, broker \((r = .36, p < 0.01)\).

The results showed that the more directors used connection power, the more likely they were to use reward, coercion, information and referent power in their school divisions. Directors' use of connection power also correlated highly with the use of broker values to guide their managerial behaviour.

**Value Subscales**

Directors' perceived use of coordinator values was significantly positively correlated to the monitor \((r = .60, p < 0.01)\), facilitator \((r = .49, p < 0.01)\), director \((r = .45, p < 0.01)\), producer and innovator \((r = .43, p < 0.01)\), and broker \((r = .33, p < 0.01)\) value subscales. Coordinator values were
also significantly positively correlated to the expert \( r = .45, p < 0.01 \) and relational \( .38, p < 0.01 \) power subscales.

The results showed that directors' use of coordinator values was positively correlated to the use of all the subscales of value, with the exception of mentor values. In addition, directors perceived use of coordinator values were most highly correlated to their perceived use of the expert and relational power subscales.

The value subscale, director, was significantly positively correlated to the producer \( r = .66, p < 0.01 \), facilitator \( r = .60, p < 0.01 \), monitor \( r = .57, p < 0.01 \), coordinator \( r = .45, p < 0.01 \), innovator \( r = .44, p < 0.01 \), mentor \( r = .39, p < 0.01 \) and broker \( r = .36, p < 0.01 \) value subscales. In addition, director was significantly positively correlated to the relational \( r = .52, p < 0.01 \), expert \( r = .45, p < 0.01 \), referent \( r = .36, p < 0.01 \) and information \( r = .32, p < 0.01 \) power subscales.

These results showed that the use of director values was positively correlated to the use of all the value subscales. In support of the conceptual framework, the use of director values to guide managerial behaviour was most highly correlated to the producer value subscale. The results also indicated the director values were highly correlated to relational, expert, information and referent power subscales.

The value subscale of facilitator was significantly positively correlated to producer \( r = .66, p < 0.01 \), director \( r = .60, p < 0.01 \), innovator \( r = .56, p < 0.01 \), mentor \( r = .55, p < 0.01 \), coordinator \( r = .49, p < 0.01 \), monitor \( r = .46, p < 0.01 \) and broker \( r = .37, p < 0.01 \) value subscales. In addition, facilitator was significantly positively correlated to the relational \( r = .60, p < 0.01 \), expert \( r = .50, p < 0.01 \) and information \( r = .25, p < 0.01 \) power subscales.
Directors' use of facilitator values was significantly correlated to the use of all the value subscales. The conceptual framework for the study suggested that the facilitator value subscale should be most positively correlated to mentor values. However, these results indicated that facilitator values were most highly correlated to the producer and director value subscales. In support of the conceptual framework, the use of facilitator values was most highly correlated with the use of relational power.

The value subscale, innovator, was significantly positively correlated to the producer \( (r = .57, p < 0.01) \), facilitator \( (r = .56, p < 0.01) \), director \( (r = .44, p < 0.01) \), coordinator \( (r = .43, p < 0.01) \), monitor \( (r = .39, p < 0.01) \) and broker \( (r = .35, p < 0.01) \) value subscales. Innovator values were also significantly positively correlated to relational \( (r = .55, p < 0.01) \), expert \( (r = .53, p < 0.01) \) and information \( (r = .37, p < 0.01) \) power subscales.

The results indicated that directors' use of innovator values was significantly correlated to all the subscales of value, with the exception of mentor values. The conceptual framework for the study suggested that innovator values should be correlated the highest with broker. However, these results showed innovator values to be most correlated with the value subscales of producer and facilitator. In addition, innovator values should have been most highly correlated with reward power, however, these results showed a high correlation to the relational, expert and information power subscales.

The value subscale, mentor, was significantly positively correlated with the facilitator \( (r = .55, p < 0.01) \), producer \( (r = .43, p < 0.01) \) and director \( (r = .39, p < 0.01) \) value subscales. Mentor values were also
significantly positively correlated with the relational ($r = .48, p < 0.01$) and expert ($r = .38, p < 0.01$) power subscales. Mentor values were also significantly negatively correlated to coercion ($r = -.33, p < 0.01$).

In support of the conceptual framework, mentor values were most highly correlated to facilitator values and relational power. The more directors used mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour, the more likely they were to use facilitator value and relational power. Mentor values were also highly positively correlated to the producer and director subscales of value and expert power, and negatively correlated to the use of coercive power.

The monitor value subscale was significantly positively correlated to the coordinator ($r = .61, p < 0.01$), director ($r = .57, p < 0.01$), producer ($r = .52, p < 0.01$), facilitator ($r = .46, p < 0.01$), innovator ($r = .39, p < 0.01$) and broker ($r = .35, p < 0.01$) value subscales. Monitor values were also significantly positively correlated to the information ($r = .45, p < 0.01$), relational ($r = .38, p < 0.01$), referent ($r = .32, p < 0.01$), expert ($r = .27, p < 0.01$) and connection ($r = .26, p < 0.01$) power subscales.

These results indicated that monitor values were significantly correlated to all the subscales of value, with the exception of mentor. In support of the conceptual framework for the study, monitor values were most highly correlated to the coordinator value subscale. However, monitor values were expected to be most highly correlated with expert power. These results showed that monitor values were significantly correlated to expert power, however, they revealed a higher correlation with information, relational and referent power.

The value subscale, producer, was significantly positively correlated to director ($r = .66, p < 0.01$), facilitator ($r = .66, p < 0.01$),
innovator ($r = .57, p < 0.01$), broker ($r = .54, p < 0.01$), monitor ($r = .52, p < 0.01$) and coordinator and mentor ($r = .43, p < 0.01$) values. Producer was also significantly positively correlated to the relational ($r = .60, p < 0.01$) and expert ($r = .50, p < 0.01$) power subscales.

The results indicated that producer values were significantly correlated to all the subscales of value. In support of the conceptual framework for the study, producer values had the highest positive correlation to director values. The conceptual framework also suggested that producer values should have been most highly correlated to legitimate power. However, these results showed producer values to be most highly correlated to the relational and expert power subscales.

The value subscale, broker, was significantly positively correlated to the producer ($r = .53, p < 0.01$), facilitator ($r = .37, p < 0.01$), innovator, director, monitor ($r = .35, p < 0.01$) and coordinator ($r = .32, p < 0.01$) value subscales. In addition, broker values were significantly positively correlated to the reward ($r = .39, p < 0.01$), connection ($r = .36, p < 0.01$) and information ($r = .32, p < 0.01$) power subscales.

These results indicated that broker values were significantly correlated to all the value subscales, with the exception of mentor. The conceptual framework for the study suggested that broker values should have been most highly correlated to innovator values and reward power. The results showed broker values to be most highly correlated to the reward power subscale. However, they showed broker values were more highly correlated with producer and facilitator values than with innovator values.

In review, the findings from the Pearson product-moment correlations generally supported the conceptual framework for the study.
For example, relational power was significantly positively correlated to facilitator and mentor values, expert power was significantly positively correlated to monitor and coordinator values, and reward power was significantly positively correlated to broker values. However, the correlation findings did not totally support the conceptual framework. Reward power was not significantly correlated to innovator values and legitimate power was not significantly correlated to producer and director values as highly as expected.

Analysis of the Interview Data

Research Question 5

What characteristics of power and value do directors consider important to their practices as educational leaders?

Research Question 5 was intended to provide a means to gather information to support or refute the data gathered by the RPP and CV questionnaires. In total, eight personal interviews were conducted with randomly selected directors who had participated in the questionnaire section of the study. Interviews ranged from 45 to 80 minutes in length, with an average length being 64 minutes. The format of the interviews was semi-structured. In addition, the respondents were free to expand upon their answers and comment on items they wished to share. All interviews were taped.

Each director of education was asked the same basic set of questions. These questions are included in Appendix C. There were three sections to the interview. Section 1, Background Information, asked
directors about their administrative experience as a director of education, what they did before becoming a director of education, and their reasons for becoming a director of education. Section 2, Power, asked directors about the perceptions of power, how they used power in their school divisions, and how educational leaders should use power in their administrative endeavors. Section 3, Competing Values, asked directors about their perceptions of values, the importance of values to the life of the organization, how directors influenced values in their school divisions, and what values directors should foster in their school divisions. The findings of the interview analysis are presented in accordance with the sections outlined above.

**Background Information**

Of the eight directors that were interviewed, three were female and five were male. It should be noted that the number of female directors interviewed was disproportionate to the population. However, it was hoped that this would provide additional insights into their administrative practices. The interviewees ranged in director experience from one to 19 years, and had an average experience of eight and a half years. When asked why they chose to become a director of education, most directors indicated that they had the experience and were capable of doing the job. Along these lines, seven directors said that it was a natural progression in their careers. One director commented that money was the primary incentive. Another director said that she really enjoyed administration and working with people to create a team environment. Finally, two directors felt that the position provided the best opportunity to influence education.
Prior to becoming a director of education, all the interviewees indicated that they had previous administrative experience in education. The most common career path began as a teacher, and then progressed to a principal, assistant superintendent/ assistant director, and finally to the position of director.

Power

Part 1. Director Perception of Power

The first part of the Power section examined director perception about the term power. When asked, What does the term power mean to you?, directors provided a variety of responses. Generally, they felt that power represented the ability to affect change and influence people within the organization.

I think that power is the ability to get things done and to control agendas. The trick of power is finding ways to influence. Power is a creative process of trying to motivate people (Interviewee # 7).

Most of the directors expanded their initial answers and discussed how different types of power affected their role as a director of education.

Through the formal structure of the organization and my position in it, I have the power to make things happen; official power. But there is another side of power; the personal and professional attributes that I have (Interviewee # 3).

Another director felt that there is no real positional power. Power is personal and depends on what you make of the position.

Part 2. Director Use of Power

The second part of the Power section examined how directors used power in their school divisions. When asked, How would you describe the distribution of power in your school division?, all the
directors said that power is fairly evenly distributed and shared throughout the organization. Three directors described their school divisions as hierarchical or bureaucratic in structure, however, they stressed that power was very balanced among many groups of people. The groups of people described as being powerful were: principals, boards, directors, parents and teachers.

To further elaborate on the distribution of power, directors were asked if Power was centralized among the top management or shared among the collectivity? All of the directors that were interviewed, with the exception of two, described their school division as having a shared power base. However, two directors said that, in some cases, power was only shared to the level of principal. These directors suggested that some principals have difficulty sharing power with teachers.

Directors were then asked, Do you consider yourself to be a powerful person in the school division? All but one director considered themselves to be powerful people in their school divisions.

Yes, I am powerful. My experience, background and knowledge make me a powerful person (Interviewee # 8).

I am not powerless. Being a director you must make certain decisions (Interviewee # 2).

I am powerful in the sense that I have significant influence; not just positional power, but influential power (Interviewee # 6).

When asked, What do you do to maintain a shared power base in your school division?, most of the directors indicated that they tried to limit their involvement in the daily activity of the organization. Instead, they focused on future events, times, and ideas, thereby creating an atmosphere where people felt free to influence them. One director said that he tried to involve himself in the maintenance of basic organizational
principles, while allowing the people below him to do their jobs. Another director said that she delegated tasks to other people and set committees to generate collaboration and shared decision making.

To further elaborate on their use of power, directors were asked, *To what extent do you control important organizational resources in your school division?* In general, directors felt that they had very little control over organizational resources. Four of the eight directors that were interviewed felt that they had varying degrees of control over budget and personnel. Two directors said that the board of education gave them the power to control organizational resources, and two directors identified the board of education as having control over organizational resources.

Directors were also asked *To what extent do people feel free to challenge your ideas and provide alternative solutions to problems?* Four of the directors indicated that their employees would feel free to challenge their ideas and provide alternative solutions to problems. Three directors said that they want their employees to feel free to do so, but identified their position as director to be very intimidating. One director said:

> Teachers aren't comfortable. They are old fashioned and tuned into the authoritative way of doing things. They expect to have policy handed down to them (Interviewee #7).

To conclude the second part of the Power section, directors were asked *To what extent are people throughout the school division involved in important decisions that you make?* All but one of the directors said that people from various levels of the organization were involved in important decisions they make. Two directors added that there was an expectation that people will be involved. Finally, one director
indicated that teachers were not very involved and that they preferred not to be involved.

Part 3. How Educational Leaders Should Use Power

How should directors use power in their practices as an educational leader? Three directors said that power should be used in a positive sense to influence activity in the organization toward common goals. Two directors said that educational leaders should strive for decentralization by sharing power throughout the organization. Finally, three directors suggested the use of specific types of power.

I think that directors should use legitimate, expert and information power. Most importantly, educational leaders should never take advantage of their power (Interviewee # 2).

The other two directors indicated that they preferred the use of relational power in order to build strong relationships with the people they work with.

The directors were then asked, Are you satisfied with the distribution of power in your school division? Six of the eight directors said that they were satisfied with the distribution of power in their school divisions. Two said that they were not satisfied because they felt more could be done to involve parents and other community groups in the education system.

When asked, To what extent do you believe that by pushing power and responsibility downward you will lose control in the process, the directors responded unanimously in disagreement with the statement. They strongly believed that by sharing power, communication improved in the organization and more control was gained.
I believe that you gain control. Culturally the organization is better (Interviewee # 1).

Well, I don't believe that to any great extent. It's the nature of education...decisions that are made about children learning are truly powerful decisions... teachers make these decisions. The more we let them make these decisions the better (Interviewee # 2).

I don't think you lose control if you move it downwards, as long as you keep a clear understanding of the organization's goals, mission and purpose. You probably enhance the outcomes (Interviewee # 3).

Competing Values

Part 1. Director Perceptions of Value

Part 1 of the competing values section examined the perceptions of directors about values in the organization. To begin, directors were asked, What does the term organizational values mean to you? Generally, directors said that organizational values represent the basic principles that guide their school divisions.

I believe that organizational values are much the same as personal values. They represent the ethos or the way you operate. They represent the disposition of the organization (Interviewee # 2).

Organizational values are what is held important. They underlie every single decision made in the organization (Interviewee # 3).

Organizational values are the beliefs and central focus of the organization. The things that motivate people (Interviewee # 5).

Organizational values are how we measure things around here. The measuring stick (Interviewee # 7).

Part 2. The Importance of Values to the Life of the Organization

Directors were asked, How important are values to the life of the organization? Unanimously, they felt that values were fundamentally
important to any organization. One director said that values keep people focused on a daily basis toward the organization's goals or ends. Another director described values as being extremely important because they represent statements of commitment to the organization.

In response to the question, To what extent should leaders try to influence organizational values?, most directors felt that it was their fundamental purpose in their school divisions.

It is a large responsibility of leaders to do so. They must constantly remind and question organizational progress in terms of its values (Interviewee # 1).

Another director said that he promoted decentralization, but when it came to values, he wanted to be involved. The director added that he was constantly promoting and modeling the goals, mission and values of the school division. One director said that basic values are hard to influence.

I don't know how much a leader can affect organizational values. But, modeling values and respecting them must start from the top (Interviewee # 7).

Overall, the directors believed that if they wanted to influence the values in their school divisions, they must initiate the process.

The final three questions in Part 2 of the Competing Values section served to identify the organizational values that were fostered in the directors' school divisions. The directors identified a respect for individual needs, the development of a caring school environment, and commitment to learning as the most common values in their school divisions. In addition, directors said that schools must strive to ensure that people were aware and understood the mission and direction of the school division.
Part 3. How Directors Influence Values in their School Divisions

Directors were asked to describe their involvement in promoting organizational values in their school divisions.

To what extent are people encouraged to come up with new ways of doing things? Five of the eight directors indicated that they encouraged people as much as possible to be creative. One director said that he did not do a lot of shoulder tapping and, therefore, could be considered average in encouraging people to be creative. One director said he had a lack of direct influence with his staff, and therefore relied on his principals to encourage people to be creative.

Directors were then asked, To what extent do people in your school division look to you to monitor and coordinate organizational activity? Only two directors indicated that they were not relied on to monitor and coordinate organizational activity. The remaining interviewees said that monitoring and coordinating organizational activity was a primary role of theirs.

I think that they look to me to monitor and coordinate things. We are trying to move away from that (Interviewee # 5).

They mostly look to me to see where were are going and how we are going to get there. It is widely recognized that I am the C.E.O. and the person of last resort. However, I am trying to decentralize more (Interviewee # 6).

The board and principals expect that of me. Teachers do not know what I do. They think that I close my door and put my feet up on the desk (Interviewee # 7).

Generally, directors recognized that they spent a considerable amount of time monitoring and coordinating organizational activity. However, they expressed an interest in decentralizing some of this responsibility.
When asked, *To what extent do you encourage people in your school division too better themselves professionally?*, all but one director said that they constantly encouraged people to better themselves professionally. One director said that because of the hard financial cutbacks in recent years, he was unable to encourage people enough in this regard.

Directors were also asked, *To what extent do you help other people visualize the future of the school divisions?*

As a director, that is what I consider leadership. That is, I help people create and live up to a vision (Interviewee # 8).

Constantly, that is my primary job. That basically is where I am every day (Interviewee # 1).

All of the directors indicated that helping people visualize the future of their school division was a primary responsibility of theirs.

The next question asked directors, *To what extent do people demonstrate a strong sense of duty and commitment to the school division?* The directors unanimously stated that their employees demonstrated a very strong sense of duty and commitment to their school divisions. One director added that some employees demonstrated stronger loyalty to their school and less to the school division as a whole.

The final question in Part 3 of the Competing Values section asked directors to identify which term best describes the organization of their school division; Team, Adhocracy, Firm, Hierarchy. Seven of the eight directors indicated that the Team best described the organization of their school divisions. One director described his school divisions as a Firm because of its well structured environment and its clear goals and
purposeful nature. Initially, four directors indicated that the Firm was the second best descriptor of their school divisions, while two directors felt that the Hierarchy was the second best descriptor of their school divisions. Upon further inquiry, the directors confirmed the Team atmosphere of their school divisions and shifted their second choice to the Hierarchy. Directors described the Hierarchical nature of their school divisions in terms of their uses of power and value.

Power is pushed downward to the councils. The basic organizational hierarchy has been changed to a flat structure (Interviewee #1)

I find myself between a rock and a hard place. I want to decentralize and break down the hierarchy, but when it comes to values, I want to be involved (Interviewee #6).

The directors also recognized the personal side of power as relational power, and discussed the involvement of people in the decision making process from all levels of their school divisions. These statements confirm the basic Hierarchical structure of the school divisions and suggest that a Team approach to organizing is emerging.

Part 4. Values Directors Should Foster in Their School Divisions

The directors were asked, What organizational values should directors foster in their school divisions? The most common values that directors identified were collaboration, cooperation, consensus, commitment, trust, work ethic, honesty, and respect for diversity.

To further expand on the directors perceptions of important values, they were asked, Are you satisfied with the values that permeate your school division? Three directors said that they were satisfied. Four directors said that they were satisfied and were continually looking for
improvements. Finally, one director indicated that she was trying to improve the sense of community in her school division.

In order to better understand how directors influence organizational values, they were asked, **What specific approaches should be used to improve the organizational values in your school division?** The directors identified talking to employees about values, modeling the values of the organization through their behaviour, and setting up collaborative approaches to make decisions as the best ways to influence organizational values.

The final question in Part 4 of the Competing Values section asked directors to identify the two terms that best described their leadership behaviour. The list of terms included mentor, monitor, innovator, producer, facilitator, coordinator, broker and director. Table 10 presents the frequency of responses. The most common competing value term that directors used to describe their leadership behaviour was facilitator (6), followed by mentor (4), innovator (2), coordinator (2) and producer (2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competing Value Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In review, there were several general themes that surfaced during the interview process. In terms of power, the directors unanimously indicated that their school divisions had a shared power base. Although most directors felt that they had the potential to be a powerful person in the school division, they continually strove to share power with other people. Directors also expressed their interest in developing a collaborative environment where people in their school divisions felt free to challenge their ideas and come up with alternative solutions to problems. To facilitate the development of a shared power base in their school divisions, directors said that they preferred to use relational, expert, legitimate and informational power in their leadership practices. Finally, directors most commonly described the organization of their school divisions as a Team.

In terms of competing values, directors unanimously felt that values were of fundamental importance to any organization. In addition, directors felt that it was a primary role of theirs to influence the values of their school divisions. When asked to describe how they would try to influence the values of their school divisions, directors said they would encourage creativity and further decentralize power and responsibility throughout the organization. Furthermore, directors said they would promote the values, purpose and mission of the organization and try to develop a greater sense of commitment to the school division. Directors identified collaboration, cooperation, consensus, commitment, trust and honesty as important values that they should try to foster in their school divisions. Finally, most directors preferred to use mentor and facilitator values to guide their managerial behaviour.
Summary

The chapter examined the quantitative statistical analyses of the data related to the Richardson Power Profile and the PRISM 1: Competing Value Self Assessment questionnaires in terms of research questions One to Four. In addition, the qualitative analysis of the interview data was examined in terms of research question Five.

The statistical analyses revealed that two main factors were being measured by the questionnaires, power and value. Furthermore, it was determined that the sixteen subscales of power and value demonstrated a high level of internal reliability.

In response to research question One, it was determined that directors most favored the use of relational and expert power, and least favored the use of coercion, connection and reward power in their administrative endeavours. The results also indicated that directors most preferred the use of mentor values and least preferred the use of broker and monitor values to guide their managerial behaviour.

The statistical analyses indicated that groups of directors, based on their context (experience, location, gender, education, size of school division) were not a major statistical issue for this study. Furthermore, it was determined that the contextual variables contributed minimally to director perception about their use of power and value in their school divisions.

The findings of the Pearson product-moment correlations generally supported the conceptual framework for the study. Relational power was significantly positively correlated to facilitator and mentor values, and expert power was highly correlated to monitor and coordinator values. Reward power was significantly positively correlated
to broker values, but failed to show a high correlation to the innovator subscale of values. Finally, legitimate power was not significantly correlated to the producer and director subscales of value as expected.

The analysis of the interview data supported the findings of the questionnaire data. As with the questionnaires, directors said that they preferred the use of relational and expert power in their school divisions. In addition, they most commonly described the organization of their school divisions in terms of the Team. The added that they were trying to move away from the hierarchy to become more characteristic of the Team. These statements supported the questionnaire data which identified directors' preferred use of mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour. The next chapter will discuss the findings of the survey and interview analyses.
CHAPTER FIVE
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of the survey and interview analyses are discussed in the following sections. The first section deals with the discriminate validity and the internal reliability of the power and value subscales. The second section discusses the findings of the power and competing value profiles of directors. The third section reviews the findings of the demographic analyses and their subsequent lack of effect on the directors' perceived use of power and value. Section four considers the relationships among the power and competing value subscales. Finally, section five addresses the findings from the interviews.

The Questionnaire Subscales

The factor analyses showed that two primary factors were being measured: one for power and one for value. The findings revealed that the power and value factors were not completely independent of one another. For example, the referent power subscale and the broker value subscale loaded fairly evenly on both factors, while the relational and expert power subscales loaded on factor one, revealing their strong value base.

In relation to the study, these findings indicated that the directors' perceived use of power and values were the two factors being measured. Furthermore, the measurement of directors' perceived use of power and
value cannot be considered as unidimensional constructs. The works of Sergiovanni (1992), Hodgkinson (1991), Quinn (1988) and McClelland (1975) support these findings by recognizing the importance of power and value to the study of administration, and that they are not mutually exclusive of one another.

The results of the alpha-scale reliability analyses showed that the subscales of power and value demonstrated a high level of internal reliability. On average, the power subscale alpha reliabilities were .80 and the value subscale alpha reliabilities were .74. Therefore, it can be stated that 79.8 percent of the variance of the total scores for power is reliable, and that 74.2 percent of the variance of the total scores for value is reliable (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

In summary, the findings from the factor analyses and the alpha-scale reliability analyses supported the discriminant and construct validity of the power and value subscales. The factor analyses suggested that power and value were the two primary factors being measured and the reliability analyses supported the internal reliability of the sixteen subscales of power and value. The following section discusses the findings of the power and competing value profiles of directors.

Power and Competing Value Profiles

Power Profile

The findings from the power profile analysis showed that directors most preferred to use relational and expert power while administrating their school divisions. Furthermore, the results showed that directors least preferred to use reward, connection and coercive power. The average mean score for each subscale of power ranged from a high of
12.17 for relational power to a low of 5.55 for coercive power. In relation to the conceptual framework for the study, the directors preferred use of relational and expert power would facilitate the development of a Team and Hierarchical organizational structure.

Quinn (1988) suggests that the development of a Team atmosphere in the organization is based on criteria such as cohesion, morale and human resource development. The leader's activity centers on the development of a flexible relational power base that facilitates participative decision making, concern and support for people throughout the organization. He adds, that the development of a Hierarchical organizational structure is based on criteria such as information management, downward communication, stability and control. The leader's activity centers on their use of expertise and influence to control the flow of information and organizational activity.

In addition, the results of the power profile analysis showed that directors have lower preferences to use reward and legitimate power within their school divisions. Quinn (1988) suggests that reward and legitimate power facilitate the development of an Adhocracy and a Firm organizational structure. The Adhocracy stresses criteria such as flexibility, growth, innovation and external support. The leader's activity centers on the use of reward power to acquire and allocate resources, while developing an underlying value system that supports growth and entrepreneurialism. The Firm stresses criteria such as planning, goal setting, productivity and efficiency. The leader uses legitimate power to provide structure, give directions and initiate organizational activity.

These findings suggested that directors most preferred to use relational and expert power which, in turn, facilitates the development of a
Team and Hierarchical organizational structure. Furthermore, the findings suggested that directors least preferred to use reward and legitimate power that facilitates an Adhocracy and Firm organizational structure. Quinn (1988) suggested that a combination of the Team and Hierarchical organizations would have a strong sense of internal focus, while being both flexible and controlling. In addition, he suggested that because directors preferred less to use reward and legitimate power, they paid less attention to external forces such as market demands, competition, conflict and assertiveness.

In summary, the power profile showed that directors preferred to use relational and expert power within their school divisions. The conceptual framework for the study suggested that the directors’ use of relational and expert power served to facilitate the development of a Team and Hierarchical organizational structure. Organizations of this nature have a high level of internal focus that reflects an orientation toward maintenance, coordination, equilibrium and longer time lines (Quinn, 1988). In addition, the power profile findings suggested that directors preferred to balance flexibility and control within their school divisions.

**Competing Value Profile**

The findings from the competing value profile showed that directors most preferred to use mentor values and least preferred to use broker and monitor values to guide their managerial behaviour. The average mean score for the value subscales ranged from a high of 6.07 for mentor values to a low of 5.31 for broker values. The results indicated that directors preferred to use all eight subscales of value.
In comparison to the power profile, the value profile demonstrated a relatively small range (6.07 to 5.31) of means. However, analyses of the test variables within each of the values subscales revealed that, on a scale of one to seven, there was a wide range responses. Therefore, it can be concluded that the test variables discerned perceptual differences among the directors toward their use of values to guide their managerial behaviour, despite the low range of means for the eight value subscales.

The directors' preference to use mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour supported their preference to use relational power. As with relational power, mentor values facilitate the development of a Team atmosphere in the organization. Mutual dependence, participative decision making and group values are the underlying criteria that guide the leader's use of role modeling to develop personal relationships based on trust and faith.

Of the eight value subscales, directors showed the least preference to use broker values. The low preference to use broker values coincided with the directors' low preference to use reward power. Quinn (1988) states that broker values and reward power serve to facilitate the development of an Adhocracy. Specifically, the use of broker values centers around the leader's control of organizational resources as a means to maintain a competitive work environment.

In review, the competing value profile showed that directors used all eight subscales of value, but most preferred to use mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour. The directors' high preference to use mentor values coincided with their high preference to use relational power. Both mentor values and relational power serve to facilitate the development of a Team atmosphere in their school divisions. Finally, the
competing value profile showed that directors least preferred to use broker values. Again, the directors' low preference to use broker values coincided with their low preference to use reward power. Both broker values and reward power serve to facilitate the development of an Adhocracy.

The findings of the power and competing value profiles indicated that directors most preferred to use relational power and mentor values. The conceptual framework for the study supported this relationship and suggested that the use of relational power and mentor values were characteristic of a Team organizational structure. The profiles also indicated that directors least preferred to use reward power and broker values. Again, the conceptual framework for the study supported this relationship and suggested that the use of reward power and broker values was characteristic of an Adhocracy. Of particular interest is that directors demonstrated a wide range in preferences toward the use of different types of power. For example, directors had a negative perception toward the use of coercion and a highly positive perception toward the use of relational power. In comparison, directors indicated a positive preference to use all eight value subscales, but most preferred to use mentor values.

Demographics

The demographic findings showed that the directors' context (experience, location, gender, education, size of school division) did not significantly affect their perceived use of power and value in their school divisions. Of the eighty t-tests or analyses of variance, among the subgroups of directors within each contextual variable, only two
significant differences (p < .05) were found. The directors' location (urban or rural) affected their perception toward the use of legitimate power and innovator values in their school divisions.

In addition, eighty multiple regression analyses were employed to evaluate what each contextual variable added to the prediction of each subscale of power and value. These findings revealed that none of the contextual variables significantly contributed to the regression equations.

The nonsignificant relationship between the directors' context and their perceived use of power and value in their school divisions is supported in the recent literature. Holmes (1991) and Allison (1991) stated that there have been few significant effects on the administration of directors of education attributed to demographic characteristics.

In summary, the findings of the demographic analyses indicated that the contextual variables were not statistically significant to this study. The following section discusses the findings of the Pearson product-moment correlation analyses.

**Correlation Analyses**

**Power Subscale Correlations**

The findings showed that there were two main sets of relationships among the power subscales. First, relational, expert and referent power were positively correlated to one another. Second, reward, coercion, connection and legitimate power were positively correlated to one another. Information power was positively correlated to all the power subscales. Previous studies have demonstrated that the power subscales in this study were not independent (Richardson & Thompson, 1981; Martin, 1978).
In 1989, Richardson described the relationship between expert, referent and legitimate power. She suggested that legitimate power reflects an individual's feelings that leaders ought to exert influence over their subordinates. Referent power is identified as non-threatening because it implies a voluntary compliance with one's superior. Finally, the administrator's position conveys the perception of expertise. Miller (1983) supported this relationship by stating, "it is reasonable that teachers perceive their principal as a fellow teacher (referent power) elevated to a position of authority (legitimate power) because of a unique combination of experience, service, and professional expertise (expert power) (Richardson, 1989, p.6).

In this study, the power subscale correlations supported Miller's relationship between expert and referent power. However, in comparison, these findings suggested that directors related their use of relational power (the ability to create meaningful relationships with people), to their use of referent power (the feeling of "oneness" with people), and to their use of expert power (a unique combination of experience, service and professional expertise). In addition, these findings suggested that directors related their use of reward power (the ability to reward) to their use of coercive power (the ability to punish), to their use of connection power (ties with powerful people), and to their use of legitimate power (power associated with one's position). Of particular interest is that previous studies have recognized that the way administrators relate their use of power varies depending on the population being studied (Richardson, 1989). In this study, there appeared to be a clear distinction between two groups of power. Relational, expert and referent power were
highly correlated, while reward, coercion, connection and legitimate power were highly correlated.

Value Subscale Correlations

Generally, the findings showed that the eight subscales of value were highly positively correlated to one another. The conceptual framework for the study suggested that coordinator and monitor values should be highly positively correlated, that mentor and facilitator values should be highly positively correlated, that producer and director values should be highly positively correlated, and that innovator and broker values should be highly positively correlated.

These findings supported the conceptual framework for the study, with the exception of the relationship between broker and innovator values. For example, director use of coordinator values was most highly correlated to the use of monitor values, director values were most highly correlated to producer values, and mentor values were most highly correlated to facilitator values. However, the broker and innovator subscales of value were most highly correlated to producer values, not each other as suggested in Quinn’s (1988) conceptual framework. The broker and innovator subscales of value were significantly positively correlated ($r = .35, p < .01$), but they were more highly correlated to other value subscales.

In summary, the correlation analyses revealed that directors clearly distinguish between the use of two groups of power. First, directors related their use of relational power to the use of referent and expert power. Second, directors related their use of reward power to the use of coercion, connection and legitimate power. Of the eight subscales of
power, directors most preferred to use relational and expert power within their school divisions. In addition, the findings showed that directors used all eight subscales of value, but most preferred to use mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour.

**Power and Value Correlations**

The correlation analyses revealed that there were strong relationships between the power and value subscales. The mentor and facilitator subscales of value were most highly correlated to relational power, the monitor and coordinator subscales of value were most highly correlated to expert power, and the broker subscale of value was most highly correlated to reward power. These relationships supported the conceptual framework for the study. However, the findings also revealed that the producer, director and innovator subscales of value were most highly correlated to relational power. These relationships did not support the conceptual framework for the study.

Denison, Hooijberg & Quinn (1993), Richardson (1989), and Quinn (1988) provided some possible explanations for the differences between these findings and Quinn's (1988) conceptual framework. First, these authors stated that the conceptual framework was designed to diagnose and intervene in business organizations. However, this study examined the power and competing value profiles of directors of education. Therefore, it may be suggested that Quinn's conceptual framework does not fully explain leadership behaviour in educational organizations. Second, these authors recognized that the use of power and value may vary significantly from one organization to the next. As a result, leaders in different organizations may prefer to use power and value as means to
achieve different ends. Consequently, these examples explain how organizational differences may have affected the relationship between the findings of this study and Quinn's conceptual framework.

The correlations between the power and value subscales indicated that directors most preferred to use mentor values in conjunction with relational power to facilitate a Team atmosphere in their school divisions. In addition, the findings showed that directors preferred to use expert power in conjunction with coordinator and monitor values to facilitate a Hierarchical organizational structure within their school divisions. The expected relationships between reward and legitimate power and their value subscales were not supported by the results of the correlation analyses. The following section discusses the findings from the interviews.

**Interview Findings**

**Power**

The first section of the interview dealt with director perceptions of power. The findings showed that most directors defined power in terms of their ability to affect change and influence people within the organization. Generally, directors distinguished between the positional power they have as a result of the formal structure of their school division, and their preference to use relational power to establish meaningful relationships with other people. These findings were consistent with those from the survey analyses. First, they supported the directors' preference to use relational power and second, they suggested that directors use relational power to establish a Team atmosphere in their school divisions.
Walker (1995), Rossler (1994), Leithwood & Musella (1991), Gronn (1987), and McClelland (1975) suggested that in order to better understand the nature of administration, one must go beyond identifying leadership practices and delve into the motive in thought and action. The following sections attempt to describe how and why directors use power to administrate their school divisions.

Section two of the interview addressed how directors used power. The findings indicated that power was distributed fairly evenly among many groups of people in most school divisions, and that directors engaged in purposeful behaviour to facilitate and maintain a shared power base.

Most directors suggested that there were many powerful groups of people in their school divisions. Some of these powerful groups included principals, teachers, school boards, directors and parents. In addition, directors described their school divisions as hierarchical and bureaucratic in structure. These findings were supported in the literature that describes educational organizations as refractory, bureaucratic, closed systems, and pathological bureaucracies (Kowalski, 1995; Louis & Miles, 1990; Payne, 1984; Hummel & Nagel, 1973).

Louis and Miles (1990), Muth (1989), and Foster (1986) suggested that, in organizations of this type, power is distributed unequally, creating centers of power and powerlessness. In most bureaucracies, power is a coveted resource that is held on to by the top management and used to control organizational activity. However, despite identifying the hierarchical and bureaucratic structure of their school divisions, directors indicated that power is shared throughout all levels of their organizations. Furthermore, they identified several strategies and techniques they used
to foster and maintain a shared power base, thereby suggesting their intentions to move away from their existing bureaucratic structure toward a Team atmosphere.

To foster a shared power base in their school divisions, directors indicated that they tried to limit their involvement in the daily activity of the organization. Directors felt that by focusing on future events, times and ideas, they created an atmosphere where people felt free to influence the decisions they made. In addition, directors purposefully set-up committees and delegated tasks to generate collaboration and participative decision making. Finally, directors indicated that by distributing power throughout all levels of the organization, they would have a greater opportunity to motivate and influence people toward the attainment of organization-wide goals. These findings were supported by Sergiovanni (1992) and Hodgkinson (1991) who suggest that when power is shared among the collectivity, it becomes a source of energy for achieving shared goals and purposes. Furthermore, these findings supported the findings of the survey analyses. A shared power base is characteristic of the use of relational power, which is used to develop a Team atmosphere in the organization.

The final power section of the interview examined how educational leaders should use power. The findings indicated that directors believed power should be used in a positive sense to influence activity in the organization toward common goals. In addition, directors felt that they should use their power to facilitate the decentralization of their school divisions and to break down their bureaucratic structure. Directors identified the importance of using relational power to build strong relationships with the people they work with, expert power to provide
support and guidance for people in the organization, and informational power to share valuable knowledge with people. These findings further supported the survey findings by showing the importance of relational and expert power to director administration.

McClelland (1975) suggested that the director perceptions toward the use of power represent a positive socializing force that is characterized by a concern for group goals, for finding those goals that will move people, for helping the group to formulate them, for taking the initiative in providing the means for achieving them, and for giving members the feeling of competence they need. Burns (1978) said that the use of power in this nature fosters mutual relationships between leaders and followers.

In summary, the power section of the interview showed that directors perceived power as a means to influence activity in the organization toward common goals. Second, directors clearly distinguished between the positional power they had as a result of the organizational structure, and their preferred use of relational power to establish meaningful relationships with people. Third, directors indicated that their school divisions had a shared power base, despite their hierarchical and bureaucratic structure. Finally, these findings indicated that directors felt they purposefully behaved in ways that fostered and maintained a shared power base in an attempt to decentralize and develop a Team atmosphere in their school divisions.
**Competing Values**

Section one of competing values in the interview dealt with director perceptions of organizational values. These findings showed that directors defined organizational values as the basic principles that guide their school divisions. In addition, organizational values were described as the ethos of the organization, what is valuable to the organization, the central focus of the organization, and the things that motivate people. The director perceptions were consistent with Sergiovanni (1987) who described values as the collective conscience that serves to guide the ethical and moral actions of individuals within the organization.

Section two examined director perceptions toward the importance of organizational values to the life of an organization. Directors were unanimous in their feelings that values were of fundamental importance to any organization. One director described values as statements of commitment to the organization. The findings also indicated that directors felt it was a fundamental responsibility of theirs to influence and shape the values of their school divisions. Walker (1993), Hodgkinson (1991), Sergiovanni (1987), and Copeland (1944) supported the director perceptions by describing leadership as the act of dealing with values. Burns (1978) identified the concept of transformational leadership, whereby leaders strive to create a mutual basis of shared motives, values and goals for the future. Finally, the directors identified respect for individual needs, a caring environment, commitment and teamwork as the most common values that permeated their school divisions.

The findings of section two supported to the survey results. Directors clearly indicated that they felt values were fundamentally important to any organization. Furthermore, directors felt a primary
responsibility toward influencing the values within their school divisions and working with people to create a mutual basis of shared motives, values and goals for the future. Finally, directors identified respect, caring, commitment and teamwork as the most common values in their school divisions. These findings are characteristic of a Team organizational structure, where criteria such as group values, mutual dependence, participative decision making and caring for individual needs are stressed. In addition, the Team is guided by the use of mentor and facilitator values, and relational power.

Section three of competing values showed how directors influenced values within their school divisions. Generally, directors indicated that they: (1) encouraged people to better themselves professionally; (2) encouraged creative problem solving; (3) helped people visualize the future; and (4) monitored and coordinated organizational activity. Directors felt that because of their efforts, employees showed a very strong sense of duty and commitment to their school divisions.

These findings supported the survey results because they showed how directors tended to the needs of people by encouraging their professional development and creativity. In addition, the findings showed that directors spent a considerable amount of time helping people visualize the future of their school divisions. These director behaviours were characteristic of a Team organizational structure, where leaders use relational power in conjunction with facilitator and mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour (Quinn, 1988). Section three also indicated that directors spent a considerable amount of time coordinating and monitoring organizational activity. Quinn (1988) associated these
competing values with the use of expert power and the development of a Hierarchical organizational structure.

Section three indicated that directors preferred to use values that facilitate the development of a Team and Hierarchical organizational structure. To support these findings directors were asked to identify which term best described the organization of their school division (Team, Hierarchy, Adhocracy, Firm). Seven of the eight directors that were interviewed said the Team and one said the Firm. Initially, four directors identified the Firm as their second choice and two identified the Hierarchy as their second choice. However, upon further inquiry, the directors confirmed the Team atmosphere of their school divisions and recognized the Hierarchical underpinnings of their organizations.

Section four dealt with the values that directors should foster in their school divisions. Directors identified collaboration, cooperation, consensus, commitment, trust, work ethic, honesty and respect for individuals as important values. Furthermore, directors indicated that they were, for the most part, satisfied with the development of these values in their school divisions. Finally, directors said that facilitator and mentor values were the competing values they preferred to use to foster these values in their school divisions.

These findings were consistent with the survey results. First, collaboration, consensus, commitment, trust, honesty and respect for individuals are characteristic of the Team. Second, Quinn (1988) suggested that facilitator and mentor values facilitate the development of a Team. Third, the questionnaire results identified directors' preference to use facilitator and mentor values.
In review, the competing values section of the interview showed that directors perceived values as the basic principles that guided their school divisions. Second, directors felt that it is a primary role of theirs to influence and shape the values of their school division because of their fundamental importance. Third, directors described the values that permeated their school divisions in terms of the Team, where criteria such as group values, mutual dependence, participative decision making, and respect for individual needs were stressed. Fourth, these findings showed that directors exhibited managerial behaviours that fostered the development of a Team and Hierarchical organizational structure. Finally, directors indicated that they preferred to use facilitator and mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour.

Summary

The factor analyses and the reliability analyses supported the discriminant and construct validity of the power and value subscales. The factor analyses showed that two primary factors were being measured: one for power and one for value. The reliability analyses indicated that the sixteen subscales of power and value demonstrated a high degree of internal reliability.

The correlation analyses revealed that there were strong relationships within and between the power and value subscales. First, the findings showed that directors clearly distinguished between the use of two groups of power. Relational power was most highly positively correlated to expert and referent power, while reward power was most highly positively correlated to coercion, connection and legitimate power.
Second, the eight subscales of value were highly positively correlated to one another.

The results from the correlation analyses generally supported the conceptual framework for the study. For example, director use of relational power was most highly positively correlated to their use of mentor and facilitator values, expert power was most highly positively correlated to monitor and coordinator values, and reward power was most highly positively correlated to broker values. However, the findings also indicated that producer, director, and innovator values were most highly positively correlated to relational power. These findings do not support Quinn's (1988) conceptual framework. Denison, Hooijberg & Quinn (1993), Richardson (1989), and Quinn (1988) suggested that the inconsistencies between the findings of this study and Quinn's conceptual framework may be attributed to organizational differences.

The power and competing value profiles provided evidence that directors most prefer to use relational power and mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour. The conceptual framework for the study suggested that the use of relational power and mentor values facilitates the development of a Team atmosphere in the organization. The profiles also indicated that directors least preferred to use reward power and broker values which facilitate the development of an Adhocracy.

Finally, the interview findings supported the results of the survey analyses. First, these findings showed that directors most preferred to use relational power to create and maintain a shared power base in their school divisions. Second, the interviews indicated that directors most preferred to use mentor and facilitator values to guide their managerial behaviour. Quinn (1988) suggested that the use of relational power in
conjunction with mentor and facilitator values serves to develop a Team atmosphere in the organization.
CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The chapter provides a summary of the study, conclusions and implications for theory, practice and research.

Summary of the Research

The purpose of the study was to examine the power and competing value profiles of directors of education in the province of Saskatchewan. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the power and competing value profiles of directors of education in the province of Saskatchewan?

2. What are the differences between groups of directors and their perceptions of power and competing values based on their context (experience, location, gender, education, and size of the school division)?

3. To what extent does the director's context (experience, location, gender, education, and size of school division) affect his/her power and value orientations?

4. How are the power and competing value profiles related?

5. What characteristics of power and values do directors consider to be important in their practices as educational leaders?

The conceptual framework of power and competing values was intended to be used to diagnose and intervene in actual organizations (Quinn, 1988). Specifically, the model integrated the underlying power
and value characteristics of leadership behaviour with the different organizational forms in theory.

Throughout history, competing organizational forms have emerged that represent the general forms and perceptions people have about administration. Quinn's (1988) conceptual framework categorized the organizational literature into four notions of organizing: the Hierarchy, the Firm, the Adhocracy, and the Team. The Hierarchy has been described as the oldest and most pervasive notion of organizing that began with Max Weber's writings on bureaucracy (Bass, 1981). The leader's role in a Hierarchy is to monitor and coordinate organizational activity by maintaining the structure and flow of the organization. The Firm is perhaps the most common notion of organizing and assumes people must be clearly instructed by a decisive authority figure. The leader's role is to clarify expectations by planning, goal setting, initiating problem solving, and setting organizational aims and goals. The Adhocracy is a relatively new notion of organizing that relies on adaptation and change to succeed within a highly competitive environment. The leader's role is to garner the appropriate organizational resources to fuel creative problem solving. Finally, the Team approach to organizing is based on the principles of Japanese management (Ouchi, 1981) and stresses consensus, cohesion and teamwork. The leader's role is to facilitate group problem solving while acting as a mentor to help people grow and develop.

The organizational context within which directors operate has been described as hierarchical. Hummel and Nagle (1973) referred to educational organizations as "closed systems", while Payne (1984) applied the term "pathological bureaucracies". Kowalski (1995)
described the evolution of the directorship amid a scene of rapidly expanding urban centers during the industrial revolution. Consequently, the bureaucratic ideals of that time were embraced and now form the bases of our current educational systems. The bureaucratic influence on directors explains much of the perceived inadequacies of our current educational leadership and the ever expanding gap between real educational needs and the failed traditional approaches to schooling.

Heckscher (1994) suggests that the contemporary workplace has experienced fundamental shifts from the use of power to influence and from bureaucracy to human accomplishment. These changes in organizations have brought to our attention the different perceptions of organizing and the advantages and disadvantages of each. Specifically, these organizational shifts explicate the need to study the underlying power motives and values that guide the practices of administrators.

This study was designed to examine the power and competing value profiles of directors of education. The study population consisted of the 91 directors of education in the Province of Saskatchewan. In January of 1997, a copy of the survey instruments were distributed to all the directors. In addition, eight of the respondents were randomly selected and interviewed. The random selection was based on the contextual variables to ensure that the stratified population was represented. Data for the study were obtained by a triangulation of questionnaire and semi-structured interviews. The Richardson Power Profile (RPP) and Quinn's (1988) PRISM 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment (CV) questionnaires were used in the study. The RPP was expanded by one subscale of power, relational power, to fit the conceptual framework for
the study. The RPP also asked for demographic information and both questionnaires used Likert-type scales.

Data were analyzed in five ways. First, factor analyses and reliability analyses were employed to support the discriminant and construct validity of the sixteen subscales of power and value. Second, t-tests, analyses of variance and multiple regression analyses were used to examine the relationship between the directors' context and their perceived use of power and values. Third, means, standard deviations and total sum scores were used to generate power and competing value profiles for directors. Fourth, Pearson product-moment correlations were used to examine the relationships within and between the subscales of power and values. Finally, data from the semi-structured interviews were classified according to themes.

Sixty-five of the ninety directors responded to the RPP and CV questionnaires. This represented a response rate of 72.2 percent. The demographic data indicated that 45 percent of the respondents had less than five years of director experience, whereas 29.2 percent had five to nine years of experience, and 30.8 percent had ten or more years of experience. Of the sixty-five respondents, fifteen worked in urban school divisions and 49 worked in rural school divisions. In terms of education, 20 of the respondents had obtained a bachelor's degree, 32 had completed a master's degree, and 13 had continued their education beyond the master's level. Seven of the last group had obtained a doctorate. Thirty-two percent of the respondents worked in school divisions with less than 1000 students, 44.6 percent worked in school divisions with 1000 to 1999 students, and 23.1 percent worked in school divisions with more than 2000 students. Finally, the demographic data
indicated that 89.2 percent of the respondents were male and 10.8 percent were female.

Conclusions

The conclusions are presented as they relate to the research questions.

Question 1. What are the self-perceived power and competing value profiles of directors if education in the province of Saskatchewan?

To construct the power and competing value profile of directors, the means and standard deviations for each test item for the RPP and CV were calculated. Then, final scores were calculated for each of the eight subscales of power and the eight subscales of value by averaging the means of the test items associated with each subscale.

The power profile showed that directors most preferred to use relational and expert power, while showing a decreasing preference to use informational, legitimate, referent, reward, connection and coercion power, respectively.

In terms of the conceptual framework, Quinn (1988) suggested that directors used relational and expert power to facilitate the development of a Team and Hierarchical organizational structure. From the data, it was concluded that the organization of the directors' school divisions reflected the characteristics of a Team and Hierarchy. In the Team, the leader's activity centers on the development of a flexible power base that facilitates participative decision making, concern and support for people throughout the school division. In a Hierarchy, the leader's activity centers on the use of expertise to control the flow of information and organizational activity.
Therefore, it was further concluded that there was a balance between a flexible and controlled organization of school divisions in Saskatchewan.

The competing value profile showed that directors used all eight value subscales, but most preferred to use mentor values to guide their managerial behaviour. In terms of the conceptual framework, directors used mentor values to facilitate a Team atmosphere in their school divisions. Therefore, it was concluded that directors rely on mutual dependence, participative decision making, and group values as the underlying criteria to guide their use of role modeling to develop relationships based on trust and faith.

The results from the power and competing value profiles were consistent. Both profiles showed that directors preferred to use power and value to create a Team environment in their school divisions. Therefore, the findings provided evidence that educational systems in Saskatchewan are experiencing fundamental shifts in organizing. A premise of this study was that organizations are moving toward more contemporary models of management. Heckscher (1994) suggested that the two fundamental shifts in the contemporary workplace are from the use of power to influence and from bureaucracy to human accomplishment.

The interactive model of organization has been described as evolutionary to the traditional bureaucracy or hierarchy. Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice (1994) suggested this transformation challenges the core of the bureaucratic structure by altering the use of power throughout the organization and moving to a system coordinated by influence and dialogue. Therefore, leadership becomes a function of managing relations not tasks, organizational politics are brought to the forefront not
pushed under the carpet, and relationships develop based on informed consensus not hierarchy and authority (Heckscher, 1994). In short, the primary difference between the traditional and contemporary organizational forms is the means by which they achieve consensus of organizational culture.

Traditional organizational forms consider culture a top-down, management controlled responsibility, whereas, the interactive model promotes the development of culture by decisions made through unconstrained dialogue. Therefore, the true difference between the traditional and interactive models of organizing can be reduced to their application of power to the organization.

It was concluded that directors were changing their use of power to more reflect the interactive organization. First, directors distinguished between the use of two groups of power: group one consisted of relational, referent and expert power and group two consisted of reward, coercion, connection and legitimate power. Second, directors said that they most preferred to use relational power (group one) and least preferred to use coercive power (group two). Third, directors suggested that power should be used in a positive manner to break down hierarchical structures and to move toward the Team. Fourth, directors purposefully engaged in leadership behaviours such as, delegation, collaboration and participative decision making that facilitated the development of a Team atmosphere. Finally, directors most commonly described their school divisions as having a shared power base, where power was fairly evenly distributed among many groups of people.

Furthermore, directors expressed a desire to shift from the use of power to influence. For example, in the interviews, directors agreed that
they could no longer adopt a power-over approach with people. Instead, they suggested that there was an expectation of involvement from their employees when it came to making important decisions. Most directors identified power as a source of energy for achieving shared goals and purposes. Furthermore, they suggested that power should not rest in the hands of upper management, rather it should be shared throughout the organization. Of particular importance was that directors were aware of the hierarchical underpinnings of their educational systems, but recognized the need and exhibited the desire to move toward a Team atmosphere.

Heckscher (1994) identified the shift from bureaucracy to human accomplishment as the second fundamental shift in the contemporary workplace. Heckscher (1994), Sergiovanni (1992), Oakley & Krug (1991), Foster (1986), and Bass (1981) suggested that the traditional use of power served to create and perpetuate barriers that disrupt human accomplishment. For example, Hodgkinson (1991) implied that when power is used to maintain structure and authority, a primitive value system is established within the organization that is grounded in what is 'good' for the individual and that promotes self-justifying behaviour. In comparison, Heckscher (1994) identified the interactive model of organizing where criteria such as consensus, group values, participative decision making, respect for individual needs and unconstrained dialogue are stressed. An organization based on these criteria is said to promote interdependence among people and to facilitate human accomplishment.

It was concluded that directors promoted the development of organizational values that were characteristic of the interactive model.
First, directors said that they most preferred to use mentor values to
guide their managerial behaviour. Second, directors recognized the
importance of influencing values in their school divisions as a means
toward establishing a mutual basis of shared motives and goals. Third,
directors identified collaboration, trust, team work, honesty, respect,
commitment and consensus as important organizational values. Fourth,
directors stressed criteria such as mutual dependence, participative
decision making and group values to guide their relationships with other
people. Finally, directors encouraged people to better themselves
professionally, encouraged creative problem solving, helped people
visualize the future of the school division, and fostered a sense of duty
and commitment to the organization.

Therefore it was concluded that directors perceived they promoted
organizational values that allowed employees to maximize their individual
potential within a mutually dependent environment. Hodgkinson (1991)
described organizations of this nature as having higher value systems
that are grounded in what is 'right' for the collectivity.

In summary, the results of this study showed that despite the
traditional bureaucratic nature of education systems, directors in
Saskatchewan have expressed a desire to shift from the use of power to
influence and to promote values that facilitate human accomplishment.
Therefore, the results supported the premise that educational systems
are moving toward more contemporary models of management.
Question 2 and 3.

What are the differences between groups of directors and their perceptions of power and value based on their context (experience, location, gender, education, size of school division)?

To what extent does the director’s context affect his/her power and competing value profiles?

To examine the relationship between the directors’ demographic context and their perceived use of power and values, t-tests, analyses of variance, and multiple regression analyses were employed. Of the eighty t-tests or analyses of variance, among the subgroups of directors within each contextual variable, only two significant differences were found. The directors’ location (urban or rural) significantly affected their perceptions toward the use of legitimate power and innovator values. The eighty multiple regression analyses showed that none of the contextual variables contributed significantly to the regression equations. Therefore, it can be concluded that the directors’ demographic context did not significantly affect their perceived use of power and value in their school divisions. These results were supported by Holmes (1991) and Allison (1991) who stated that there have been few significant effects on the administration of directors of education attributed to demographic characteristics.

Question 4. How are the power and competing value profiles related?

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to measure the nature of the relationships among the sixteen subscales of power and value. The findings indicated that directors distinguished between the use of two groups of power. First, directors related their use of
relational power to their use of expert and referent power. Second, directors related their use of reward power to their use of coercion, connection and legitimate power. Previous studies by Richardson (1989) and Miller (1983) supported the relationship between expert and referent power (their studies did not include a measure for relational power). The findings also indicated that the eight value subscales were positively correlated to one another.

The correlation analyses revealed that there were strong relationships between the power and value subscales. Mentor and facilitator values were most highly positively correlated to relational power, coordinator and monitor values were most highly correlated to expert power, and broker values were most highly positively correlated to reward power. These findings supported the conceptual framework for the study. However, the findings also showed that director, producer and innovator values were most highly positively correlated to relational power. These findings did not support the conceptual framework for the study. Therefore, it was concluded that Quinn's (1988) conceptual framework was not totally supported.

Denison, Hooijberg & Quinn (1993), Richardson (1989), and Quinn (1988) addressed this conclusion by suggesting that different populations may use different types of power depending on their organizational context. Therefore, the inconsistency between the conceptual framework and the data for this study may be attributed to the different uses of power by directors of education. For example, the questionnaire and interview data suggested that directors of education in Saskatchewan most identified with the uses of power and value that were associated with the Team and Hierarchy. Coincidentally, the findings
supported the Team and Hierarchy quadrants of the conceptual framework. In comparison, directors least identified with the uses of power and value that were associated with the Firm and Adhocracy. The data did not support the Firm and Adhocracy quadrants of the conceptual framework.

The inconsistencies between the findings and the conceptual framework may be due to several reasons. First, Quinn's (1988) conceptual framework was designed to study business organizations and may need to be modified to better explain educational organizations. Second, directors in Saskatchewan are less familiar with the uses of power and value within the Firm and Adhocracy. As a result, directors may have misperceptions or misuse these types of power. Finally, the inconsistencies may be due to a combination of the need to modify the conceptual framework to better reflect the educational organization and the unfamiliarity of directors about the uses of power and value in the Firm and Adhocracy.

**Question 5. What characteristics of power and value do directors consider important to their practices as educational leaders?**

The results showed that directors preferred to use relational power to influence their school divisions toward the attainment of common goals. Directors also indicated that their school divisions had a shared power base, and that they purposefully engaged in behaviour that facilitated a shared power base. Finally, the interviews showed that directors used relational power as a means to decentralize or flatten the hierarchical structure of their school divisions in an attempt to move toward a Team approach to organizing.
Directors indicated that values were fundamentally important to the life of any organization, and that a primary responsibility of theirs was to influence and shape the values of their school divisions. Second, directors described their school divisions in terms of a Team, where criteria such as group values, mutual dependence, participative decision making, and respect for individual needs were stressed. Finally, directors said that mentor and facilitator values best reflected their leadership behaviour, and that the Team best described the organization of their school divisions.

In conclusion, the interview data supported the survey findings. Directors indicated that their school divisions were hierarchical in structure, but that they preferred to engage in leadership behaviour that facilitated the development of a Team atmosphere. Furthermore, directors identified consensus, team building, collaboration, respect, commitment and trust as important organizational values. These values are also representative of a Team organizational structure. Therefore, the interview data supported the conclusion that education systems in Saskatchewan are moving toward a more contemporary model of management.

Implications

In this section, implications for theory, practice and research are discussed.

Implications for Theory

In the recent organizational literature, there has been considerable debate over which model of organizing can best meet the challenge of
the contemporary workplace. Many scholars have supported the traditional closed model of organizing, where the formulation and promulgation of organizational aims and goals are the exclusive responsibility of top-management (Krackhardt, 1994; Gordon, 1994; Wardell, 1994; Kets de Vries, 1980). Other writers have argued that the interactive model of organizing is superior, where the leader's role is to develop unconstrained dialogue among all group members to generate cultural consensus (Heckscher, 1994; Heckscher & Applegate, 1994; Heckscher, Eisenstat & Rice, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1994, 1992, 1987; Hodgkinson, 1991, 1983; Burns, 1978). The current status of the debate is that there has been a transformation away from the traditional, top-down, management controlled hierarchy to the more collaborative processes of the interactive model. Heckscher (1994) stated that the contemporary workplace has experienced fundamental shifts from the use of power to influence and from bureaucracy to human accomplishment. The findings from this study provided evidence that educational systems in Saskatchewan may be experiencing these organizational shifts. First, directors showed that they preferred to use relational power in a positive way to influence organizational activity toward common aims and goals. Second, directors indicated that they preferred to use mentor values to foster cohesion and morale which, in turn, promoted human accomplishment. The use of relational power and mentor values are characteristic of a Team approach to organizing (Quinn, 1988) which stresses criteria such as group values, participative decision making and problem-based relations.

These findings have implications for theory. In terms of power, directors identified their preference to use relational power and, therefore,
supported Heckscher’s statement that power has shifted toward influence. In the literature review, it was suggested by Kowalski (1995) that directors of education operated within a bureaucratic organizational structure. It was further suggested that because of this bureaucratic orientation, directors have, for the most part, governed divisions of operation on the basis of assumed expertise and legitimate authority. Sergiovanni (1992) described the use of power in this context as power-over. Power-over is said to create separation between organizational functions that depend on each other, limit the ability to work well across departmental lines, and disrupt the development of a community atmosphere in group dynamics (Oakley & Krug, 1991; Foster, 1986; Bass, 1981). This study showed that directors of education in Saskatchewan least preferred to use power in the form of power-over, rather it showed that directors preferred to use relational power in the form of power-to. Sergiovanni (1992) described the concept of power-to as a shift of power from an individual asset to that of a group asset. Power-to represents a shared power base, where power is distributed among the group and is used as an instrument of higher power that is directed toward the benefit of the collectivity (McClelland, 1975).

In terms of values, directors recognized their importance to organizing and, therefore, supported Heckscher’s statement that bureaucracy has shifted toward human accomplishment. Under the guise of bureaucracy, traditional education systems minimized the importance of values to administration and favored rationalized explanations of scientific research based on concrete facts. In comparison, interactive organizations acknowledged individual consciousness and subjectivity, wherein values are of critical importance.
The importance of higher level conative and cognitive values to administration was supported in this study. Walker (1993) stated that “leadership is, at its roots, a context dependent set of values grounded by seminal value-commitments” (p.2). However, Hodgkinson (1991), Forsyth (1990), Bogue (1985) and Burns (1978) suggested that contemporary leadership is obsessed with value negotiations that are based in self-interest, and is therefore antithetical to leadership because it depersonalizes relationships among people, lessens reciprocity, and erodes common purpose and direction. Hodgkinson (1991) classified the use of values based in self-interest as Type 11 values. Type 11 values are said to be self-justifying, emotional and grounded in what is ‘good’ for the individual.

Central to Hodgkinson’s (1991) concept of values is that leaders have a natural tendency to resolve value conflict at the lowest level of the hierarchy possible, or from values of self-interest. However, the findings from this study showed that directors preferred to use mentor values to guide their leadership behaviour. Quinn (1988) suggested that mentor values facilitated the development of a Team atmosphere in the organization and that they relied on criteria such as mutual dependence, participative decision making, and group values. The use of mentor values in establishing employee relationships is said to be based on trust and faith.

Hodgkinson’s (1991) model of values would categorize mentor values further up the hierarchy and into the conative (Type 1) and cognitive (Type 11) domains. Type 1 values are metaphysically grounded by deep-rooted ethical and moral principles, whereas Type 11 values are rational and employ the cognitive function. Directors' use of mentor
values has implications for theory. First, it shows that directors in Saskatchewan do not rely on the use of lower-level values to guide their leadership behaviour as suggested in the recent literature. Second, it shows that directors have refocused the way in which they resolve value conflicts. Director leadership is consistent with the principles of transformational leadership in that it has broken away from the traditional exchange-based negotiations with followers and moved toward creating a mutual basis for shared motives, values and goals with followers.

Directors’ preference to use relational power and mentor values is characteristic of the Team organizational structure. Within the Team, human resources and the development of commitment are emphasized through information sharing and collaborative processes. The leader’s role is to facilitate group problem solving while acting as a mentor to help people grow and develop. The findings of this study seem to express a need to redefine the role of organizational leadership outside of the parameters of the traditional bureaucratic nature of administration. To do this, we must reflect on our beliefs of what makes a good leader and question the underlying internal processes, attitudes and beliefs that govern leadership behaviour and practice.

In the literature review it was suggested that very little is known about the norms and practices of educational leaders (Rossler, 1994; Gronn, 1987). In 1991, Leithwood and Musella identified only thirty-eight studies on the superintendency and suggested that these studies paid little attention to the leader’s internal processes, attitudes, values and beliefs. In 1995, Walker concluded that the educational leader’s ethical, personal, internal and external value sets, and their mediating frameworks have been largely ignored. This study, therefore, has
contributed to the literature by applying the organizational theory to the study of the power motives and competing value frameworks of directors, thereby testing the utility of the theory to the practice of educational administrators in Saskatchewan.

The findings from this study did not totally support Quinn’s (1988) conceptual framework. Denison, Hooijberg & Quinn (1993) suggested that different populations may use different types of power depending on their organizational context. Quinn developed his conceptual framework to assess the leadership behaviours of business executives. Therefore, the inconsistency between the conceptual framework and the data for this study may be attributed to the different uses of power by directors as opposed to their business counterparts.

In this study, directors of education most identified with the uses of power and value that were associated with the Team and Hierarchy. The Team and Hierarchy represent organizational forms that have an internal focus and long time-lines. The literature supports the internal focus and refractory nature of educational organizations (Kowalski, 1995, Hodgkinson, 1991, Payne, 1985, Hummel & Nagle, 1973). Therefore, it seems reasonable to state that the findings from the study supported the Team and Hierarchy quadrants of the conceptual framework because they best represented the organizational structure of education systems and employed the types of power and values that directors were most familiar with. In addition, it would further imply that the Adhocracy and Firm organizational forms did not adequately explain educational systems because they made use of types of power and value that were of less utility to directors. For example, the Firm and Adhocracy organizational forms thrive in a competitive market place and have an
external focus. Criteria such as competition, assertiveness and resource acquisition are stressed to ensure that an up-to-date, production-oriented culture is maintained within the organization. The use of power and value in these settings are not conducive to the educational environment. As a result, the findings of this study did not support the Adhocracy and Firm quadrants of the conceptual framework.

These findings have implications for theory because they explicate the need to develop a conceptual framework that better explains the educational organization. Specifically, the results indicated that educational organizations are internally focused and operate on long time-lines. In addition, the findings supported the left side (Team, Hierarchy) of Quinn's (1988) conceptual framework, and indicated that directors preferred to use power and value that were characteristic of the Team. Furthermore, the findings supported Heckscher's (1994) statement that power has shifted toward influence and that bureaucracy has shifted toward human accomplishment in the contemporary workplace. Therefore, there is a basis to reconceptualize Quinn’s conceptual framework along these parameters and to place more emphasis on the interactive approach to organizing.

Finally, it was indicated in Chapter Three that the power instruments used in previous research did not account for relational power (Richardson, 1989). In this study, relational power contributed substantially to the power profiles of directors. As a result, there is a basis for retaining a measure of relational power in future studies of directors and power. In addition, this finding showed a need for researchers to further develop the concept of relational power and to create measurement tools that account for relational power.
Implications for Practice

The findings of this study indicated that directors of education most preferred to use relational power and mentor values to guide their leadership behaviour. The interviews suggested that directors used relational power and mentor values as a means to decentralize the hierarchical structure of their school divisions in an attempt to move toward a Team organizational structure. However, the recent literature described the educational organization as a closed system, as having authoritarian control, and as having remained organized as they were in the early 1920s (Kowalski, 1995; Payne, 1985; Hummel & Nagle, 1973).

These results have implications for the practices of educational leaders in Saskatchewan. First, the results indicated that the norms and practices of directors did not embody bureaucratic principles, rather they reflected the interactive model of organizing. Therefore, it may be in the best interest of directors to enhance their understanding of the interactive model of organizing. For example, the interactive organization symbolizes a transformation away from the bureaucratic, rational definition of offices to a true collaborative process that opens up information and public dialogue across departmental boundaries. In order to facilitate the development of leadership that is characteristic of the interactive organization, directors need to reexamine their power motives and competing value frameworks. Specifically, directors need further education and practical experience altering their traditional uses of power, moving toward influencing teamwork and collaborative processes that promote unconstrained dialogue. In addition, directors need to reflect on their use of value to develop creative applications of higher level conative and cognitive values in ways that promote common goals and
purposes within their school divisions. In sum, the findings suggested that more attention be paid to the underlying attitudes, values and beliefs that guide director practice. By doing so, Hodgkinson (1991) stated that educational leaders will: (1) gain self-knowledge and understanding; (2) gain an greater understanding of others to empathy, sympathy and compassion; and (3) make progress with problems of division, antagonism and conflict.

The League of Educational Administrators, Directors and Superintendents (LEADS) has recognized the importance of educational leadership and its impact on delivering quality educational services. As a result, LEADS has worked with directors to develop their leadership practices around a predetermined set of value commitments. The four commitments of LEADS members are: the commitment to a common set of ethical principles; the commitment to the LEADS Code of Ethics; the commitment to professional convictions; and the commitment to the voice of personal conscience (Walker, 1993). In short, LEADS has encouraged directors to adopt a more contemporary model of management: one that is guided by a common set of value commitments. It is imperative that LEADS continues this work with directors. For example, more inservices, mentoring programs and workshops may provide the means to further improve the practices of directors.

Implications for Research

The findings of this study provided valuable insights into director perceptions toward their use of power and value in their school divisions. Future researchers may consider examining and comparing the
perceptions of other levels of educational leaders (principals, associate and assistant directors, superintendents), teachers, and school boards to support or refute the findings from this study. Secondly, future researchers may consider using other means to examine director use of power and value. For example, case studies would contribute to the current knowledge base. Third, Quinn's (1988) conceptual framework was not totally supported by the findings of this study. Therefore, future researchers may consider modifying the conceptual framework or developing a new one that better explains educational administrative practice.

Concluding Comments

In education systems, the chief executive officer is recognized for having the potential to considerably influence the organization (Leithwood & Musella, 1991). Though directors of education have considerable power and therefore the greatest potential to influence the values, norms and expectations that underpin the culture of their school divisions, little is known about practices of these chief executive officers. This study provided detailed analyses of the power and competing value frameworks of directors of education in Saskatchewan.

In much of the contemporary literature, there has been a transformation away from the traditional, top-down, management controlled hierarchy toward the collaborative processes of the interactive model of organizing. Heckscher (1994) suggested that the contemporary workplace has experienced fundamental shifts from the use of power to influence and from bureaucracy to human accomplishment. The findings from this study provided evidence that education systems in
Saskatchewan are experiencing these organizational shifts. Specifically, directors indicated that they preferred to use relational power and mentor values to guide their leadership behaviour. Relational power and mentor values are characteristic of a Team approach to organizing, where criteria such as group values, participative decision making, and problem-based relations are stressed.

On a personal note, the results of this study provided many unforeseen insights into the practices of directors in Saskatchewan. For example, despite the organizational shifts in the contemporary workplace as outlined by Heckscher, education systems have been predominantly regarded as bureaucratic and refractory in nature. As a result, the public and private sectors of society have criticized education systems of being unable to meet the demands of today's rapidly changing environment. However, through discussions with directors, it became evident that they have initiated many progressive reforms to their leadership practices. Most importantly, directors appeared to be keenly interested in new theory, practical methods and feedback that would facilitate better practice.

Another surprising outcome of this study was the apparent comfort of directors toward decentralizing or sharing power throughout the organization. For the most part, directors recognized the need to establish collaborative processes in their school divisions that push power and responsibility downward. This was surprising because it is widely accepted that leaders have a natural Machiavellian tendency to hold on to power. In short, directors willingness to share power provided further evidence that their leadership practices have transformed away from bureaucracy toward the interactive model of organizing.
These findings have implications for the theory and practice of educational leaders. The power and competing value frameworks of directors in Saskatchewan reflect the collaborative practices of the interactive model of organizing. Therefore, there is an impetus to redefine the role of educational leadership outside of the parameters of the traditional, bureaucratic nature of administration. To do so, more attention must be paid to the underlying attitudes, values and beliefs that guide director practice. The employment of reflective practice by directors and the continued support by LEADS are necessary to further improve the practices of directors.
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APPENDIX A

Richardson Power Profile
RICHARDSON POWER PROFILE (RPP)

Instructions: The questionnaire consists of two parts. Part A asks for demographic data. Part B requires the respondent to place a mark on the line below each item at the point which best indicates how you feel about the item.

Part A. Demographic Data

Please circle the appropriate response.

1. Your experience as a Director of Education:
   A. 1-4 years
   B. 5-9 years
   C. 10-14 years
   D. 15-19 years
   E. 20-24 years
   F. Over 25 years

2. Current location of Directorship:
   A. Large Urban (Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Moose Jaw)
   B. Small Urban (North Battleford, Swift Current, Yorkton, Weyburn, Estevan, Lloydminster, Melfort, Melville)
   C. Rural

3. Your highest completed level of education:
   A. B.A. or B.S.
   B. B.Ed.
   C. Post Graduate Diploma
   D. Master's in Education
   E. Master's, not in education
   F. Master's plus additional graduate work
   G. Master's plus Doctoral work
   H. Specialists degree
   I. Doctorate
   J. Beyond Doctorate
   K. Some other degree

4. Gender:
   A. Female
   B. Male
5. Size of school division (# of students):
   A. Less than 1000  
   B. 1000-1999  
   C. 2000-2999  
   D. 3000-3999  
   E. 4000-4999  
   F. Over 5000  

**Part B.** Place a mark on the line that best describes how you feel about the item.

**Example**

Ice cream tastes good.

Disagree____________________Agree

This person moderately agreed that ice cream tastes good.

In my work setting, people follow my leadership because...

1. I can bestow favors through powerful connections. 
   Disagree____________________Agree

2. People can relate to me as a person. 
   Disagree____________________Agree

3. People believe that they should follow my lead because of the administrative position I occupy. 
   Disagree____________________Agree

4. My knowledge, judgment, and experience are respected. 
   Disagree____________________Agree

5. I use a “speak softly, carry a big stick” approach. 
   Disagree____________________Agree

6. I share power with other people 
   Disagree____________________Agree

7. People fear repraisal if they don't follow my lead. 
   Disagree____________________Agree
In my work setting, people follow my leadership because...

8. People like me personally.  
   Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

9. The office which I hold is respected.  
   Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

10. I have the legitimate authority to lead.  
    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

11. My judgment and experience foster cooperative effort.  
    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

12. I have "up-to-date" information about what board members are thinking.  
    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

13. I develop a climate in which people feel it is safe to challenge my ideas.  
    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

15. People recognize my skills and accomplishments.  
    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

16. People care for me as a person.  
    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

17. I have valuable insight into my Board's views.  
    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

18. People are aware of the possible negative consequences for not cooperating.  
    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

19. It is my job to lead, and I expect to be followed.  
    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

20. I involve people from many levels of the organization in participative decision making.  
    Disagree___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree
In my work setting, people follow my leadership because...

21. People respect the authority that I derive from my professional connections.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

22. I have connections with influential and important people.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

23. My knowledge of specific skills minimizes doubt and confusion.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

24. I share important political information that makes people feel "in on things".
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

25. I have gained allegiance by rewarding desired behaviour.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

26. Influential connections may support me.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

27. I rely on the power of group values to influence people.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

28. People suspect that they may be punished if they do not cooperate.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

29. People respect my knowledge of "inside" information about political issues.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

30. People would not risk their friendship with me.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

31. My position in the organization conveys the authority to direct work activities.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

32. People want the reinforcements that I offer.
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree
In my work setting, people follow my leadership because...

33. Irresponsible behaviours harmful to the organization may be punished.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

34. I encourage relations that are based on the problems at hand, not the person's official position in the organization.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

35. My association with important persons is well known.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

36. People feel that I am a special kind of person.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

37. People feel that they should respect my position.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

38. I can use influence with friends.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

39. I know what is really "going on" in the system.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

40. I reward people who cooperate.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

41. I provide appropriate rewards to encourage people to follow directions.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

42. I rely on help from others to get tasks done.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

43. I supply needed "political" information.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

44. I motivate people through the promise of reward.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree

45. People do not want to hurt my feelings.  
   Disagree __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ Agree
In my work setting people follow my leadership because...

46. Displeasure may be expressed otherwise.
   Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree

47. I use expertise to help others do a better job.
   Disagree ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ ___ Agree
APPENDIX B

PRISM: 1 Competing Values

Self Assessment Questionnaire
PRISM 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment

This questionnaire is intended to identify the competing values that affect the Director's behaviour within the school division. You are asked to identify your perceptions about how competing values affect your leadership behaviour by completing 32 statements. Please respond to each statement by circling one of the seven numbers.

7 = Almost always
6 = Very frequently
5 = Frequently
4 = Occasionally
3 = Seldom
2 = Very Seldom
1 = Never

PART A. As a leader, I would describe myself as someone who:

1. Comes up with inventive ideas
2. Exerts upward influence in the organization
3. Creates a climate of productive accomplishment in the work unit*
4. Clarifies the unit's purpose
5. Aids unit members in resolving coordination issues
6. Hold regular reviews of progress on projects
7. Facilitates consensus building in the work unit
8. Listens carefully to subordinates
9. Experiments with new concepts and ideas
10. Influences decisions made at higher levels
11. Develops a productive "can do" attitude among people

* The word unit is meant to represent school division
As a leader, I would describe myself as someone who:

12. Develops and communicates strategic plans for the unit 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. Brings a sense of order into the unit 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. Develops checkpoints for reviewing assignments 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. Surfaces key differences among group members, then works participatively to resolve them 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. Shows empathy and concern in dealing with subordinates 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. Does problem solving in creative ways 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. Gets access to people at higher levels 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. Gets people to work productively 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. Communicates the unit's vision in a meaningful way 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. Anticipates workflow problems, avoids crisis 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. Keeps track of what is going on in the unit 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. Helps people express different opinions and then come to an agreement 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. Treats each individual in a sensitive and caring way 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. Searches for innovations and improvements 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
As a leader, I would describe myself as someone who:

26. Persuasively sells new ideas to higher-ups
27. Develops an achievement orientation in others
28. Clarifies the unit’s priorities and directions
29. Helps people plan, schedule, organize, and coordinate efforts
30. Monitors progress on assigned tasks and objectives
31. Develops consensual resolution to openly expressed differences
32. Shows concern for the needs of subordinates
APPENDIX C

Interview Guide
THE INTERVIEW GUIDE

Background

1. How long have you been a Director of Education?

2. How long have you been a Director of Education in your present school division?

3. Why did you become a Director of Education?

4. What were you doing prior to becoming a Director of Education?

Power

1. What does the term power mean to you?

2. How would you describe the distribution of power in your school division?

   a) Is power centralized among the top management or is power shared throughout the school division?
   b) What characteristics of the school division have an influence on the distribution of power in the school division?
   c) Do you consider yourself a powerful person in the school division? Are there other powerful persons/groups in the school division?
   d) What do you do to maintain a centralized/shared power base in your school division?
   e) To what extent do you control important organizational resources in your school division?
   f) To what extent do people feel free to challenge your ideas and provide alternative solutions to problems?
   g) To what extent does your official position as Director of Education give you power in your school division?
   h) To what extent are people throughout the school division involved in important decisions that you make?

3. How should Directors use power in their practices as an educational leader?

   a) Are you satisfied with the distribution of power in your school division?
   b) To what extent do you believe that by pushing power and responsibility downward you will lose control in the process?
c) What specific approaches (strategies/techniques) should be used to improve/control the distribution of power in your school division?

**Competing Values**

1. What does the term organizational values mean to you?

2. How important are values to the life of the organization?
   a) To what extent do values affect organizational effectiveness?
   b) To what extent should leaders try to influence organizational values?
   c) Does the school division have a vision and goals related to its educational purpose and activities? If so, what is it?
   d) To what extent do people in your school division have a clear understanding of its vision and goals?
   e) What are some of the important values that are fostered in the vision and goals of the school division?

3. How would you describe the organizational values in your school division?
   a) To what extent are people encouraged to come up with new ways of doing things?
   b) To what extent do people in your school division look to you to monitor and coordinate organizational activity?
   c) To what extent do you encourage people in your school division to better themselves professionally?
   d) To what extent do you help other people visualize the future of the school division?
   e) To what extent do people demonstrate a strong sense of duty and commitment to the school division?
   f) What term would best describe the organization of your school division? Why? (respondents will be asked to identify one of the following choices from a handout).

   i) The Adhocracy: Short time-lines and low certainty
      Need for variation, risk, excitement, growth
      Idealistic orientation
      Subjective nature
ii) The Firm: Short time-lines
Need for independence and achievement
Purposeful orientation (a priori logic)
Structured and clear goals
Logical nature

iii) The Hierarchy: Long time-lines
Predictability and security
Present orientation (what is?)
Search for optimal solution to problems
Objective nature

iv) The Team: Long time-lines
Need for affiliation and mutual dependence
Oriented towards feelings
Learn through personal experience
Harmony and consideration for individuals

4. What organizational values should Directors foster in their school division?
   a) Are you satisfied with the values that permeate your school division?
   b) What values would you like to instill in your school division?
   c) What specific approaches (strategies/techniques) do you use to improve the organizational values in your school division?
   d) Could you identify the two terms that best describe your leadership behaviour in your school division? (respondents will be asked to identify two of the following choices from a handout).

A) Mentor: treat people in caring way
empathetic to other's needs
help people grow and develop

B) Monitor: keeps track of what goes on in the organization
monitors progress and assigns tasks
holds regular reviews of progress

C) Innovator: comes up with innovative ideas
experiments with new concepts
solves problems in creative ways
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D) **Producer:** gets people to complete tasks
creates a "can do" climate in the organization
initiates action in the organization

E) **Facilitator:** practices participation and team building skills
facilitates consensus building
accepts differences of opinion

F) **Coordinator:** brings a sense of order to the organization
helps people plan, coordinate, and organize
maintains the organizational structure

G) **Broker:** exerts upward influence in the organization
persuasively sells ideas
acquires needed resources

H) **Director:** provides direction for the organization
clarifies priorities
communicates organizational vision in a meaningful way
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Ethics Guidelines
Brent Kay
Department of Educational Administration
College of Education
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, SK. S7N 0W0

The Advisory Committee
On Ethics on Behavioral Science Research

Re: Application for Approval of Research Protocol

To the Advisory Committee:

Please note that I have enclosed an application for approval of research protocol for my Ph.D. dissertation for your perusal. Included are eight copies of the proposal and appendices that follow the guidelines set out in your application summary. Should you require any further information, please contact me at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Brent Kay

Dr. Larry Sackney, Supervisor

Dr. Pat Renihan, Department Head
Application for Approval of Research Protocol

Student Name: Brent W. Kay, Candidate for Ph.D., Advisor: Dr. Larry Sackney

Title of the Study: Power and Value: Directors of Education in the province of Saskatchewan

Abstract: The purpose of the study is to examine the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education in the Province of Saskatchewan. The basic purpose of the study will be addressed through the following questions:

1. What are the power and value profiles of Directors of Education in the province of Saskatchewan?

2. What are the differences between groups of Directors and their perceptions of power and competing values based on their context (experience, location, gender, education, and size of the organization)?

3. Does the Director's context affect his/her power and value orientations?

4. How are the power and competing value profiles related?

5. What characteristics of power and values do Directors consider to be important in their practices as educational leaders?

Funding: The student is funded through the Graduate Teaching Fellowship programme.

Subjects: Each Director of Education in Saskatchewan will receive a package that describes the nature and purpose of the study; asks for their consent to participate in the study; and contains the Richardson Power Profile questionnaire and the Quinn's (1988) Competing Values Self-Assessment questionnaire with instructions for completion. The sample for the study will consist of those Directors that voluntarily respond to the questionnaire. There are no anticipated risks to the subjects or deception of the subjects for this study.

Methods and Procedures: Two methods for the collection of research data will be used in the study. First, the above mentioned questionnaires will be administered to elicit the self-perceptions of Directors about their power and competing value profiles. Second, a semi-structured interview will be administered to approximately ten percent of the questionnaire respondents. The interview format will be designed to probe further into
the research questions raised and addressed in the questionnaire. To ensure that the procedures are conducted with respect and consideration for the individuals involved in the study: participants will be informed as to the nature and purpose of the study; participants will be informed of the voluntary nature of the study and will be allowed to withdraw from the study at any time; and finally, participants will be provided with an opportunity to respond to interpretations of the questionnaire and interview data.

Confidentiality: Anonymity of the respondents will be maintained at all times. For example, all identifying marks will be removed from the respondent's questionnaires and pseudonyms will be used for individuals that participate in the interview process. In addition, safe storage will ensure that only the researcher and his advisor will have access to the data.

Debriefing and Feedback: In order to provide the subjects with an accessible means to review the study and its findings, a copy of the dissertation will be provided to Joe Zalkavich, the Executive Director of LEADS (League of Educational Administrators, Directors, and Superintendents). Also, the findings will be published in scholarly and professional journals.
NAME AND EC #:  L. Sackney (Brent W. Kay)  
Educational Administration  
For Reference: 96-138

DATE:  January 23, 1997

The University Advisory Committee on Ethics in Human Experimentation (Behavioral Sciences) has reviewed your study, "Power and Value: Directors of Education in the Province of Saskatchewan" (96-138).

1. Your study has been APPROVED.

2. Any significant changes to your protocol should be reported to the Director of Research Services for Committee consideration in advance of its implementation.

3. The term of this approval is for 3 years.

Michael Owen, Secretary  
for the University Advisory Committee  
on Ethics in Human Experimentation, Behavioral Science

Please direct all correspondence to:  Michael Owen, Secretary  
UACEHE, Behavioral Science  
Office of Research Services  
University of Saskatchewan  
Room 210 Kirk Hall, 117 Science Place  
Saskatoon, SK S7N 5C8
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Letter to Participants

Follow-up Letter to Participants
LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

Dear Participant:

My name is Brent Kay. I am currently working toward the completion of my Doctor of Philosophy Degree in Educational Administration at the University of Saskatchewan. My dissertation topic is *Power and Competing Values: Directors of Education in the Province of Saskatchewan*. The purpose of the study is to examine the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education.

Your participation in this study will contribute to understanding the power and competing value profiles of Directors of Education in the province of Saskatchewan. Your participation is voluntary, and if you consent to become a participant, you will be free to withdraw from the study at any time. As a researcher, I will advise you of any new information that may have a bearing on your decision to continue in the study.

For the purposes of data collection, I will be asking each participant to complete the enclosed questionnaires: the Richardson Power Profile and the PRISM 1: Competing Values Self-Assessment. The questionnaires will take about 20 minutes to complete.

The anonymity of your responses in the questionnaires will be protected by the use of pseudonyms in reference to the site and participant.

During the process of the study, you may contact either myself (966-7612) or my advisor, Dr. Larry Sackney (966-7626) of the Department of Educational Administration, University of Saskatchewan, to receive further information or answers to your questions relating to the research.

Your participation is appreciated. Thank you for giving this request your consideration.

Sincerely,

Brent Kay

________________________________________________________________________

(cut here)

________________________________________________________________________

I, ______________________, understand that this research has been approved by the University of Saskatchewan Ethics Committee, and agree to participate voluntarily.

Respondent: ______________________
Date: ______________________
Dear Participant,

I am writing to you regarding the Power and Competing Value questionnaires that were mailed to you in early January. Although the response rate has been good, I have yet to receive your completed questionnaires. At this time, I would like to reaffirm my interest in your participation in the study and encourage you to complete and return the questionnaires at your earliest convenience. Your response is valued and will contribute greatly to the overall success of the research study. Once again, let me thank you for taking the time to consider this request and reassure you of the anonymity of your response. I look forward to receiving your questionnaires in the near future, if you have not already completed and returned them.

Should you have any concerns or if you require another copy of the questionnaires, please contact myself at the location provided below or my supervisor, Dr. Larry Sackney.

Sincerely,

________________________
Brent Kay

Brent Kay
Department of Educational Administration
College of Education
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, SK S7N 0X1
306-966-7612
306-966-7020 Fax.
kay@sask.usask.ca
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Pearson Product Moment Correlations
### Correlation Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BROKER</th>
<th>COERCION</th>
<th>CONNECT</th>
<th>COORDINA</th>
<th>DIRECTOR</th>
<th>EXPERT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROKER</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COERCION</td>
<td>.3124**</td>
<td>.3634**</td>
<td>.3253**</td>
<td>.3582**</td>
<td>.2846*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td>.6101**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COORDINA</td>
<td>.3253**</td>
<td>.0979</td>
<td>.0686**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.4513**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>.3582**</td>
<td>.0614</td>
<td>.0724**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.4509**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPER</td>
<td>.2846*</td>
<td>.0170</td>
<td>.1786**</td>
<td>.4471**</td>
<td>.4509**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITA</td>
<td>.3721**</td>
<td>.1186**</td>
<td>.0031**</td>
<td>.4848**</td>
<td>.6012**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFOR</td>
<td>.3287**</td>
<td>.3683**</td>
<td>.5432**</td>
<td>.1581**</td>
<td>.3198**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNOVAT</td>
<td>.3446**</td>
<td>.0047</td>
<td>.0472**</td>
<td>.4255**</td>
<td>.4366**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGIT</td>
<td>.3388**</td>
<td>.5648**</td>
<td>.6348**</td>
<td>.1356**</td>
<td>.1837**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENTOR</td>
<td>.1122</td>
<td>.3316**</td>
<td>.1651**</td>
<td>.1369**</td>
<td>.3913**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITOR</td>
<td>.3530**</td>
<td>.1288**</td>
<td>.2582**</td>
<td>.6032**</td>
<td>.5743**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
<td>.5388**</td>
<td>.0212**</td>
<td>.1780**</td>
<td>.4258**</td>
<td>.6579**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFER</td>
<td>.2444*</td>
<td>.1349**</td>
<td>.3829**</td>
<td>.2212**</td>
<td>.3628**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATION</td>
<td>.2935*</td>
<td>.0645**</td>
<td>.1062**</td>
<td>.3771**</td>
<td>.5127**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REWARD</td>
<td>.3964**</td>
<td>.6476**</td>
<td>.5945**</td>
<td>.0843**</td>
<td>.1042**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITA</th>
<th>INFOR</th>
<th>INNOVAT</th>
<th>LEGIT</th>
<th>MENTOR</th>
<th>MONITOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROKER</td>
<td>.3721**</td>
<td>.3287**</td>
<td>.3446**</td>
<td>.3388**</td>
<td>.1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COERCION</td>
<td>.1186</td>
<td>.3683**</td>
<td>.0047</td>
<td>.5648**</td>
<td>.3316**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT</td>
<td>.0031</td>
<td>.5432**</td>
<td>.0472**</td>
<td>.6348**</td>
<td>.1581**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COORDINA</td>
<td>.4848**</td>
<td>.1582**</td>
<td>.4255**</td>
<td>.1356**</td>
<td>.1369**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>.6012**</td>
<td>.3198**</td>
<td>.4366**</td>
<td>.1837**</td>
<td>.3913**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPER</td>
<td>.4990**</td>
<td>.4127**</td>
<td>.5279**</td>
<td>.2684**</td>
<td>.3837**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITA</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.2466**</td>
<td>.5596**</td>
<td>.0122**</td>
<td>.5491**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFOR</td>
<td>.2466**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.3699**</td>
<td>.3925**</td>
<td>.0792**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNOVAT</td>
<td>.5996**</td>
<td>.3699**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.0014**</td>
<td>.2329**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGIT</td>
<td>.0122</td>
<td>.3925**</td>
<td>.0014**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.1858**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENTOR</td>
<td>.5491**</td>
<td>.0792**</td>
<td>.2329**</td>
<td>.1858**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITOR</td>
<td>.4575**</td>
<td>.4452**</td>
<td>.3846**</td>
<td>.1191**</td>
<td>.1816**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
<td>.6639**</td>
<td>.3098**</td>
<td>.5687**</td>
<td>.2384**</td>
<td>.4278**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFER</td>
<td>.2076</td>
<td>.5809**</td>
<td>.2373**</td>
<td>.3905**</td>
<td>.2358**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATION</td>
<td>.6017**</td>
<td>.4726**</td>
<td>.5450**</td>
<td>.1520**</td>
<td>.4787**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REWARD</td>
<td>.0410</td>
<td>.4886**</td>
<td>.0155</td>
<td>.6227**</td>
<td>.1889**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRODUCER</th>
<th>REFER</th>
<th>RELATION</th>
<th>REWARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BROKER</td>
<td>.5388**</td>
<td>.2444*</td>
<td>.2935*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COERCION</td>
<td>.0212**</td>
<td>.1349**</td>
<td>.0645**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONNECT</td>
<td>.1780</td>
<td>.3829**</td>
<td>.1062**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COORDINA</td>
<td>.4258**</td>
<td>.2212**</td>
<td>.3771**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTOR</td>
<td>.6579**</td>
<td>.3628**</td>
<td>.5127**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPER</td>
<td>.5582**</td>
<td>.4971**</td>
<td>.7359**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACILITA</td>
<td>.6639**</td>
<td>.2076**</td>
<td>.6017**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFOR</td>
<td>.3098**</td>
<td>.5809**</td>
<td>.4726**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNOVAT</td>
<td>.5687**</td>
<td>.2373**</td>
<td>.5450**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGIT</td>
<td>.2384</td>
<td>.3905**</td>
<td>.1520**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENTOR</td>
<td>.4278**</td>
<td>.2358**</td>
<td>.4787**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONITOR</td>
<td>.5196**</td>
<td>.1155**</td>
<td>.3692**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCER</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.2821*</td>
<td>.6025**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFER</td>
<td>.2821</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.4070**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATION</td>
<td>.6025**</td>
<td>.4070**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REWARD</td>
<td>.0976</td>
<td>.2883**</td>
<td>.0034**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Signif. LE .05  ** = Signif. LE .01  (2-tailed)

*..* is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed
APPENDIX G

Subscales and Items

for the RPP and CV
Subscales and Items Which Were Included in the Richardson Power Profile (RPP) and the PRISM 1: Competing Values Self Assessment (CV) Questionnaires
RPP Subscales and Items

1. Reward
   B25. I have gained allegiance by rewarding desired behaviour.
   B32. People want the reinforcements that I offer.
   B40. I reward people who cooperate.
   B41. I provide appropriate rewards to encourage people to follow directions.
   B44. I motivate people through the promise of reward.

2. Coercion
   B5. I use a "speak softly, carry a big stick" approach.
   B7. They fear reprisal if they don't follow my lead.
   B18. They are aware of the possible negative consequences for not cooperating.
   B28. They suspect that they may be punished if they do not cooperate.
   B33. Irresponsible behaviors harmful to the organization may be punished.
   B46. Displeasure may be expressed otherwise.

3. Legitimate
   B3. People believe that they should follow my lead because of the administrative position I occupy.
   B9. The office which I hold is respected.
   B10. I have the legitimate authority to lead.
   B19. It is my job to lead, and I expect to be followed.
   B31. My position in the organization conveys the authority to direct work activities.
   B37. People feel that they should respect my position.

4. Referent
   B2. People can relate to me as a person.
   B8. People like me personally.
   B16. People care for me as a person.
   B30. People would not risk their friendship with me.
   B36. People feel that I am a special kind of person.
   B45. People do not want to hurt my feelings.
Table 4. continued

RPP Subscales and Items

5. Expert
   
   B4. My knowledge, judgment, and experience are respected.
   B11. My judgment and experience foster cooperative effort.
   B15. People recognize my skills and accomplishments.
   B23. My knowledge of specific skills minimizes doubt and confusion.
   B47. I use expertise to help others do a better job.

6. Information
   
   B12. I have "up-to-date" information about what board members are thinking.
   B17. I have valuable insight into my superior's views.
   B24. I share important political information that makes people feel "in on things".
   B29. People respect my knowledge of "inside" information about political issues.
   B39. I know what is really "going on" in the system.
   B43. I supply needed political information.

7. Connection
   
   B1. I can bestow favors through powerful connections.
   B21. People respect the authority that I derive from good connections.
   B22. I have connections with influential and important people.
   B26. Influential connections may support me.
   B35. My association with important persons is well known.
   B38. I can use influence with friends.

8. Relational
   
   B6. I share power with other people.
   B13. I develop a climate in which people feel it is safe to challenge my ideas.
   B20. I involve people from many levels of the organization in participative decision making.
   B27. I rely on the power of group values to influence people.
   B34. I encourage relationships that are based on the problems at hand, not the person's official positions in the organization.
   B42. I rely on help from others to get tasks done.
Table 4. continued

CV Subscales and Items

1. Innovator
   C1. Comes up with inventive ideas.
   C9. Experiments with new concepts and ideas.
   C25. Searches for innovations and improvements.

2. Broker
   C2. Exerts upward influence in the organization.
   C10. Influences decisions made at higher levels.
   C18. Gets access to people at higher levels.
   C26. Persuasively sells new ideas to higher-ups.

3. Producer
   C3. Creates a climate of productive accomplishment in the work unit.
   C11. Develops a productive "can-do" attitude among people.
   C19. Gets people to work productively.
   C27. Develops an achievement orientation among people.

4. Director
   C4. Clarifies the unit's purpose.
   C12. Develops and communicates strategic plans for the unit.
   C20. Communicates the unit's vision in a meaningful way.
   C28. Clarifies the unit's priorities and directions.

5. Coordinator
   C5. Aids unit members in resolving coordination issues.
   C13. Brings a sense of order to the unit.
   C29. Helps people plan, schedule, organize, and coordinate efforts.

6. Monitor
   C6. Holds regular reviews of progress on projects.
   C14. Develops checkpoints for reviewing assignments.
   C22. Keeps track of what is going on in the unit.
   C30. Monitors progress on assigned tasks and objectives.
Table 4. continued

CV Subscales and Items

7. Facilitator

C7. Facilitates consensus building in the work unit.
C15. Surfaces key differences among group members, then works participatively to resolve them.
C23. Helps people express different opinions and then come to an agreement.
C31. Develops consensual resolution to openly express differences.

8. Mentor

C8. Listens carefully to subordinates.
C16. Shows empathy and concern in dealing with subordinates.
C24. Treats each individual in a sensitive, caring way.
C32. Shows concern for the needs of subordinates.
APPENDIX H

Multiple Regression Analyses
**MULTIPLE REGRESSION**

Equation Number 1  
Dependent Variable: MONITOR

Variable(s) Removed on Step Number 8: LOCR

| Multiple R | .33730 |
| R Square   | .11377 |
| Adjusted R Square | .08471 |
| Standard Error | .66550 |

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.46823</td>
<td>1.73411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.01615</td>
<td>.44289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 3.91547 \]  
Signif F = .0251

--------------------- Variables in the Equation ---------------------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUR</td>
<td>.238128</td>
<td>.117387</td>
<td>.244867</td>
<td>2.029</td>
<td>.0469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>-.484541</td>
<td>.266922</td>
<td>-.219123</td>
<td>-1.815</td>
<td>.0744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.794000</td>
<td>.568282</td>
<td>10.196</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--------------------- Variables not in the Equation ---------------------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Min Toler</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>.006681</td>
<td>.006798</td>
<td>.917537</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.9582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCR</td>
<td>-.066398</td>
<td>-.070452</td>
<td>.995192</td>
<td>-.547</td>
<td>.5864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZER</td>
<td>.031126</td>
<td>.032861</td>
<td>.986807</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.7998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End Block Number 2  
POUT = .100 Limits reached.
MULTIPLE REGRESSION

Equation Number 1  Dependent Variable..  LEGIT

Variable(s) Removed on Step Number
9..  SIZER

Multiple R    .25339
R Square      .06421
Adjusted R Square    .04911
Standard Error  2.15702

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>19.79235</td>
<td>19.79235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>288.47083</td>
<td>4.65276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 4.25390  Signif F = .0434

--------------- Variables in the Equation -----------------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCR</td>
<td>1.312789</td>
<td>.636504</td>
<td>.253389</td>
<td>2.062</td>
<td>.0434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.047211</td>
<td>1.155720</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.098</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--------------- Variables not in the Equation -----------------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Min Toler</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUR</td>
<td>.069752</td>
<td>.072092</td>
<td>.999651</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>.5745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>.099733</td>
<td>.102959</td>
<td>.997319</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.4220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>.040005</td>
<td>.041318</td>
<td>.998196</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.7478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZER</td>
<td>.172334</td>
<td>.158176</td>
<td>.788352</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>.2157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End Block Number 2  POUT = .100 Limits reached.
**MULTIPLE REGRESSION***

Equation Number 1  Dependent Variable..  INFOR

Variable(s) Removed on Step Number 8..  EXPR

Multiple R  .33426
R Square  .11173
Adjusted R Square  .08261
Standard Error  2.25812

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39.12461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>311.04643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 3.83641  Signif F = .0270

------------------------ Variables in the Equation ------------------------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUR</td>
<td>.824711</td>
<td>.398107</td>
<td>.250220</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>.0425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZER</td>
<td>.671197</td>
<td>.384204</td>
<td>.211012</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td>.0857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>7.349782</td>
<td>1.069136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

------------------------ Variables not in the Equation ------------------------

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Beta In</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Min Toler</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>-.165083</td>
<td>-.174309</td>
<td>.990123</td>
<td>-1.371</td>
<td>.1754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>-.143532</td>
<td>-.151284</td>
<td>.986807</td>
<td>-1.185</td>
<td>.2405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCR</td>
<td>-.093307</td>
<td>-.087819</td>
<td>.785636</td>
<td>-.683</td>
<td>.4973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End Block Number 2  POUT = .100 Limits reached.
APPENDIX I

T-Test and One-Way Analysis of Variance Summary
## T-Test Analysis Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th># of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-1.32</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc 2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th># of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovator Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## One-Way-Analysis of Variance Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Fratio</th>
<th>Fprob</th>
<th>Mean Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referent by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>218.74</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3,1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>292.08</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1,3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>417.95</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1,3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>148.37</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>314.00</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>361.93</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>118.30</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>454.58</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>3,1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.34</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.22</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>3,1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31.01</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1,3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32.34</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>3,1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40.92</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>2,1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.76</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29.53</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>336.65</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker by</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Order</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Fratio</td>
<td>Fprob</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer by Experience</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1,3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor by Experience</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1,3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor by Experience</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator by Experience</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator by Experience</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1,3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director by Experience</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>1,3,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.54</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator by Experience</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broker by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>2,1,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>24.26</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovator by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31.65</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.23</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion by Size</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>300.16</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward by Size</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>410.96</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Fratio</td>
<td>Fprob</td>
<td>Mean Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational by Size</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>143.54</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent by Size</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>229.93</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate by Size</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>317.32</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert by Size</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>115.39</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection by Size</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3,1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>451.54</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercion by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1,2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>307.41</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>3,1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>415.92</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>142.97</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referent by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>3,1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>223.91</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>3,1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>309.35</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>342.98</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>2,3,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>118.69</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection by Education</td>
<td>between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>3,2,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>456.81</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>