Agentic and Communal Confidence in Relationship to Transactional, Transformational, and Transformative Leadership Styles of Educational Administrators in Nebraska By Amy Catherine Hansen Rauch Himes

Amy Catherine Hansen Rauch Himes
*University of Nebraska at Omaha*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork](https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork)

Part of the Education Commons

Please take our feedback survey at: [https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE](https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE)

**Recommended Citation**

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).
Agentic and Communal Confidence in Relationship to Transactional, Transformational, and Transformative Leadership Styles of Educational Administrators in Nebraska

By

Amy Catherine Hansen Rauch Himes

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Administration

Under the Supervision of Dr. Elliott Ostler

Omaha, Nebraska

February 2018

Supervisory Committee:

Dr. Kay Keiser

Dr. Tamara Williams

Dr. Richard Christie

Dr. Phyllis K. Adcock
The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate leadership styles of educational leaders in the state of Nebraska. The research described herein has built upon past research and examined traditional gender roles in educational leadership. Male and female educators, in their respective roles, have shaped and facilitated a school model designed to uphold traditional social roles within the existing contemporary society (Engel, 2015; Goldstein, 2014; Koenig & Eagly, 2014).

Educational leadership style norms were established in the mid-1800’s and were founded on traditional gender roles guided by a general set of beliefs about masculine and feminine attributes (Goldstein, 2015). The terms agency (agentic - masculine) and communion (communal - feminine) were introduced within the context of psychology by David Bakan (1966), who described them as the basic modalities of human existence. The validity of tests for masculinity-femininity were challenged in the research findings of Anne Constantinople (1973) and in concert with social justice movements of the 1970’s.

Today, the Information Age (Goldman & Scardamalia, 2013) presents new challenges to the traditional school system. An agentic and communal balance of interpersonal confidences may provide leaders with more effective and efficient tools to
adapt. An imbalance of agentic and communal traits and confidences may limit the ability of a leader, team, group, or an organization to perform as well as possible (Carli & Eagly, 2001).

The Information Age grew from an industrial base (Transactional Leadership) to a postindustrial base (Transformational and Transformative Leadership) (Goldman & Scardamalia 2013; Leonard, 2003). This research investigation analyzes agentic and communal confidences of Nebraska administrators while focusing on how they influence leadership decisions in the context of conflict management. Now, and in the future, a “think manager, think male” (Sczesny, 2003) mindset adversely impacts progress and creates barriers for progress in the educational environment in the state of Nebraska.
Acknowledgements and Dedication

I would like to acknowledge the help I received from the staff at the University of Nebraska-Omaha, College of Education’s Department of Educational Leadership beginning in 2015, when Dr. Richard Christie answered the phone during winter break. He has provided expert guidance throughout the coursework and helped me prepare for the Superintendent Praxis Exam. Thank you to Meghan Salsbury at Criss Library whose research expertise led to the discovery of the CSIE by Dr. Kenneth Locke and to the work of Dr. Alice Eagly. I would like to thank Dr. Kay Keiser for her leadership in the design of the exceptional EdD program of study. A heartfelt thank you to Dr. Elliott Ostler for his commitment to research and for his time spent encouraging me during my coursework and the dissertation. He consistently shared insights about the challenges of the investigation. He helped steer this study clear of inherent bias about gender equality. Thank you to Dr. Tamara Williams whose course required the joy of discovery through extensive reading. Thanks to Dr. Phyllis K. Adcock for providing valuable written feedback and for agreeing to serve on the dissertation committee.

I dedicate this dissertation to my Mother, Catherine Stump Rauch; to my Father, Robert Rauch; to my daughters, Ann Elizabeth Himes and Emma Catherine Himes; and to my husband, Timothy George Himes Sr. I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to the memory of my Grandmother, Elizabeth May Hansen Stump, a college educated world traveler and a Nebraska farm wife. She was born in 1912, Canton, Ohio. At the time of her death in 1983, she was reading Testament of Youth, by Vera Brittain and had underlined this quote: Will the Recording Angel, I wonder, put down a little to one's credit for all one meant, and yet failed, to do?
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements and Dedication .................................................................................. iv
List of Tables and Figures .................................................................................................. viii

CHAPTER 1: The Problem .................................................................................................. 1
  Leadership and Power ..................................................................................................... 1
  Agentic and Communal Traits and Confidences .............................................................. 3
  Problem Statement ........................................................................................................ 4
  Research Questions ........................................................................................................ 5
  Operational / Transactional Definitions ......................................................................... 6
  Delimitations .................................................................................................................... 8
  Significance of the Problem: Academic Merit / Social Impact .................................... 8
  Purpose Statement ......................................................................................................... 9

CHAPTER 2: Literature Review .......................................................................................... 10
  Research Framework ..................................................................................................... 10
    Agency and Communion - Agentic and Communal Attributes, Traits, and Characteristics ......................................................................................................................... 10
  Events of 1973 .............................................................................................................. 12
  Demonstrations of M-F Constructs in Recent History ................................................... 15
  Justify Operational Definitions ..................................................................................... 19
  The Double Bind ........................................................................................................... 19
  Prejudice and The Double Bind as Norms ................................................................... 23
  Justify Subjects, Procedures, Instrumentation ............................................................... 25
  Dr. Kenneth Locke: CSIV and CSIE ............................................................................. 25
CHAPTER 3: Methodology

Subjects
Instrumentation Discovery
Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy (CSIE)
Procedures
Data Collection by Research Questions
Data Collection and Data Analysis

CHAPTER 4: Data Analysis

Data Analysis and Presentation of Findings
Research Questions to Be Tested
Analysis and Presentation of Findings from Each Research Question
Construct reprise Summary for Research Question 1
Construct reprise Summary for Research Question 2
Construct reprise Summary for Research Question 3
Conclusion

CHAPTER 5

Summary of Subjects and School Districts
Discussion of Research Questions, Results, Summaries
Research Question #1
Research Question #2
Research Question #3
Summary of Purpose
Conclusion.........................................................................................................................122

Future Research..............................................................................................................125

References.........................................................................................................................129

Appendix A............................................................................................................................139

Appendix B: District Superintendent and

Research Committee Communication..................................................................................141

Appendix C: Email communication with Dr. Kenneth Locke.............................................144

Appendix D: CSIE illustrations examples............................................................................145
**List of Tables and Figures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tables</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>CSIE Scales</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Total CSIE Male and Female Agentic and Communal Confidence Means</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>CSIE octant PA = Dominant (+A)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>CSIE octant BC = Distant &amp; Dominant (+A-C)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>CSIE Octant DE = Distant (-C)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>CSIE Octant FG = Distant &amp; Yielding (-A-C)</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>CSIE Octant HI = Yielding (-A)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>CSIE Octant JK = Friendly &amp; Yielding (-A+C)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>CSIE Octant LM = Friendly (+C)</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>CSIE Octant NO = Friendly &amp; Dominant (+A+C)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 11</td>
<td>Transactional Leadership (68 subjects of the total 147 responses to Q #33)</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 12</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership (65 subjects of the total 147 responses to Q #33)</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 13</td>
<td>Transformative Leadership (14 subjects of the total 147 responses to Q #33)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 14</td>
<td>Question 34: Are you male or female?</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 15</td>
<td>Question 35: What is your age range?</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 16</td>
<td>Question 36: How many years have you worked in education?</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 17</td>
<td>Administrators with 0 – 25 years of experience in education. Total of 57 subjects. (Males 32; Females 43)</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 18</td>
<td>Administrators with 26 – 45 years of experience in education. Total of 57 subjects. (Males 32; Females 25)</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19
Question 37:
How many years have you been in your current position? ...................... 103

Table 20
Years in Administration and Communal and Agentic Confidence Mean ................. 104

Table 21
Where communal confidence is greater than agentic confidence:
The Outliers .................................................................................. 105

Figures

Figure 1
Total Responses for 157 Subjects All Subjects +/- Agentic +/- Communal. Orange line = Agentic rawX. Blue line = Communal rawY .................................................. 60

Figure 2
82 Males Subjects Agentic rawX and Communal rawY
Figure 2 shows data for 82 male respondents. +/- Agentic +/- Communal. Orange line = Agentic rawX. Blue line = Communal rawY .................................................. 61

Figure 3
75 Female Subjects Agentic rawX and Communal rawY
Figure 3 shows data for the 75 female respondents. +/- Agentic +/- Communal. Orange line = Agentic rawX. Blue line = Communal rawY .................................................. 62

Figure 4
CSIE Octant PA = Dominant (+A) ................................................. 65

Figure 5
CSIE Octant BC = Distant & Dominant (+A-C) ................................. 67

Figure 6
CSIE Octant DE = Distant (-C) ..................................................... 69

Figure 7
CSIE Octant FG = Distant & Yielding (-A-C) ................................. 71

Figure 8
CSIE Octant HI = Yielding (-A) .................................................. 73

Figure 9
CSIE Octant JK = Friendly & Yielding (-A+C) ................................. 75

Figure 10
CSIE Octant LM = Friendly (+C) .................................................. 77

Figure 11
CSIE Octant NO = Friendly & Dominant (+A+C) ................................. 79

Figure 12
Transactional Leadership Style Solution Question #33 ......................... 86

Figure 13
Transformational Leadership Style Solution Question #33 ......................... 88

Figure 14
Transformative Leadership Style Solution Question #33 ......................... 90
Figure 15  Transactional, Transformational, and
Transformative Leadership Style.......................94

Figure 16  Communal rawY and Agentic rawX Ages 30 - 45 Years................98

Figure 17  Communal rawY and Agentic rawX Ages 46 - 65 Years...............99
CHAPTER 1: The Problem

Leadership and Power

There is a common belief that females and males should differ in their typical traits and behaviors, which directly applies to the gendering of traditional leadership styles (Carly & Eagly, 2007; Karau & Eagly, 1999; Trapnell & Paulhus, 2012). Research in educational leadership acknowledges the term leadership is often a construct described and envisioned with agentic terms such as: governance, control, supremacy, rule, command, and power. Agentic and communal terms include markers and descriptors that demonstrate how traditional expectations and stereotypical qualities of females and males differ.

Some of the most consistent tendencies shown in research are that females have high levels of communal traits, including being friendly, unselfish, concerned with others, and emotionally expressive. Communal may also be described as having concern with the welfare of other people. Research also reveals expectations that males have high levels of agentic traits such as controlling, confident, aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, independent, self-sufficient, and self-confident. These traits have traditionally been associated with power, which has made males more likely to act as leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002).

The traditional construct of the term leadership is broadly agentic because it is defined by dominant traits. This perception has created substantial barriers to attaining leadership for those who more readily demonstrate communal traits, specifically females. For example, when female leaders in education display agentic traits, they are subjected to prejudiced reactions because those actions are generally incongruent with behaviors
expected from females (Kent, Blair, Rudd & Schuele, 2010; Trapnell & Paulhus, 2012). Research in leadership categorization theory, and agentic versus communal leadership behaviors, suggests that females are rated more poorly than males when they do not perform in accordance with expected communal traits (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992; Kent, Blair, Rudd, & Schuele 2010). Gender perceptions and effective leadership have been studied through social role theory (Koenig & Eagly, 2014), gender role theory (Karau & Eagly, 1999), and role congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Role theories have consistently shown that when females act, to gain power, their actions are perceived as agentic and are incongruent with communal expectations. Such actions create negative perceptions because such traits are perceived as a rejection of traditional gender expectations.

To increase the understanding and development of transactional, transformational, and transformative leadership skills, a better understanding of the balance of agentic and communal interpersonal traits is required. This research will seek data regarding these traits from educational leaders in the state of Nebraska by utilizing an instrument called the CSIE (Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy) (Locke & Sadler, 2007), which is a test that grew from Locke’s original CSIV (Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Values) (Locke, 2000; Locke & Sadler, 2007).

Information about agentic and communal interpersonal traits and confidences will serve as a framework to examine educational leadership styles and will seek a deeper understanding of how those traits shape and guide educational leadership in the Information Age (Abele, 2003; Eagly, 1987; Carli & Eagly, 2001; Eagly, 2007; Eagly & Carli, 2003; Eagly & Carli 2007; Eagly, A. H., & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly,

Agentic and Communal Traits and Confidences

This research will seek to reveal a deeper understanding of how today’s educational leaders balance their agentic and communal traits and confidences in relation to interpersonal relationships (Locke, 2000; Locke & Sadler, 2007). The terms agentic and communal will serve as the foundation for this research and for the exploration of leadership styles among administrators in Nebraska. Agentic and communal traits and confidences may be observable in distinct educational leadership styles and thus influence all aspects of the school community. Agentic and communal markers will be used to define, describe, and explore gender roles of educational leaders in Nebraska. The agentic and communal trait and confidence data will be studied and correlated with three distinct leadership styles: transactional, transformational, and transformative (TTT) as they apply to educational leaders in Nebraska (Shields, 2010).

Bakan (1966) introduced the terms agency and communion to psychology, and described them as the basic modalities of human existence. The three role theories (social role, gender role, and role congruity theories) utilize the terms, agentic and communal to describe and define gender roles. Agentic traits are defined as assertive, ambitious, capable, clever, confident, and decisive. Communal traits are defined as cooperative, empathetic, friendly, generous, sincere, and trustworthy. Additionally, it is necessary to address that agentic and communal traits are generally associated with masculine and
feminine gender roles (Constantinople, 1973). Agentic and communal traits are observable in educational leadership styles and may influence the school community as a whole.

Anne Constantinople published seminal research in 1973, which pointed out the flaws in generalized definitions of the terms *masculine* and *feminine* as they were used by those developing tests of male v. female (M-F) at the time. A brief overview of major events in the year 1973 is included in Chapter 2. Major events in the 1970’s provide reference points for the evolution of gender expectancies, roles, prejudices, and stereotypes. In 1973, Constantinople posited that gender identity is integral to the process of identifying agentic and communal traits and confidences. This was a pivotal study, during a time when gender roles were being closely examined in new ways, and it brought forth a key finding: no agentic or communal trait is limited to only one gender and both males and females maintain a balance of agentic and communal traits which ebb and flow throughout a lifetime. Thirty years later, Carli and Eagly (2001) showed again that perceptions and understandings of gender are consensual beliefs about the respective traits of females and males, and the traits and confidences exist on a continuum ebbing and flowing throughout the course of a lifetime.

**Problem Statement**

Gender equity and gender parity in the field of educational leadership has not been achieved in Nebraska. Professional male and female educators continue to bump up against stereotypical gender biases and are subject to traditional interpretations of agentic and communal traits and confidences. The result of the perpetual bias is a gender
imbalance in educational leadership which impacts the entire social structure of the school community. Young male and female students continue to observe a disproportionate number of males and females serving in educational leadership roles. Males dominate educational administration positions in Nebraska. The gender imbalances in educational leadership, which have existed since the feminization of the teaching profession in the 1800’s, will be investigated within the framework of agentic and communal traits and confidences and will be connected to the transactional, transformational, and transformative leadership style norms.

Research Questions

The following Research Questions were developed:

Question #1: How do Nebraska Administrators self-report agentic and communal traits as evidenced from the CSIE Instrument?

Question #2: Which approach do Nebraska leaders utilize when solving an interpersonal conflict among staff members (transactional, transformational, and transformative)?

Question #3: How do Nebraska Administrators view themselves as transactional, transformational, and transformative leaders versus the data collected from the CSIE?
Operational / Transactional Definitions

Definition of Terms

- **Agentic or Agency** – *agentic (or masculine) attributes*, exemplified by being independent, masterful, assertive, and competent (Karau, S. J., & Eagly, A. H. 1999), exhibiting dominance, power, and status (Locke, 2000).

- **Communal or Communion** – *communal (or feminine) attributes*, including being friendly, unselfish, concerned with others, and emotionally expressive. (Karau, S. J., & Eagly, A. H. 1999) and expressing friendliness, warmth, love (Locke, 2000). Bakan (1966) introduced the terms *agency* and *communion* to psychology and described them as the basic modalities of human existence:

  I have adopted the terms ‘agency’ and ‘communion’ to characterize two fundamental modalities in the existence of living forms, agency for the existence of an organism as an individual, and communion for the participation of the individual in some larger organism of which the individual is part. Agency manifests itself in the formation of separations; communion in the lack of separation. Agency manifests itself in isolation, alienation and aloneness; communion in contact, openness, and union. Agency manifests itself in the urge to master; communion in non-contractual cooperation. Agency manifests itself in the repression of thought, feeling, and impulse; communion in the lack and removal of repression. (Bakan, 1966, pp. 14–15)
• **Attribute / Trait / Characteristic** – An attribute (trait or characteristic) represents how an individual or individuals in an organization feel, behave, or think (Creswell, 2015, p. 112). This will be determined by responses to CSIE in the eight areas of agentic and communal traits. The CSIE is a self-reporting inventory designed to assess interpersonal behavior by efficiently assessing a comprehensive set of agentic and communal values. (Locke, 2000; Locke & Sadler, 2007).

• **Interpersonal Values** – Values are generally defined as preferences for certain outcomes or modes of conduct. Accordingly, in developing the CSIV, Locke conceptualized *interpersonal values* as preferences for certain interpersonal outcomes or modes of conduct (Locke, 2000).

• **Interpersonal Efficacy** – Efficacy or self-efficacy is a person’s confidence in his or her own ability to perform a specific task or behavior successfully (Bandura, 1997). Interpersonal self-efficacy is a person’s confidence in his or her ability to perform a specific type of interpersonal behavior (e.g., giving orders or following orders) (Locke & Sadler, 2007).

• **Transactional Leadership** – Transactional leadership involves a reciprocal transaction. Reciprocal actions follow from others' initial actions (Shields, 2010).

• **Transformational Leadership** – Transformational leadership focuses on improving organizational qualities, dimensions, and effectiveness (Shields, 2010).

• **Transformative Leadership** - Transformative leadership begins with questions of justice and democracy; working for equity in diverse contexts (Shields, 2010).
Delimitations

This research is limited to subjects in the state of Nebraska who hold current Nebraska Administrative Certificates and who currently work in administrative positions.

Significance of the Problem: Academic Merit and Social Impact

Use of Power in Leadership

Acknowledgement of gender differences does not mean all females and males in power share the same style of leadership. Being a person of one gender has implications for how one uses power, but those are often based on assumptions and stereotypes. The core difference in how males and females use power revolves around the tension between competition and collaboration. Socialization and education play a major role because males are better prepared by their education for competitive strategies while females are better prepared for relationship strategies. Male managers are more likely to be autocratic and employ a command and control style of leadership. In contrast, females may prefer to lead in ways that are consensual, empowering, and encourage team-work. Female leaders are participatory, interpersonally oriented, and are more likely to adopt empathetic, supportive, and collaborative approaches. However, the higher the level of authority, and the more power a male or female leader has, the more likely they are to act in an agentic manner (Campus, 2013 p.16).

Shields’ (2010) research on the three transactional, transformational, and transformative (TTT) leadership styles joins with research on gender role theories to suggest that individuals are expected to behave as others. This is the connection between the study of existing agentic and communal traits and confidences in educational leaders.
and their individual ability to lead in ways that will enrich the educational environment for teachers, parents, and students.

Shields states:

“It is not simply the task of the educational leader to ensure that all students succeed in tasks associated with learning the formal curriculum and demonstrating that learning on norm-referenced standardized tests; it is the essential work of the educational leader to create learning contexts or communities in which social, political, and cultural capital is enhanced in such a way as to provide equity of opportunity for students as they take their place as contributing members of society” (2010, p. 572).

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of the current investigation is to examine traditional agentic and communal traits and confidences as they apply to the leadership styles of educational leaders in Nebraska. Based on the literature context, which suggests the stereotypical male is agentic and the stereotypical female is communal, this study will contribute to the understanding of the connection of agentic and communal stereotypes with leadership style norms (transactional, transformational, and transformative). This investigation will deliver results that show both males and females possess agentic and communal traits and confidences to varying degrees. The ability of males and females to enact transactional, transformational, or transformative leadership style based on their respective balance of agentic and communal traits and confidences will be examined.
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

Research Framework

Agency and Communion – Agentic and Communal Attributes, Traits, and Characteristics

One of the most important research studies on gender expectations was published in 1973, a pivotal moment for gender equality in America. The seminal research study was titled, *Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum?* by Anne Constantinople.

Constantinople’s research illuminated the shortcomings of most generalized definitions of the terms *masculine* and *feminine* as they were used by those developing tests of male v. female (M-F), at the time. In most tests of M-F, Constantinople wrote, “M-F are relatively enduring traits which are more or less rooted in anatomy, physiology, and early experience, and which generally serve to distinguish males from females in appearance, attitudes, and behavior” (Constantinople, 1973, p. 390). Gender roles, gender competition, and gender identity issues entered a new phase in the United States in 1973. Constantinople was acutely aware of the complexity brought about by the fight for equality and she recognized a need to look more closely at the wide-range of masculine and feminine traits. Constantinople discovered flaws in how masculine and feminine traits were being tested and measured.

Constantinople (1973) examined the notion that the universe of known sex differences is large, and it is unreasonable to expect that these differences are not multidimensional. She concluded that the comparative data pointed to the greater power of M-F measures when combined-sex groups were used. However, upon further review
of M-F-related research, she found that it revealed a preponderance of single-sex studies, and she also noted that the tests seemed weaker when applied to females than they did when measuring M-F in males, which may suggest that femininity was not adequately conceptualized as simply a reversal of masculinity. The sub-traits cited by Constantinople (1973) are a precursor for this new research study centering on agentic and communal traits and confidences.

“If M-F reflect a number of sub-traits, such as aggressiveness, sensitivity, self-confidence, etc., is there anything to be gained by combining these measures in ways that are most characteristic of men and women? Multidimensional analysis may reveal that there are certain patterns of traits that appear more often in healthy males than healthy females, but the pattern may be different for most masculine versus least masculine men and most feminine versus least feminine women.

(Constantinople, 1973, p. 405)

Constantinople’s review of the flaws in major tests of the M-F construct:
(a) that M-F is best defined in terms of sex differences in item responses;
(b) that M-F is defined as a single bipolar dimension ranging from extreme masculinity at one end to extreme femininity at the other; and
(c) that M-F are one-dimensional in nature and can be adequately measured by a single score.
The second of the three assumptions posited by Constantinople applies to this research study: that M-F (Male-Female) is a single, bipolar dimension ranging from extreme masculinity to extreme femininity that applies directly to the study of agentic and communal traits and attributes. Constantinople stated that “the terms, masculinity and femininity, have a long history in psychological discourse, but both theoretically and empirically they seem to be among the muddiest concepts in the psychologist’s vocabulary” (1973, p. 389). Nearly fifty-years after Constantinople examined the ambiguity of sex differences, this research study will continue to question M-F stereotypes and expectancies in the field of educational leadership. Constantinople posited evidence which questioned the validity of the assumptions of the M-F tests. She came to the conclusion that further theoretical and empirical work was necessary in all aspects of the problem (Constantinople, 1973, p. 391).

**The Events of 1973**

To effectively examine gender roles and the complexity of agentic and communal traits as they exist today in males and females, reference to the events in the 1970’s is useful. By the early 1970’s when Anne Constantinople, a professor at Vassar College, wrote her seminal piece on the muddy masculinity-femininity scales of the day, the concept of bipolar masculinity-femininity scale was beginning to show its age. Psychologists were interested in the idea of androgynous identity and thus, the attitudes toward bipolar gender identities were changing dramatically. The 1970’s were the era of women’s liberation. Professional psychologists and educators began to rethink what the terms masculinity and femininity truly meant to a modern society. The same questions
about agentic and communal stereotypes are relevant today and for the purpose of this research study about leadership roles. Therefore, it is useful to draw a comparison to the events that unfolded in 1973. The social and political climate created dramatic changes in the previously accepted masculinity-femininity scales in the 1970’s. Today’s current events, social and political, have also impacted common 21st century bipolar masculine and feminine stereotypes. The Information Age has been accompanied by a wide range of discussions about issues such as the gender pay gap, gender equity, gender parity in leadership, as well as women’s empowerment movements such as current social media movements like #MeToo and #TimesUp.

In consideration of agentic and communal traits, leadership style norms, and the historic work of Anne Constantinople on revising masculinity-femininity scales in 1973, a brief history of the specific events which impacted all aspects of American life and culture in 1973 is relevant to this study.

**January 1973:** Richard Nixon was sworn in for a second term as President of the United States and the U.S. Supreme Court overturned state bans on abortion in the case of Roe v. Wade.

**May 1973:** Tennis player Bobby Riggs challenged and defeated Margaret Court, the world's #1 women's player, in a nationally televised tennis match set in Ramona, California. Bobby Riggs won the match setting in motion a popular culture war on the ideas of masculinity and femininity.

**July 1973:** The United States Congress passes the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA) federally mandating Special Education. This created a new landscape in American society and in America’s public schools. The new law challenged previously
held beliefs about the capacity of all human beings to make a contribution to American society.

**September 1973:** *The Battle of the Sexes:* Bobby Riggs match against Billie Jean King. Billie Jean King defeated Bobby Riggs in a televised tennis match at the Astrodome in Houston, Texas. With an attendance of 30,492, the event remains the largest live audience ever to see a tennis match in U.S. history. The global television audience, in 36 countries, was estimated at 90 million. The controversy over gender stereotypes continued to gain traction across the country and around the world.

**November 1973:** President Nixon told the Associated Press managing editors, "I am not a crook." This same month, and as American society was roiling in a state of political turmoil, Anne Constantinople published her review of major tests of Male-Female (M-F) in adults. Constantinople paid attention to the ways in which the M-F tests construction reflected three untested assumptions, or stereotypes, about the nature of masculinity and femininity.

**December 1973:** On the issue of Gay Rights in the United States, the American Psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from its DSM-II (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders II, 1968). This was another change which challenged previously held beliefs about the acceptance that all human beings were capable of making a contribution to American society.

Together, and in retrospect, the events of 1973 helped frame the dramatic changes toward masculine and feminine gender roles. The women’s empowerment movement of the 1970’s is not unlike the social movements we see in American society today. The Women’s March on Washington in 2017 was likely the largest single-day demonstration
in recorded U.S. history. The tidal wave of change brought about by The Women’s March of 2017 is still unfolding and is having an impact on the number of females pursuing leadership positions particularly in politics. Today, the agentic (masculinity) and communal (femininity) scales may be experiencing another massive transformation and rebalancing, as was the case in the 1970’s, but it is still uncertain whether this will impact educational leadership and the K-12 educational environment.

**Demonstrations of M-F Constructs in Recent History**

In the 1990’s, twenty years after Ann Constantinople published her findings about M-F tests, females continued to be the dominant gender in teaching and in university-based programs for administrators but males continued to dominate educational leadership positions. Even though the percentage of female superintendents had gone from 6.6% percent to 13.2% percent in the 1990’s, 87% percent of superintendent positions were still held by males. In the year 2000, males still outnumbered females in administration and females outnumbered males in the classroom by a large margin. In the United States, in the year 2000, approximately 13,728 of the superintendents were male and 1,984 were female. Also, in 2000, 72% (percent) of all K-12 teachers in the United States were women, according to the U.S. Department of Education (Glass, 2000). These figures emphasize the gender gap and lack of gender parity in administration and in the classroom.

In 2017, in the state of Nebraska, thirty-three (33) of the two hundred and forty (240) Nebraska superintendents are female (13.7%). Comparing this figure to national averages, in 2015, according to a report by the AASA (The School Superintendents
Association) the national percentage of female superintendents was 27%. This report shows a 13.3% deficiency in hiring female leaders in the state of Nebraska and demonstrates that Nebraska falls well below the national shockingly below the national average.

The imbalance of males and females in educational leadership positions has been researched mostly by case studies because so few females hold the highest administrative positions in education (Glass, 2000). The case studies reveal barriers that exist today, some 50 years after Constantinople’s *Masculinity-Femininity: An Exception to a Famous Dictum?* was published.

This current research herein will build upon the existing research and focus on how agency and communion are basic dimensions of social motives and social judgments and behaviors, which permeate every aspect of an individual’s life. Social cognition literature suggests that the descriptors people use to conceptualize themselves and others can be organized into agentic qualities (e.g., assertive, ambitious, capable, clever, confident, and decisive) and communal qualities (e.g., cooperative, empathetic, friendly, generous, sincere, and trustworthy) (Locke, 2015). Gender identity is inherent in the process of defining agentic and communal attributes, but the attributes are not exclusive to one gender (Constantinople, 1973). The complex balance of agentic and communal interpersonal attributes changes over the course of a person’s lifetime. Therefore, an educational leader’s agentic and communal traits and behaviors may vary or co-occur in subtle and nuanced ways, depending on the circumstances and the life-stage of the individual (Locke, 2015). Contemporary researchers have explored how stakeholders in
PreK-12 educational organizations perceive agentic and communal traits differently (Kis & Konan, 2014).

Gender expectancies and stereotypes described by Constantinople continue to be imposed on males and females. Gender expectancies may result in professional reciprocity and reciprocal rewards and, in contrast, the same stereotypes may prevent career success and/or professional advancement. Agentic traits, or agency, influence career success and career success influences agency. There is reciprocity between having agentic qualities and professional advancement because traditional leadership roles have been defined with agentic markers. In contrast, the research shows that communal influenced family roles, but there was no reciprocal influence, or positive implications, for career advancement (Abele, 2003).

This research study on gender differences and similarities, and the ways males and females perceive themselves as leaders and engage in leadership, reveals that leadership has traditionally been a masculine enterprise with special challenges for females. Consciously or unconsciously, the old saying, *think manager, think male* continues to influence contemporary thinking and decision-making (Campus, 2013; Sczesny, 2003). According to Eagly (2007), more people in the U.S. prefer male rather than female bosses, and it is more difficult for females to become leaders and succeed in male-dominated leadership roles. There has been progress toward equality, yet Eagly (2007) points out that progress toward equality is overshadowed by lack of greater or complete equality in organizational leadership.

The perception of male superiority in leadership raises questions about how women may contribute to this stereotypical perception. Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt
Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) further explained the necessity of ensuring that gender balance is embedded in a leadership structure.

A lack of diversity in gender perspectives may limit the ability of a team, group, or organization to perform as well as might be possible when gender balance is achieved. Eagly and Johnson (1990) studied the interpersonally oriented, task-oriented, autocratic, and democratic styles of women and men. Their data adds to previous research by offering information about transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership styles. Their research also builds upon the foundation of masculine and feminine and agentic and communal categories to describe qualities and characteristics of leadership from a feminist perspective.

Some feminists theorize that the perception of sex differences in leadership style or other attributes can provide a rationale for excluding women from opportunities and especially from male-dominated leadership roles. Other feminists believe that the perception of sameness would fail to acknowledge the relational qualities that are a traditional source of female pride and that may contribute to superior performance by women leaders (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001, p. 782). Whether intended or unintended, a natural consequence of applying gender expectations to thoughts and opinions is that they elicit expectancies based upon preconceived notions and categorizations of males and females (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001).
Anne Constantinople’s 1973 research, and present-day feminist theory, respond to a time in the U.S. of gender roles changes and to the emergence of social justice as a way forward toward greater equality. Constantinople’s writing about masculinity-femininity scales is relevant today because it provides perspective from a half century of progress. It affords the research herein to examine agentic and communal traits and confidences among educational leaders of today within a longstanding framework of reference. Constantinople’s 1973 challenge to the masculinity-femininity scales provides a bedrock for this study in 2018.

Today’s contemporary culture is nearing the year 2020, and this research study explores the idea that it is time to degenderize leadership specifically in Nebraska. The result of splitting leadership along gender lines restricts the range of possible styles of leadership for both males and females. Therefore, the effort to degenderize K-12 educational leadership in Nebraska may produce greater differentiation and allow educational leaders, both males and females, to face new challenges posed by leading in contemporary culture more effectively (Campus, 2013, p119). Degenderizing leadership in Nebraska could potentially help correct the lack of female administrators at the highest levels in the field of education and broaden the possibilities for progress in PreK-12 education.

**Justify Operational Definitions**

**The Double Bind**

Women in performance settings face a Catch-22 known as the double bind. They are criticized for being too strong and assertive, and for being too caring and collaborative. This has resulted from a long process of polarization that conceptualizes
leadership in a rigid distinction between a male model, in which leadership is based on authority, decision-making capacity, and assertiveness; and a female model, in which leadership involves cooperation, concern for others and communality (Campus, 2013 pp. 54-72). The double bind dilemma for females in leadership is that females in organizations struggle to overcome contradictory demands for performance, behavior, and leadership. The double bind manifests itself in distinct predicaments for females in the work place. Researchers Shulz and Enslin (2014) explain one example of the double bind faced by females: a high competency threshold describes a predicament in which females must deliver to higher standards than male counterparts, often for smaller rewards. As a result, females face a high competency threshold when they are required to prove leadership ability repeatedly. Also, females must perform more consistently and at a higher level than male counterparts only to receive the same or lower compensation, recognition, or opportunities (p. 3).

Another predicament females face in the work place stems from acting on agentic behaviors. If a female displays agentic behaviors in order to be perceived as qualified for leadership roles, she is rewarded with competence ratings equal to those for agentic males, but she suffers a backlash effect in social repercussions from her colleagues. In other words, females who exemplify the qualities desired in a leader may not be well-liked, especially by other females. Specifically, agentic females are viewed as socially deficient, compared with identically represented males, which may result in hiring discrimination. Although a female is likely to be seen as competent when she assumes a masculine style of leadership, she risks being judged as insufficiently nice. In contrast,
males who behave in identical ways are judged less harshly because that is an expected form of conduct for a male in the work place (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992).

According to researchers Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001), there are generally two identified and agreed upon forms of prejudice, which lead to the double bind experienced by female leaders: (1) less favorable evaluation of females’ (than males’) potential for leadership because leadership ability is more stereotypic of males than females, and (2) less favorable evaluation of the actual leadership because agentic behavior is perceived as less desirable in females than males. The research of Heilman (2001) confirms the findings of Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, (1992) and Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001). Like other researchers in the area of the double bind, Heilman (2001) found three specific outcomes of gender stereotyping that threaten females as they attempt to advance their careers:

1. Devaluation of their performance;
2. Denying of credit to them for their successes;
3. Penalization for proven competence.

The first two (devaluation, denying) derive from the descriptive aspect of the female gender stereotype. In other words, when a female’s behavior is not congruent with the gender expectancies for a female, she is denied credit and devalued for her success. The third outcome (penalizing) derives from its normative prescription. In other words, when a female enacts agentic qualities in order to succeed in leadership, she will be less liked by her peers and thus, penalized socially. (Heilman, 2001, p. 661)

A summary of research on the double bind for females would not be complete without discussion of female appearance. Females are often burdened with the
assumption on the part of others that they have risen in the organizational hierarchy because of special relationships with those in power. This is particularly problematic for attractive females (Heilman, 2001, p. 666). Attractive females are perceived more gender stereotypically than unattractive females. Therefore, when applying for managerial positions, attractive females were evaluated less favorably than their unattractive counterparts, although they were evaluated more favorable when applying for non-managerial jobs (Rudman & Glick, 2001). A female’s beauty was a disadvantage in applying for male-dominated positions but an advantage in applying for female-dominated positions (Eagly & Karau, 2002). “Physical attractiveness, feminine clothing, and token status illustrate variables that may disadvantage women because they cause perceivers to weight [sic] the female gender role more heavily when judging women leaders” (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 583). Physical attractiveness may heighten negative reactions toward a female because when she enacts agentic traits, the violation of normative prescription for femininity may be seen as more egregious by a female considered to be very feminine in appearance (Heilman, 2001; Schulz & Enslin, 2014).

The consequences of the double bind is summarized by Eagly & Karau, (2002):

Consequently, women, more than men, face a difficult challenge to prove that they have the high level of ability required to become a leader. Despite doubts about women’s competence as leaders, one might expect that highly agentic female leaders would be able to overcome such difficulties. However, people may perceive women who demonstrate clear-cut leadership ability as insufficiently feminine. Thus, a female leader can be rejected because people perceive her to lack the agentic
qualities associated with effective leadership or because she possesses too many of them. This rejection as ‘‘too masculine’’ results from injunctive or prescriptive gender role norms—that is, consensual expectations about what men and women ought to do—that require women to display communal behavior and not too much agentic behavior (p. 820).

Prejudice and the Double Bind as Norms

Prejudice is a powerful word that indicates the presence of bias. Prejudice evokes powerful feelings and reactions, and in this current research study, it is vital to evaluate whether prejudice is one of the causes of female’s rarity in major leadership positions. Eagly and Karau (2002) proposed a role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders that (a) extends Eagly’s social role theory of sex differences and similarities into new territory; (b) proposes novel, measurable predictions about prejudice and its consequences; and (c) yields an effective organizing framework for a very large number of empirical findings from laboratories, field settings, organizations, and public opinion polls. (p. 573). In general, the prejudice toward female leaders follows from the incongruity that many people perceive between the characteristics of females, and what it means to be feminine, and the requirements of leadership roles. Eagly and Karau (2002) describe the norm violations which may occur when women assume leadership roles:

1. Descriptive Norms: Descriptive norms are consensual expectations about what members of a group actually do.

2. Injunctive Norms: Injunctive norms are consensual expectations about what a group of people ought to do or ideally would do. (p. 574)
Two forms of prejudice:

1. The first type of prejudice stems from descriptive norms of gender roles – that is, activation of descriptive beliefs about females’ characteristics and consequent ascription of female-stereotypical qualities to them, which are unlike the qualities expected and desired in leaders.

2. The second type stems from injunctive norms of gender roles – that is activation of beliefs about how females ought to behave. If female leaders violate these prescriptive beliefs by fulfilling the agentic requirements of leadership roles, and by failing to exhibit the communal supportive behaviors preferred in females, they can be negatively evaluated for these violations, even while they may also receive some positive evaluation for their fulfillment of the leader role. (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 576)

Females who fulfill leadership roles may elicit negative reactions even while they receive positive evaluations for their work. Researchers have found that even when female managers are described as successful, their superiors, peers, and subordinates regarded them as more hostile. Some descriptive words used by those observing the successful female leaders were: devious, quarrelsome, selfish, bitter. The successful females were described as less rational, less logical, less objective, and less able to separate feelings from ideas than their successful male counterparts. Some descriptions of powerful females included Dragon Lady, Battle Ax, and Iron Lady (Eagly & Karau, 2002, p 576).

The double bind is about how female leaders’ choices are constrained by threats from two directions:
1. Conforming to their gender role would produce a failure to meet the requirements of their leadership role;

2. Conforming to their leadership role would produce a failure to meet the requirement of their gender role.

(Eagly & Karau, 2002, p. 576)

Justify Subjects, Procedures, Instrumentation

Dr. Kenneth Locke: CSIV and CSIE

Dr. Kenneth Locke (2000) developed the CSIV and the CSIE (Locke & Sadler, 2007), by conceptualizing *interpersonal values and efficacy* as preferences for certain interpersonal outcomes or modes of conduct. Locke states that values are generally defined as preferences for certain outcomes or modes of conduct. Modern value instruments typically operationalize values as ratings of the subjective importance of various outcomes or modes of conduct. The CSIE operationalizes interpersonal values by asking respondents to rate the importance of various interpersonal outcomes or modes of conduct. It uses a rating, rather than a ranking or comparison procedure, because respondents typically find rating procedures less frustrating and more natural. What differentiates the CSIE from other value instruments is that it offers a more focused picture of interpersonal values and efficacy (Locke, 2000; Locke & Sadler, 2007).

The CSIE is useful for studying a variety of interpersonal phenomena, in addition to interpersonal traits. For example, the interactions involving social support in the school community may be examined by using the CSIE. Whereas some problems elicit agentic social support (e.g., giving advice, facilitating action), other problems tend to elicit communal social support (e.g., expressing empathy and caring). These qualities make the
CSIE an excellent tool by which to elicit agentic and communal traits and confidences of Nebraska administrators for the purpose of the current research investigation.

People who lead in the educational environment, and who value agentic traits, may be most comfortable giving and receiving agentic support. People who value communal traits may be most comfortable giving and receiving communal support. Moreover, because people are most satisfied when the type of support they receive matches the type of problems they express, social support transactions may be most satisfying among people with similar value systems and leadership styles. Using the CSIE to predict specific interpersonal behaviors among co-workers (administrators and teachers) is an important step in determining the significance of the leadership style norms utilized by the subjects for this research investigation. (Locke, 2000, p. 264).

The CSIE is a 32-item inventory designed to complement existing interpersonal circumplex measures by efficiently assessing confidence that one can engage in a variety of interpersonal behaviors. The eight 4-item scales of the CSIE appear to have a circumplex structure, adequate internal reliability, and convergent validity with measures of interpersonal values and interpersonal problems. For each item, respondents rate on a scale from 0 (not important) to 10 (extremely important) how important it is for them that they act, or appear, or are treated that way in interpersonal situations. Specifically, the CSIE asks participants to rate how sure you are that you can act that way with other people (Locke & Sadler, 2007).

The CSIE instrument is a vital means by which to determine the actual agentic and communal traits and confidences of Nebraska administrators. This real data will be used to determine the significance between the perceived data from the transactional,
transactional, and transformative (TTT) interpersonal conflict resolution narrative and the chosen solution. A direct connection between agentic and communal traits will be made TTT leadership styles using data from the CSIE.

**Transactional, Transformational, and Transformative Leadership**

**TTT Leadership Styles**

Role theories such as social role theory, gender role theory, and role congruity theory, trace an evolution of thought about agentic and communal traits and confidences and the preconceived notions about leadership styles of males and females. The traits associated with the terms agentic and communal are integrated within the various gender role theories. These same role theories have also been considered in the field of educational leadership and in the context of transactional, transformational, and transformative (TTT) leadership styles (Shields, 2010). TTT leadership styles associated with agentic and communal traits may determine whether there is some significant connection between how an educational leader values interpersonal relationships in the school community and how an educational leader’s style affects the entire school community (Debebe, 2011; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003; Shields, 2010).

Transactional leadership examples are associated with agentic traits are found where hierarchical management structures exist. This style is a chain-of-command organizational structure. The hierarchy of the transactional leadership style is found in the military and historically was a paramount structure to the success of the factory assembly line during the industrial revolution. Transactional leadership is an autocratic form of
leadership based on adherence to a chain-of-command model which allows leaders to influence their environment without interference from the opinions, thoughts, or ideas of their subordinates. The key values of transactional leadership are honesty, responsibility, fairness, and honoring commitments (Goldstein, 2014; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & van Engen, 2003; Shields, 2010).

Transformational leadership is focused on the overall improvement of an organization through communal efforts toward collaboration. The holistic approach of the transformational style is most commonly associated with communal leadership attributes. The interconnectedness of the transformational leadership style and the age of technology is evident in the media today and specifically on social media sites where information is shared, media representation is gendered, and issues are examined by a user’s chosen communal environment. The key values of transformational leadership are liberty, justice, and equality (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & van Engen, 2003; Shields, 2010; Romaniuk, 2016). Transformational leaders are those leaders who are able to communicate a vision to their followers, compelling them to rise above self-interest. Transformational leadership grew in opposition to transactional leadership which is based on an exchange of social or economic resources between the leader and the followers. The concept of transformational leadership may be a step toward gender-neutral leadership (Campus, 2013).

The transformative leadership style is complex in application and evolution. It is not synonymous with any other leadership style because it holds potential to meet both the academic and the social justice needs of complex and diverse societies in today’s
Information Age (Goldman & Scardamalia, 2013). The transformative leadership style focuses on the individual and the organization. When implemented with fidelity, transformative leadership may lead to greater balance of democratic empowerment. The key values of transformative leadership are liberation, emancipation, democracy, equity, and justice (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992; Shields, 2010).

Transformative leadership is based upon the premise that both agentic and communal attributes are functioning in a balanced manner and are demonstrated effectively in the leadership style of the individual. Transformative leadership may be associated with androgynous, degenderized, or gender-neutral leadership. These leadership styles may be enacted where incongruity with expected gender identity behavior or gender expectations are not important. Transformative leadership begins with critical reflection and analysis, which is associated with agentic attributes. The next step in transformative leadership is communal, because it moves through enlightened understanding toward action, not only with respect to equal access of information, but also where academic, social, and civic outcomes are concerned (Shields, 2010). Transformative leadership, which includes a balance of agentic and communal attributes, may have significant effects upon a school system and influence individual teachers and students as they develop their own social roles and individual identities. The transformative leadership style may have a clear connection to the social justice movements and to social media in the Information Age.

School leadership functions in much the same way as it did in the 1970’s, apart from the advent of the Internet, the administrators are predominantly male and the vast
majority of teaching positions are held by females. Schools follow a set of expectancies, stereotypes, and long-held beliefs about gender roles. This research will explore whether agentic and communal traits have a significant role in the style of leadership most common among educational leaders in Nebraska, and how an examination of leadership styles may affect change and bring balance to gender roles within the school community.

The three role theories use the terms *agentic* and *communal* in their definitions: social role theory (Koenig & Eagly, 2014), gender role theory (Karau & Eagly, 1999), and role congruity theory (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Role theories have evolved over time and continue to provide an ongoing framework to define associations with agentic and communal traits and confidences among leaders. Agentic behavior is often viewed as the expected and highly coveted behavior of effective leadership. This intersection of thought and theory reintroduces the ‘think manager, think male’ hiring philosophy which continues to impact the manner in which individuals perceive those who may be qualified for the role of leader in an organization (Koenig, Mitchell, Eagly, & Ristikari, 2011; Sczesny, 2003).

Expectations for leaders to possess a high level of agentic traits have strong underpinnings in transactional leadership style and in general expectancies for males and females when it comes to leadership positions (Abele, 2003; Reis, 2015; Shields, 2010). The balance of agentic and communal interpersonal traits may influence the tendency toward acting on one of the three TTT leadership styles. The connection between the balance of agentic and communal interpersonal traits and TTT leadership styles may also influence how systemic changes and strategic goals are addressed and, ultimately, how they are met (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Leonard, 2003).
This current research study is designed to contribute to the knowledge base about the agentic and communal traits and confidences of Nebraska’s educational leaders, the interpersonal strengths and weaknesses of Nebraska’s educational leaders, and the study herein may also bring an awareness of the tendency to act in a specific TTT leadership style. This study will provide educational leaders an opportunity to examine the evolution of their own leadership style and may reveal possibilities for growth in new directions away from traditional gender roles and toward a new gender balance in leadership. An outgrowth of this research will be the attention focused on androgynous or transformative (equal balance of agentic and communal attributes) leadership practices, which may prove to be a better method to address strategic goals, changes in the Information Age, and adjustments in the school climate for all the community stakeholders.

This research will enrich knowledge and strategies used to identify leadership potential in individuals, regardless of gender. A consistent finding among researchers is that the successful leader is perceived to behave and act in ways associated with masculine traits. Increased knowledge about the tendency to ‘think manager, think male’ could serve to inform educational leaders in human resources of their own hidden biases and to challenge those individuals toward hiring goals that facilitate systemic changes and strategic goal setting, rather than hiring decisions that maintain the status quo from centuries and decades past.

The three styles of leadership examined in this research study: transactional, transformational, and transformative (TTT), each has its place in the history of both the public and private sectors of the United States. Each has been explored and applied to the areas of industry, education, to autocracy and democracy. For the purposes of this study,
TTT will be examined through the lens of educational leadership. The research of Shields (2010) is basic to the current research and to gaining understanding about how agentic and communal traits influence TTT individual leadership styles.

Transactional leadership involves reciprocal transactions and is associated with the military or with the management of the Industrial Revolution assembly line.

Transformational leadership focuses on improving organizational qualities, dimensions, and effectiveness. This form of leadership is focused on the whole organization. Transformational leadership begins by challenging inappropriate uses of power and privilege that create or perpetuate inequity and injustice with the goal of democratic organizational solutions.

Since the 21st century, transformative leadership theory has been consistently heralded as a form of leadership grounded in an activist agenda; one that combines a rights-based theory that every individual is entitled to be treated with dignity, respect, and absolute regard. Transformative leadership is a style with a focus on social justice theory of ethics that takes these rights to a societal level. Transformative leadership therefore, recognizes the need to begin with critical reflection and analysis and to move through enlightened understanding to action – action to redress wrongs and to ensure that all members of the organization are provided with as level a playing field as possible – not only with respect to access but also with regard to academic, social, and civic outcomes (Shields, 2010, pp. 571-572).

Transformative leadership is inextricably engaged with wider society because its concepts of social justice are closely connected through the shared goal of identifying and restructuring frameworks that generate inequity and disadvantage. Transformative ideals
owe much to the work of Paulo Freire (1970, 1998), who used the terms *transform*, *transformation*, and *transformative* to describe the changes that may occur through education. (Shields, 2010, p. 566).

There is a need for the school administrator to be a transformative intellectual “to encourage social justice” and to practice “transformative leadership which can transcend the intellectual bias in democratic schooling to the benefit of all students and staff” (Shields, 2010, p. 567). The major divergence between transformational and transformative leadership theories is that the former focuses primarily on what happens within an organization, whereas the latter starts with a recognition of some material realities of the broader social and political sphere, recognizing that the inequities and struggle experienced in society affect one’s ability both to perform and to succeed in an organizational context (Shields, 2010, p. 568).

Weiner (2003) delineates the responsibilities of a transformative leader to instigate structural transformations, to reorganize political space, and to understand the relationship between leaders and those they led dialectically (and not hierarchically). He also calls for leaders to confront more than just what is, and instead to work toward creating an alternative political and social imagination that does not rest solely on the rule of capital or the hollow moralism of neoconservatives but is rooted in radical democratic struggle (Weiner, 2003, p. 97).

The fundamental task of the educational leader in this transformative tradition is to ask questions, for example, about the purposes of schooling, about which ideas should be taught, and about who is successful. Critique lays the groundwork for the promise of schooling that is more inclusive, democratic, and equitable for more students.
Transformative leadership is anti-racist, anti-sexist, anti-homophobic, and responsive to class exploitation (Weiner, 2003, p. 100). Transformative leaders always experience the challenge of having one foot in the dominant structure of power and authority. At the same time, transformative educational leaders must be able to work from within dominant social formations to exercise effective oppositional power, to resist courageously, and to be activists and voices for change and transformation. They must be willing to take risks, form strategic alliances, to learn and unlearn their power, and reach beyond a fear of authority toward a concrete vision of work in which oppression, violence, and brutality are transformed by a commitment to equality, liberty, and democratic struggle (Weiner, 2003, p. 102). The transformative leader is willing to grapple with the details in their role as a leadership and they are willing to conduct deep and meaningful examinations of the existing educational structure.

Transformative educational leadership works for the good of every individual in the school system. At its core, it has the potential to work for the common good of society as well. Transformative leadership considers the ways in which the inequities of the outside world affect the outcomes occurring internally in educational organizations. Transformative leaders, who focus on both critique and promise, do more than bemoan current failure and tinker around the edges of deep and meaningful reform. Indeed, they act courageously and continuously to ensure more equitable learning environments and pedagogical practices for all children (Shields, 2010, p. 584).
CHAPTER 3: Methodology

Subjects

The target subjects for this study are adults working as administrators in the field of PreK-12 education in Nebraska. Subjects will hold current Nebraska Administrative Certificates and work in administrative positions. A minimum sample of 100 administrators will be sought; they will be asked to identify their gender, age range, years of experience in education, and years of experience in administration.

The subjects will also be asked to provide their years of experience in education by delineating the amount of time spent in the classroom and the amount of time spent as an administrator. The study will rely on information gathered from the CSIE (Locke, 2000 & 2009; Locke & Sadler, 2007). Constraints include time and reliance on administrators to thoughtfully self-assess using the CSIE.

Instrumentation

The Development of CSIE Instrument by Dr. Kenneth Locke

The CSIV (2000) and the CSIE (2007) were designed by Dr. Kenneth Locke to assess interpersonal values associated with adaptive and maladaptive interpersonal behaviors. In developing the CSIV, Locke conceptualized interpersonal values as preferences for certain interpersonal outcomes or modes of conduct. Modern value instruments typically operationalize values as ratings of the subjective importance of various outcomes or modes of conduct. Locke describes the development of the CSIV in terms of its ability to demonstrate its reliability, circular structure, and convergent and discriminant validity; and explores its utility for enriching our understanding of the
interpersonal problems associated with personality disorders. Interpersonal self-efficacy is a person’s confidence in his or her ability to perform a specific type of interpersonal behavior. The interpersonal circumplex (IPC) is a widely adopted model for conceptualizing, organizing, and assessing interpersonal dispositions and this tool served as the catalyst for the development of the Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy (CSIE). The IPC is defined by two orthogonal axes: a vertical axis (of dominance, agency, status, power, or control) and a horizontal axis (of friendliness, communion, solidarity, warmth, or love). The CSIE is a measure of individuals’ confidence in their ability to perform interpersonal behaviors is associated with each region of the IPC. (Locke & Sadler, 2007).

Regarding values, Locke cites, Rokeach (1973), *The Nature of Human Values*:

“Values may often be a more convenient target of change interventions than either implicit assumptions or behaviors. In summary, interpersonal values are a potentially useful construct for understanding and enhancing interpersonal interactions” (Locke 2000, p. 264).

The CSIV (2000) provided the foundation for the CSIE, developed in 2007. Kenneth Locke, along with Pamela Sadler (2007), acknowledged that past research existed on the role of self-efficacy in educational, occupational, and medical domains, but not in the interpersonal domain. They set out to study the relationship between efficacy and behavior in the domain of interpersonal interactions. In solidarity with previous research on self-efficacy, they predicted that people are more likely to perform those interpersonal behaviors that they believe they can perform successfully. This idea is
central to this study to determine if self-efficacy in the form of agentic and communal traits and confidences is specific to one gender. The central theory of this research is that males have greater agentic traits and confidences than females which is why males are more likely to serve in educational leadership roles than females.

**Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy (CSIE)**

This quantitative study will explore whether agentic and communal traits and confidences have a connection with the leadership style norms most common among educational leaders in Nebraska. This research seeks to gather data and identify agentic and communal interpersonal traits and confidences of a minimum of 100 educational leaders in Nebraska by using the CSIE instrument as part of a self-reporting survey based on agentic and communal traits (Locke & Sadler, 2007).

The CSIE contains 32 questions which correlate in varying degrees to agentic and communal traits and confidences. The CSIE inventory provides the subject with the instructions for responses on a 1 – 10 scale. The scale indicates if the subject is absolutely confident that they can express themselves clearly, they are instructed to mark a 10. If the subject does not feel at all confident, they are instructed to mark a 0. If the subject feels moderately confident that they can express themselves clearly, they are instructed to mark a 5.

0 - 1 I am not at all confident that...
2 – 3 I am mildly confident that...
4 – 6 I am moderately confident that...
7 – 8 I am very confident that…
9 – 10 I am absolutely confident that…

The 32-questions appear in the following manner on the survey for this study.

Each question includes a slider scale from 1 – 10 and allows the subjects to skip a question if they chose to do so.

01. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can express myself openly

02. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be tough

03. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can follow the rules

04. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be assertive

05. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can hide my thoughts and feelings

06. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can fit in

07. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can keep the upper hand

08. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can avoid getting into arguments

09. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can smooth over any difficulties

10. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be cold and unfriendly when I want to

11. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can get along with them

12. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can speak up when I have something to say

13. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be submissive

14. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can understand their feelings
15. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can win any arguments or competitions
16. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be a follower
17. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can get them to listen to what I have to say
18. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can get them to leave me alone
19. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be nice
20. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can take charge
21. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can disappear into the background when I want
22. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can soothe hurt feelings
23. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be aggressive if I need to
24. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can avoid making them angry
25. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be a leader
26. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be cruel when the situation calls for it
27. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be giving
28. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be forceful
29. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be quiet
30. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can be helpful
31. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can tell them when I am annoyed
32. When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can let others take charge
The sample scoring of the CSIE is shown below by example with SPSS program.

For the purpose this study, the octants will be computed for the traditional bipolar X (agentic rawX) and Y (communal rawY) using SPSS, or a similar program, to compute the results of the CSIE.

* PA = +A, BC = +A-C, DE = -C, FG = -A-C,
   HI = -A, JK = -A+C, LM = +C, NO = +A+C.

* Compute raw scores (each raw octant score = mean of 4 items).

\[
\text{COMPUTE NO} = (i01i09i17i25)/4.
\]
\[
\text{COMPUTE PA} = (i04i12i20i28)/4.
\]
\[
\text{COMPUTE BC} = (i07i15i23i31)/4.
\]
\[
\text{COMPUTE DE} = (i02i10i18i26)/4.
\]
\[
\text{COMPUTE FG} = (i05i13i21i29)/4.
\]
\[
\text{COMPUTE HI} = (i08i16i24i32)/4.
\]
\[
\text{COMPUTE JK} = (i03i11i19i27)/4.
\]
\[
\text{COMPUTE LM} = (i06i14i22i30)/4.
\]
\[
\text{COMPUTE csiemean} = (PA+BC+DE+FG+HI+JK+LM+NO)/8.
\]

* Compute scores for the traditional bipolar X (agentic) and Y (communal) vectors.

\[
\text{COMPUTE rawY} = \text{rawA} - \text{rawunA}.
\]
\[
\text{COMPUTE rawX} = \text{rawC} - \text{rawunC}.
\]
The traditional bipolar scoring shows subjects’ overall agentic and communal traits and confidences. For example, when a subject’s dominant traits fall in the octant $PA = +A$, it is computed using questions numbered 04, 12, 20, and 28 ($PA = (i04+i12+i20+i28)/4$) which indicates the subject has a high level agentic confidence. In contrast, if a subject’s dominant score is in the octant $JK = -A+C$ ($JK = (i03+i11+i19+i27)/4$), this result indicates they have low agentic confidence and high communal confidence.

After subjects answer the 32 questions from the CSIE, question number 33 asks for a response to a narrative question about a conflict management issue in the workplace. The leadership style of each subject will be self-reported based on perception of dominant leadership style: transactional, transformational, or transformative. To determine this, the interpersonal conflict will be presented with three possible paths toward conflict resolution and each solution is formed based upon the descriptors from the transactional, transformational, and transformative (TTT) leadership matrix (Shields, 2010).

The conflict scenario is designed to present a common workplace issue and with enough ambiguity to provide the opportunity for subjects to interject their own experience as they arrive at their chosen resolution to the issue.

**Consider this conflict scenario:**

A long time staff member, a teacher, uses the school email to send out jokes, video clips, and cartoons. The teacher has been a member of the staff for about 25 years. Most of the staff put up with the emails or just delete them. Some experienced staff members respond with an eye-roll,
chuckle, or a written response, which only seems to encourage the sender to send more emails.

A new school year has begun, and a group of teachers have decided to speak up because they do not want to see the "jokes" starting up again for yet another school year. You learn about the teachers' perceptions of the email exchanges from their department leaders. Some teachers are upset by what they perceive as an inappropriate use of email.

Subjects will choose one of the following three conflict resolution choices that is most closely aligned with their leadership style.

**Conflict resolution #1 (Transactional):**

You remind staff of their responsibility to limit use of the school email to school business only, starting immediately. You announce the renewed expectation to staff via email. You cite School Board Policy in your message and explain the policy is fair. You make plans to follow up on the next professional development day with a printed copy of Board Policy and the expectation that all staff will honor their professional commitment for proper use of workplace email.

**Conflict resolution #2 (Transformational):**

You address the issue within the existing organizational culture via email. You discuss the importance of professionalism and humor in the work place to help staff better understand the motive for the
emails. You encourage department leaders to discuss the use of
e-mails with their teams, to develop a common purpose for email,
and help staff focus on how email helps bring organizational goals
into focus. All staff work on setting a new direction at the next
professional development day.

**Conflict resolution #3 (Transformative):**

You acknowledge power and privilege exist within the staff. You
acknowledge that the social / cultural knowledge generates
inequity. You focus on democracy and the responsibility to uphold
the rights of all staff members. You point to the conflicts created
by stereotyping. You stress that if one person is made to feel
uncomfortable, then everyone should be uncomfortable. Therefore,
all must have the moral courage to challenge past practices and
make a change for the good of the individual and for the
organization as a whole.

The final four questions on the survey, 34 through 37, ask subjects for
demographic information about gender, age range, years of experience in education, and
in educational leadership. The overall meaning and importance of this research will be
determined by the CSIE data collected about the agentic and communal attributes of
school leaders in Nebraska and by the results of the conflict resolution question.

The CSIE will reveal the balance of agentic and communal qualities possessed by
the subjects. The conflict resolution of the interpersonal problem will reveal the subjects’
tendency to seek transactional, transformational, or transformative solutions to every day issues in the school community. The comparison will add to the body of knowledge about common educational leadership styles and whether the CSIE and the self-reported leadership styles of males and females vary significantly. CSIE results, interpersonal conflict management narrative, and demographic information will provide a framework for determining significance between the real results from the CSIE and the self-reported conflict resolution. Further, a comparison between agentic and communal traits and confidences with the self-reported leadership styles (TTT) may lead to a deeper understanding of the educational leadership constructs across the state of Nebraska (Abele, 2003; Abele & Wojciszke, 2013; Bakan, 1966; Carli & Eagly, 2001; Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001).

The results will be analyzed with descriptive statistics in Chapter 4. The data analysis will be shown in figures and tables that address each octant and show the agentic rawX and the communal rawY traits and confidences for the subjects in this study. The distinctions among three theories of leadership, transactional, transformational, and transformative will be based on the matrix created by Shields (2010, p. 563). The protocol for correlating agentic and communal traits with the TTT leadership styles is based on the linguistic descriptors for agentic and communal traits, and on the specific categories of the TTT leadership styles. The results will be explained and illustrated with descriptive statistics.
Procedures

CSIE, TTT Matrix, Survey Monkey

The results of the CSIE are quantitative and will be analyzed according to the process established and with the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) or a similar program. The self-reported conflict solution based on the TTT leadership style matrix may lead to results that determine whether there is a gap in the subject’s understanding of their actual and perceived leadership styles. Specifically, the CSIE asks participants to indicate for each of the behaviors how they rate their self-assuredness to act in that way with other people with confidence (Locke, 2000; Locke & Sadler, 2007). If a subject is highly agentic and chooses a transformational style of conflict resolution, this may lead to a deeper understanding in the realm of agentic and communal decision making.

The exploration of interpersonal values in the study herein may be a useful construct for understanding and enhancing interpersonal interactions of educational leaders (Locke, 2000). Researchers Locke and Sadler (2007) used the key construct of interpersonal theory (the interpersonal circumplex) to organize and measure constructs of social-cognitive theory (efficacy expectancies and subjective values) to predict and understand the interpersonal behaviors expressed and satisfaction experienced in interpersonal interactions of a variety of subjects, including University of Idaho students. The results of the study by Locke and Sadler (2007) correlated the CSIV and the CSIE, and both instruments are based on the interpersonal circumplex (IPC). Locke and Sadler found that CSIE and CSIV organize interpersonal variables in terms of the interpersonal circumplex and suggest CSIE and CSIV are highly
useful instruments for investigation of the role of self-efficacy and subjective values in shaping how people act and feel during dynamic interpersonal interactions (Locke & Sadler, 2007, p. 106). The actions and common behaviors of educational leaders is the focus of this current research study so the CSIE serves as a highly appropriate means by which to gather information about the agentic and communal confidences of the educational leaders in Nebraska.

Data will be collected via electronic submission to SurveyMonkey from a minimum of 100 administrators currently working in educational leadership roles in the state of Nebraska. The protocol for each school district will be followed according to each district’s policy. Subjects will be identified, an introductory letter will be sent via email, and the CSIE short-form (32-questions) including the narrative and demographic questions will be sent via email with a link to the survey.

The final questions on the survey are important in the determination of the significant findings for this study. The question number 33 ask subjects to answer a question about an interpersonal conflict among staff members and subjects will determine which solution path best fits with their perceived leadership style. In addition, respondents will be asked to identify their gender, age range, years of experience in education, and years of experience in administration. The data will be analyzed according to the instructions for the CSIE and the self-reported TTT leadership style used to solve the interpersonal conflict.
The Survey

The introduction to the survey is as follows:

My name is Amy Himes and I am a Doctoral Candidate at University of Nebraska, Omaha in Educational Leadership. I am extending a request that you kindly take the following survey on leadership styles. Your anonymous responses will be used to learn about current educational leadership styles in Nebraska. The data will be reported in aggregate form only, no identifiers will be associated with you or with your responses. There is no way to identify you, your district affiliation, or how you have responded to any of the 37 questions. Your participation is completely voluntary. You can decide to withdraw from participation at any time and deciding not to participate will not harm your relationship with the researcher. You can skip items if you are not comfortable answering. The 37-question survey will take approximately 10 minutes. Please respond as candidly as possible. When you click "submit" you are giving permission for the responses to be used in aggregate form only.

A. The CSIE is comprised of 32 questions:

For each of the following behaviors, rate how sure you are that you can act that way with other people.

Use the following rating scale:

0 - 1 ... I am not at all confident that...

2 - 3 ... I am mildly confident that...

4 - 5 - 6 ... I am moderately confident that...
7 - 8 ... I am very confident that...

9 - 10 ... I am absolutely confident that...

**CSIE Sample Item:**

When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can express myself clearly

If you are absolutely confident that you can express yourself clearly, you would slide the bar to 10. If you feel not at all confident, you would slide the bar to 0. If you feel moderately confident that you can express yourself clearly, you would slide the bar to 5, and so on.

B. Interpersonal Problem/Solution:

You will choose one of the three leadership pathways to a solution based on which solution is most closely related to your own conflict-resolution style.

C. Four demographic questions:

Gender; age range; years of experience in education; and years in administration.

**Data Collection by Research Questions**

**Question #1:** How do Nebraska Administrators self-report agentic and communal traits as evidenced from the CSIE Instrument?
This question will be examined by the self-reported results of the CSIE in aggregate form which will summarize the self-reported responses to questions about agentic and communal traits. The CSIE will generate quantitative statistical data to identify agentic and communal interpersonal traits. Efforts will be made to gather information from both large and small school communities. The CSIE will determine a compilation of agentic and communal interpersonal markers to provide a framework and a deeper understanding of how interpersonal traits are reflected in the current population of educational leaders in Nebraska. The transactional, transformational, and transformative leadership matrix will be connected to the CSIE (Locke, 2000; Locke, 2009) and the communal and agentic markers data will be used to gain insight into the type of leadership style (TTT) most commonly used by educational administrators in Nebraska (Shields, 2010). The CSIE (Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy) was designed in 2007 (Locke & Sadler), with a focus on efficacy in interpersonal relationships.

**Question #2:** Which approach do Nebraska leaders utilize when solving an interpersonal conflict among staff members (transactional, transformational, and transformative)?

This question will be examined by results of self-reporting for the transactional, transformational, and transformative interpersonal problem. The results of self-reporting for the use of transactional, transformational, and transformative interpersonal problem solving. A simple conflict scenario will be described in the survey with three possible pathways toward resolution. Each pathway will be correlated to one of the three TTT leadership styles and the subject will choose the solution that best fits their leadership
style. The protocol follows the conflict resolution scenario and the three possible conflict resolutions are designed to help determine the most likely conflict resolution strategy employed by the subject. Leadership styles will be determined by responses to the interpersonal conflict in which the respondents self-report their perceptions about how they reach a solution.

Although administrators cite interpersonal skills as an area of strength, they also report conflict resolution, mediation/negotiation processes as on-going professional development needs (Foley, 2001). The three conflict resolution pathways are each based on TTT research by Shields (2010). The protocol for the three approaches to conflict resolution include words and phrases from the TTT matrix and descriptors, based on agentic and communal traits, in order to distinguish one conflict resolution choice from the other. For example: the transactional conflict resolution relies on agentic descriptors such as responsibility, expectations, and commitment; the transformational conflict resolution relates to communal descriptors such as common purpose, encourage, and together set a new direction; and the transformative conflict resolution relates to both agentic and communal traits such as social / cultural knowledge, moral courage, and change.

Survey subjects will not know which solution is identified as transactional, transformational, or transformative leadership style. This is intended to prevent bias or preconceived ideas about leadership styles to influence the conflict scenario solution. Administrators may have studied leadership styles and may have bias regarding which leadership style is most valued or acceptable. They will choose the conflict resolution pathway which they perceive as the closest match to their own TTT leadership style. The
leadership matrix provides clear distinctions among three theories of leadership (Shields, 2010, p. 563)

- **Transactional Leadership** – Transactional leadership involves a reciprocal transaction. Reciprocal actions follow from others' initial actions (Shields, 2010).

- **Transformational Leadership** – Transformational leadership focuses on improving organizational qualities, dimensions, and effectiveness (Shields, 2010).

- **Transformative Leadership** - Transformative leadership begins with questions of justice and democracy; working for equity in diverse contexts (Shields, 2010).

This study will examine whether the actual or perceived leadership of Nebraska administrators is categorized into one of the three leadership categories defined in Shields’ matrix: transactional, transformational, or transformative. The agentic and communal attributes will provide data to determine the significance of actual leadership styles and the self-perceived leadership style of each subject.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting Point</td>
<td>A desired agreement or item</td>
<td>Need for the organization to run smoothly and efficiently</td>
<td>Material realities &amp; disparities outside the organization that impinge of the success of individuals, groups, &amp; organization as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>An exchange</td>
<td>Meet the needs of complex &amp; diverse systems</td>
<td>Critique &amp; promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Deep &amp; equitable change in social conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Immediate cooperation through mutual agreement and benefit</td>
<td>Understanding of organizational culture; setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing the instructional program</td>
<td>Deconstruction and reconstruction of social/ cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity, acknowledgement of power, &amp; privilege; dialectic between individual &amp; social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key values</td>
<td>Honesty, responsibility, fairness, and honoring commitments</td>
<td>Liberty, justice, equality</td>
<td>Liberation, emancipation, democracy, equity, justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Agreement; mutual goal advancement</td>
<td>Organizational change; effectiveness</td>
<td>Individual, organizational, &amp; societal transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Mostly ignored</td>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>Positional, hegemonic, tool for oppression as well as for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Ensures smooth and efficient organizational operation through transactions</td>
<td>Looks for motive, develops common purpose, focuses on organizational goals</td>
<td>Lives with tension, &amp; challenge; requires moral courage, activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related theories</td>
<td>Bureaucratic leadership, Scientific management</td>
<td>School effectiveness, School reform, School improvement, Instructional leadership</td>
<td>Critical theories (race, gender), Cultural and social reproduction, Leadership for social justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Distinctions among three theories of leadership
Question #3: How do Nebraska Administrators view themselves as transactional, transformational, and transformative leaders versus the data collected from the CSIE?

The transactional, transformational, and transformative leadership matrix will be connected to the CSIE (Locke, 2000; Locke, 2009) and the communal and agentic markers data will be used to gain insight into the type of leadership style (TTT) most commonly used by educational administrators in Nebraska (Shields, 2010). The chosen conflict management solution (TTT leadership style) will provide the means to correlate their agentic and communal traits and confidences with their natural style of conflict management.

The data from the CSIE will be compared to the results of the TTT interpersonal conflict solution. In addition, the ratio of male and female administrators, years in education, and years working as an administrator, will be considered and included in the results. In this section, the actual data from the CSIE will be compared to the self-reported results of the TTT to determine if there is significant connection between the results of the CSIE (agentic and communal traits and confidences) and the perceived TTT narrative problem. The data will be reported in aggregate form only, to maintain anonymity of the subjects.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

The results of the CSIE (Locke & Sadler, 2007) for this research and the results of the conflict management resolution question will reveal the agentic and communal traits and confidences of males and females in educational leadership. Further, the results may lead to a new form of instrumentation for future research. The new instrumentation,
based on the results of the CSIE and the conflict resolution scenario solution from the TTT leadership style matrix, may lead to new interpretations of the balance of traits among males and females working as administrators in PreK-12 in Nebraska, and their actual leadership styles versus perceived leadership styles which are based on traditional gender roles.

Nebraska administrators will take an electronic version of the CSIE to assess their actual agentic and communal attributes. The CSIE will be used to measure actual agentic and communal attributes for this study. Questions are answered on a scale, commonly known as a Likert scale. The results of the CSIE are quantitative and will be analyzed according to the process established and described (Locke, 2000, 2009; Locke & Sadler, 2007) with the SPSS, or a similar program. The CSIE is considered a comprehensive and efficient structural model for representing interpersonal dispositions and the interplay between agentic and communal attributes. The CSIE results are defined by dimensions of agency (dominance, power, status) and communion (friendliness, warmth, love) and are divided into eight (8) sections in the analysis (Locke, 2000, p. 250).

Following the CSIE, subjects will be asked to answer a question about a problem and they will determine which solution path best fits with their perceived leadership style. The problem will be the same and there will be three pathways toward a solution. Each of the three pathways will correlate with one of the three leadership styles, TTT (transactional, transformational, and transformative). The administrators will choose one of the three pathways which will have a protocol that correlates to each of the three TTT leadership styles (one interpersonal conflict followed by three possible paths toward a solution). This will determine whether the individual subject identifies himself or herself
as a transactional, transformational, or transformative leader. By answering questions about the problem posed in a narrative format, and, by choosing one of the three pathways toward a solution, subjects will reveal their perceived approach to problem solving and therefore, their perceived leadership style.

A set of four demographic questions including: (1) male/female (2) elementary/secondary (3) years in education and (4) years in administration will be asked and answered in order to obtain general data on the career trajectory of male and female administrators in the state of Nebraska.

Comparing the data from the CSIE instrument to the self-reporting narratives will allow an exploration of whether the actual CSIE results and the TTT perceptions align. Or, whether there is a significant difference between the CSIE and the TTT conflict resolution choice of leadership style. The data will lend insight into how the balance of interpersonal traits may influence educational leadership styles and, thus, the potential for change in school communities.
CHAPTER 4: Data Analysis

Data Analysis and Presentation of Findings

The data for this study will be presented with descriptive statistics in Chapter 4. Nebraska administrators (N = 157 total subjects; Females 75, Males 82; age range 31-65) working in educational leadership positions in the state of Nebraska responded to an on-line survey via SurveyMonkey Inc. A link to the electronic survey was sent to administrators in ten (10) Nebraska school districts. The survey was designed on October 1, 2017 and was open from October 1, 2017 through December 21, 2017. Ten (10) Nebraska School districts were contacted with a request for participation in the study. The ten Nebraska school districts that voluntarily participated in this study are listed in alphabetical order:

1. Bellevue Public Schools
2. Bennington Public Schools
3. DC West Community Schools
4. Kearney Public Schools
5. Lincoln Public Schools
6. Millard Public Schools
7. North Platte Public Schools
8. Papillion La Vista Community Schools
9. Ralston Public Schools
10. Westside Community Schools

Research Questions to Be Tested

Question #1: How do Nebraska Administrators self-report agentic and communal traits as evidenced from the CSIE Instrument?
The interpersonal circle or interpersonal circumplex (IPC) is a widely adopted model for conceptualizing, organizing, and assessing interpersonal dispositions. The IPC is defined by two orthogonal axes: a vertical axis (of dominance, agency, status, power, or control) and a horizontal axis (of friendliness, communion, solidarity, warmth, or love). Interpersonal self-efficacy is a person’s confidence in his or her ability to perform a specific type of interpersonal behavior. The IPC served as the vehicle to develop the Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy (CSIE) (Locke & Sadler, 2007).
Analysis and Presentation from Each Research Question

Table 1: CSIE Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Octant</th>
<th>Scale Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA (Dominant)</td>
<td>I can be assertive; I can be forceful; I can speak up when I have something to say; I can take charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC (Dominant &amp; Distant)</td>
<td>I can be aggressive if I need to; I can keep the upper hand; I can tell them when I am annoyed; I can win any arguments or competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE (Distant)</td>
<td>I can be cold and unfriendly when I want to; I can be cruel when the situation calls for it; I can be tough; I can get them to leave me alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG (Yielding &amp; Distant)</td>
<td>I can be quiet; I can be submissive; I can disappear into the background when I want; I can hide my thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI (Yielding)</td>
<td>I can avoid getting into arguments; I can avoid making them angry; I can be a follower; I can let others take charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK (Yielding &amp; Friendly)</td>
<td>I can be giving; I can be nice; I can follow the rules; I can get along with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM (Friendly)</td>
<td>I can be helpful; I can fit in; I can soothe hurt feelings; I can understand their feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO (Dominant &amp; Friendly)</td>
<td>I can be a leader; I can express myself openly; I can get them to listen to what I have to say; I can smooth over any difficulties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CSIE = Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy.

Instructions to compute scores for the traditional Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy (CSIE) bipolar X (agentic) and Y (communal) vectors were followed based on the expert advice obtained from Dr. Kenneth Locke (K. Locke, personal communication, December 21, 2017). Figure 1, 2, and 3 show total responses, from the total 157 subjects, to the CSIE form questions. These octants (PA = +A, BC =
+A-C, DE = -C, FG = -A-C, HI = -A, JK = -A+C, LM = +C, NO = +A+C) are used to assess the confidence of the participants to engage in a variety of interpersonal behaviors in the workplace. This study uses the CSIE octants and binary agentic rawX and communal rawY confidence and situational behavior for the subjects. The results of this study are reported in aggregate form to maintain confidentiality of the subjects in the reporting of this data.
In sum, the 157 subjects have greater agentic confidence than communal confidence in how they engage interpersonally within their leadership roles and within the school environment. Research in educational leadership acknowledges the term *leadership* is often a construct described and envisioned with agentic terms such as: governance, control, supremacy, rule, command, and power.
Males have greater agentic confidence than communal confidence in how they engage interpersonally within their leadership roles and within the school environment. Research reveals expectations that males have high levels of agentic traits such as controlling, confident, aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, independent, self-sufficient, and self-confident. These traits have traditionally been associated with power, which stereotypes males as more likely to act as leaders (Eagly & Karau, 2002).
Females have greater agentic confidence than communal confidence in how they engage interpersonally within their leadership roles and within the school environment. Role theory studies have shown when females act, to gain power, their actions are perceived as agentic and are incongruent with communal expectations and stereotypes for their gender. Such actions create negative perceptions because such traits are perceived as a rejection of traditional gender expectations. Female leaders are participatory, interpersonally oriented, and are more likely to adopt empathetic, supportive, and collaborative approaches. However, the higher the level of authority, and the more power a male or female leader has, the more likely they are to act in an agentic manner (Campus, 2013 p.16).

Figure 3: 75 Female Subjects Agentic rawX and Communal rawY

Note: Figure 3 shows data for the 75 female respondents. +/- Agentic +/- Communal. Orange line = Agentic rawX. Blue line = Communal rawY. n = 75.
Table 2: Total CSIE Male and Female Agentic and Communal Confidence Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>CSIE +/- Agentic +/- Communal</th>
<th>Sum</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Communal rawY</td>
<td>19.591</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Communal rawY</td>
<td>3.343</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Agentic rawX</td>
<td>181.437</td>
<td>2.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Agentic rawX</td>
<td>213.341</td>
<td>2.844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CSIE = Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy. M = Mean. m = male, f = female.

Table 2 data shows a mean difference in males’ communal confidence and females’ communal confidence ($m = .238 > f = .044$). Table 2 data shows a mean difference females’ agentic confidence males’ agentic confidence ($f = 2.844 > m = 2.212$). The communal and agentic rows are in bolded font to emphasize the mean differences in self-perceptions. Male and female agentic and communal confidence perceptions in interpersonal situations differ in a surprising finding in Table 2 because the means oppose stereotypes for males and females.

Individual octant scores (PA = +A, BC = +A-C, DE = -C, FG = -A-C, HI = -A, JK = -A+C, LM = +C, NO = +A+C) offer a visualization of the statistical range for the responses for all 157 subjects in this study. Each question was answered using the rating scale that ranged from 1 – 10 and the meaning of the scale was defined in the survey introduction. The range of choices were defined as: 0 - 1 (I am not at all confident that...); 2 - 3 (I am mildly confident that...); 4 - 5 - 6 (I am moderately confident that...); 7 - 8 (I am very confident that...); 9 - 10 (I am absolutely confident that...). Each octant of the CSIE form contains four questions used to compute the individual subject’s agentic or communal confidence level.
Figure 4 through Figure 11 show the data for each of the 8 octants of the CSIE. These same octants were used to compute simple binary agentic (rawX) and communal (rawY) data. Each graph is titled with the octant and the formula used to compute the data for that octant and for all 157 participants that completed the study. Figure 4 through Figure 11 include data for all 157 subjects.
Figure 4 shows the agentic range for the total group of 157 administrators in this study. Figure 4 also includes the list of four questions used to calculate this octant. The result shows the dominance of agentic traits and confidences is in the upper range on the CSIE scale.

*Note: Figure 4 is data for octant PA = Dominant (+A)*
Table 3: CSIE octant PA = Dominant (+A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects (N)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.71875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>8.37804878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.106666667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* CSIE questions begin with: When I am with others. Octant includes questions 04. I can be assertive; 12. I can speak up when I have something to say; 20. I can take charge; 28. I can be forceful

Table 3 further illustrates the dominance in agentic confidence for all subjects and shows the subgroup means, males and females, exceed 8 on the CSIE confidence ranking scale. Together, Figure 4 and Table 3 demonstrate the high level of agentic confidence shared equally by all of the subjects in this study.
Figure 5: CSIE Octant BC = Distant & Dominant (+A-C)

BC = Distant & Dominant (+A-C)
COMPUTE BC = (i07+i15+i23+i31)/4.

N = Total 157 subjects

Note: Figure 5 is data for octant BC = Distant & Dominant (+A-C)
Table 4: CSIE Octant BC = Distant & Dominant (A-C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects (N)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.77647293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.923780488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.566666667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: CSIE questions begin with: When I am with others. Octant includes questions 07. 1. I can keep the upper hand; 15. I can win any arguments or competitions; 23. I can be aggressive if I need to; 31. I can tell them when I am annoyed.

Figure 5 and Table 4 illustrate the high level agentic confidence in the group. However, this CSIE octant also shows a range of 9 for females which may indicate that females are willing to adapt to the given situation and to adjust their agentic and communal confidence as necessary to lead at that moment. Female leaders are participatory, interpersonally oriented, and are more likely to adopt empathetic, supportive, and collaborative approaches. However, the higher the level of authority, and the more power a male or female leader has, the more likely they are to act in an agentic manner (Campus, 2013 p.16). Males in this octant display greater confidence in this octant and have a range of 5.5 when choosing a situational behavior. It is interesting to notice that males and females share a mean between 6.5 and 6.9 generally indicating a similar agentic confidence level in this octant where agentic confidence dominates.
Figure 6: CSIE Octant DE = Distant (-C)

Note: Figure 6 DE = Distant (-C) indicates absence of communal confidence and a strong tendency toward agentic confidence.
Table 5: CSIE Octant DE = Distant (-C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects (N)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>-2.238256369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.570121951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.986666667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* CSIE questions begin with: When I am with others. Octant includes questions: 02. I can be tough; 10. I can be cold and unfriendly when I want to; 18. I can get them to leave me alone; 26. I can be cruel when the situation calls for it.

Figure 6 and Table 5 show a range of 9.5 for all subjects CSIE scale. This indicates that the subjects may have been conflicted on the questions that reveal their ability to be tough, cold, unfriendly, and cruel. As previous research has shown, a common predicament females face in the work place stems from acting on agentic behaviors. If a female displays agentic behaviors in order to be perceived as qualified for leadership roles, she is rewarded with competence ratings equal to those for agentic males, but she suffers a backlash effect in social repercussions from her colleagues. In other words, females who exemplify the qualities desired in a leader may not be well-liked, especially by other females. Specifically, agentic women are viewed as socially deficient, compared with identically represented males, which may result in hiring discrimination. Although a female is likely to be seen as competent when she assumes a masculine or agentic style of leadership, she risks being judged as insufficiently nice. In contrast, males who behave in identical ways are judged less harshly because that is an expected form of conduct for a male in the work place (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992).
Figure 7: CSIE Octant FG = Distant & Yielding (-A-C)

\[
FG = \text{Distant & Yielding (-A-C)} \\
\text{COMPUTE } FG = (i05+i13+i21+i29)/4.
\]

N = Total 157 Subjects

*Note:* Figure 7 FG = Distant & Yielding (-A-C) indicates an absence of both agentic and communal confidence and points toward situations where the subject disengages from a situation.
Table 6: CSIE Octant FG = Distant & Yielding (-A-C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects (N)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>-0.989848726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.765243902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>6.293333333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CSIE questions begin with: When I am with others. Octant includes questions: 05. I can hide my thoughts and feelings; 13. I can be submissive; 21. I can disappear into the background when I want; 29. I can be quiet.

Figure 7 and Table 6 reveal behavioral responses to situations in which an administrator retreats or disengages from their leadership role in a situation. The decision to retreat or to be quiet may be the result a leader viewing a situation in which they do not feel effective or where their confidence level is low. Another possible explanation for submissive behavior, specifically for females, may be because leadership ability is more stereotypic of males and if females believe there is risk of less favorable evaluations because agentic behavior is perceived as less desirable, females may hide, become submissive, or disappear altogether. The research on the double-bind supports this explanation and explains three specific outcomes of gender stereotyping that threaten females as they attempt act on agentic behaviors:

4. Devaluation of their performance;
5. Denying of credit to them for their successes;
Figure 8: CSIE Octant HI = Yielding (-A)

HI = Yielding (-A)
COMPUTE HI = (i08+i16+i24+i32)/4.

Note: Figure 8 HI = Yielding (-A) indicates a high level of communal confidence and the shows the ability to follow in a situation.
Table 7: CSIE Octant HI = Yielding (-A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects (N)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>-0.03602707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.460365854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CSIE questions begin with: When I am with others. Octant includes questions: 08. I can avoid getting into arguments; 16. I can be a follower; 24. I can avoid making them angry; 32. I can let others take charge.

Figure 8 and Table 7 show the range of situational and behavioral abilities possessed by the subjects in this study to yield their authority and to be strategic in maneuvering through a complex behavioral situation. People who value communal traits may be most comfortable giving and receiving communal support. Moreover, because people are most satisfied when the type of support they receive matches the type of problems they express, social support transactions may be most satisfying among people with similar value systems and leadership styles.
Figure 9: CSIE Octant JK = Friendly & Yielding (-A+C)

\[ JK = \text{Friendly} \& \text{Yielding (-A+C)} \]

\[ \text{COMPUTE} \ JK = (i03+i11+i19+i27)/4. \]

\[ N = \text{Total 157 Subjects} \]

*Note:* Figure 9 CSIE Octant JK = Friendly & Yielding (-A+C) indicates high levels of communal confidence through the behaviors of being nice and friendly.
Table 8: CSIE Octant JK = Friendly & Yielding (-A+C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects (N)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>9.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CSIE questions begin with: When I am with others. Octant includes questions: 03. I can follow the rules; 11. I can get along with them; 19. I can be nice; 27. I can be giving.

Figure 9 and Table 8 show a narrower range for males and females, 1.65, and a mean above 9 for males and females. Females mean is 9.32 in this octant of friendly and yielding behavior. Some of the most consistent tendencies shown in research are that females have high levels of communal traits, including being friendly, unselfish, concerned with others, and emotionally expressive. Communal may also be described as having concern with the welfare of other people. This octant also shows all of the subjects’ ability to adhere to rules, policies, and procedures. Male and female leaders appear to have similar abilities to get along with others and share a strong communal confidence level.
Figure 10: CSIE Octant LM = Friendly (+C)

LM = Friendly (+C)
COMPUTE LM = (i06+i14+i22+i30)/4.

N = Total 157 Subjects

Note: Figure 10 CSIE Octant LM = Friendly (+C) indicates a high level of communal confidence.
Table 9: CSIE Octant LM = Friendly (+C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects (N)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.812699045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>8.259146341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>8.43333333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CSIE questions begin with: When I am with others. Octant includes questions: 06. I can fit in; 14. I can understand their feelings; 22. I can soothe hurt feelings; 30. I can be helpful.

Figure 10 and Table 9 show that the range is narrower and mean is higher for female subjects in this study in the category of friendly. Some of the most consistent tendencies shown in research are that females have high levels of communal traits, including being friendly, unselfish, concerned with others, and emotionally expressive. Table 9 also indicates that male subjects have a high level of communal confidence and act on friendly behaviors. Females range is smaller, 3.75, than males, 5.25, indicating they have less flexibility to choose behaviors other than those considered highly communal.
Figure 11: CSIE Octant NO = Friendly & Dominant (+A+C)

\[ \text{NO} = \text{Friendly & Dominant (+A+C)} \]
\[ \text{COMPUTE NO} = \frac{(i01+i09+i17+i25)}{4}. \]

N = Total 157 Subjects

Note: Figure 11 CSIE Octant NO = Friendly & Dominant (+A+C) indicates that the subject is capable of taking control in a situation in order to lead.
### Table 10: CSIE Octant NO = Friendly & Dominant (+A+C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects (N)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/F</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.863654459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.402439024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.383333333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: CSIE questions begin with: When I am with others. Octant includes questions: 01. I can express myself openly; 09. I can smooth over any difficulties; 17. I can get them to listen to what I have to say; 25. I can be a leader.*

Figure 11 and Table 10 show the means for males and for females in the area of friendly and dominant is equal. This indicates that both males and females are able to act on communal traits when the framework of dominance is established.
Summary for Question #1

The summary data for question 1 shows that Nebraska administrators, males and females, have more agentic than communal confidence. The data set reported in Figure 1, Total Responses 157 subjects, shows a range of agentic and communal confidence is present however, agentic tendencies dominate self-perceptions for both males and females.

Figures 2 and 3, the male and female subgroups, show administrators by gender have greater agentic than communal confidence.

Figures 4 through 11, along with Tables 1 through 10, explain details of how the subjects perceive themselves as more agentic than communal by octant. The 75 females and 82 males show varying differences in agentic and communal confidence, both in range and mean. Several octants show the ranges and means for the male and female subgroups have little variance.

Question #2:

Which approach do Nebraska leaders utilize when resolving an interpersonal conflict among staff members (transactional, transformational, and transformative)?

The narrative survey question, number 33, which describes an interpersonal conflict among staff members and three distinct choices or pathways toward solution, was answered by 147 of the 157 participants that completed the study, 10 participants skipped question number 33 but completed the remainder of the survey. Question number 33 asked the subjects to choose a strategy for solving a common interpersonal workplace issue with email. This question is designed to determine how the subject would choose to
move toward a conflict resolution and resolve interpersonal strife in the workplace. The scenario offers the option to choose one of three possible pathways toward resolution. The three choices were not labeled with a specific leadership style titles, however, each solution was distinctly described using specific language and directly aligned with words and phrases from the TTT Leadership Matrix (Shields, 2010). Each of the three pathways toward resolution contained at least four key-words from each of the three leadership in the areas of emphasis, processes, and key values. The subjects could choose only one of the three solutions so the subjects chose the conflict solution that best fits their own perception of their individual leadership style.

Key words for Survey Question #33

- Transactional Leadership: responsibility, fair, expectations, commitment
- Transformational Leadership: organizational culture, motive, common purpose, setting direction
- Transformative Leadership: power and privilege, social/cultural knowledge, democracy, moral courage

Question #33: Three Pathways to Conflict Resolution

Consider this conflict scenario:

A long time staff member, a teacher, uses the school email to send out jokes, video clips, and cartoons. The teacher has been a member of the staff for about 25 years. Most of the staff put up with the emails or just delete them. Some experienced staff members respond with an eye-roll, a chuckle, or a written response, which only seems to encourage the sender to send more emails.
A new school year has begun, and a group of teachers have decided to speak up because they do not want to see the "jokes" starting up again for yet another school year. You learn about the teachers' perceptions of the email exchanges from their department leaders. Some teachers are upset by what they perceive as an inappropriate use of email.

Choose the solution most closely aligned with your leadership style.

**Transactional leadership solution:**

You remind staff of their **responsibility** to limit use of the school email to school business only, starting immediately. You announce the renewed expectation to staff via email. You cite School Board Policy in your message and explain the policy is **fair**. You make plans to follow up on the next professional development day with a printed copy of Board Policy and the **expectation** that all staff will honor their professional commitment for proper use of workplace email.

**Transformational leadership solution**

You address the issue within the existing **organizational culture** via email. You discuss the importance of professionalism and humor in the work place to help staff better understand the **motive** for the emails. You encourage department leaders to discuss the use of emails with their teams, to develop a **common purpose** for email, and help staff focus on how email helps bring organizational goals into focus. All staff work on **setting a new direction** at the next professional development day.
Transformative leadership solution

You acknowledge **power and privilege** exist within the staff. You acknowledge that the **social / cultural knowledge** generates inequity. You focus on **democracy** and the responsibility to uphold the rights of all staff members. You point to the conflicts created by stereotyping. You stress that if one person is made to feel uncomfortable, then everyone should be uncomfortable. Therefore, all must have the **moral courage** to challenge past practices (email use) and make a change for the good of the individual and for the organization as a whole.

Previous research shows that administrators cite interpersonal skills as an area of strength, however they also report conflict resolution processes as on-going professional development needs (Foley, 2001). It is noteworthy that the scenario in this study is based on an interpersonal conflict created by the use of workplace email and that two of the three pathways, transactional and transformational, utilize email as the means to initiate the conflict resolution. In other words, the transactional and transformational leadership choices, to send an email about the email issue, are directed from behind the computer screen. Meanwhile the transformative approach makes no mention of the means by which to initiate communication about the email issue and instead focuses on the thoughts and ideas of the transformative leadership model. The transformative leadership choice turns to the thought process related to approaching the interpersonal conflict and does not suggest a means of communicating those thoughts and ideas. In other words, it is the
solution that is most deeply rooted in theory of leadership and it was the least likely choice for conflict resolution.

Figure 12, Figure 13, and Figure 14 show the agentic (rawX) and communal (rawY) confidence for each of the three leadership styles. It is noteworthy to highlight that 46.26% chose transactional leadership, 44.22% chose transformational leadership, and 9.52% chose transformative leadership. The first two leadership styles were the most popular choices out of the 147 subjects that responded to question 33. The transactional and transformational leadership solutions were concise in their descriptions of how the issues would be addressed and both contain a conclusion. Due to the expediency of addressing issues through email, the transactional and transformational solutions both offered the means for an immediate resolution. In contrast, the transformative leadership choice offered thoughts and ideas about the future and about shifting the focus of the organization. In fact, the transformative leadership solution focuses on raising the expectations, for increased unity, and for equity in the workplace.
Figure 12: Transactional Leadership Style Solution Question #33

68 subjects (Males 37; Females 32)

*Note:* Figure 12 Transactional Leadership Style Solution Question #33 shows the overall agentic rawX and communal rawY confidence for the subjects who chose the transactional style of leadership.
Table 11: Transactional Leadership (68 subjects of the total 147 responses to Q#33)
46.26%  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>+/- A +/- C</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>(+A)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Distant &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>(+A-C)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>(-C)</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>Distant &amp; Yielding</td>
<td>(-A-C)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>(-A)</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td>Friendly &amp; Yielding</td>
<td>(-A+C)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>(+C)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Friendly &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>(+A+C)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Transactional Leadership key words: responsibility, fair, expectations, commitment

Table 11 shows the octant results for the 68 subjects, 46.26% of the respondents, who chose the transactional leadership style. Nearly half of the subjects chose the transactional leadership style of conflict resolution. The 9.5 range (DE / Distant) written in bold type reveals a low communal (-C) response. This low communal confidence response indicates there is a strong or dominant agentic (+A) response in this octant.

Additionally, the 7 range for (FG / Distant & Yielding), also written in bold, may indicate there is greater flexibility in certain situations to respond as needed with a high level of dominance balanced with nice behavior (-A-C) within the transactional leadership style. The subjects’ self-perception in these areas of the CSIE octants may indicate they have communal confidence and are nice, friendly, and yielding as long as the dominant transactional leadership parameters are in place.
Figure 13: Transformational Leadership Style Solution Question #33

Note: Figure 13 Transformational I Leadership Style Solution Question #33 shows the overall agentic rawX and communal rawY confidence for the subjects who chose the transactional style of leadership.
Table 12: Transformational Leadership (65 subjects of the total 147 responses to Q #33) 44.22%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>+/- A +/- C</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>(+A)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Distant &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>(+A-C)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>(-C)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>Distant &amp; Yielding</td>
<td>(-A-C)</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>(-A)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td>Friendly &amp; Yielding</td>
<td>(-A+C)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>(+C)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Friendly &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>(+A+C)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Key words for Transformational Leadership: organizational culture, motive, common purpose, setting direction

Table 12 shows the results for 65 subjects who chose the transformational leadership style. The transformational leadership style of conflict resolution was chosen by 65 of the 147 subjects. More than half of the ranges for transformational leadership are 4.5 or greater indicating that transformational leadership allows for more flexibility or a wider interpretation of the parameters within a given situation. A transformational leader may be more agile in their agentic and communal confidence as well as in decision-making processes and behaviors associated with conflict resolution. The greater ranges may also indicate less consistency in decision making and more dependency on the given situation and on the individuals involved in the conflict.
Figure 14: Transformative Leadership Style Solution Question #33

14 Subjects (Males 7; Females 7)

Note: Figure 14 Transformative Leadership Style Solution Question #33 shows the overall agentic rawX and communal rawY confidence for the subjects who chose the transformative style of leadership.
Table 13: Transformative Leadership (14 subjects of the total 147 responses to Q #33) 9.52%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Octant</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>+/- A +/- C</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>(+A)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Distant &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>(+A-C)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>Distant</td>
<td>(-C)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>Distant &amp; Yielding</td>
<td>(-A-C)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>(-A)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JK</td>
<td>Friendly &amp; Yielding</td>
<td>(-A+C)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>(+C)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Friendly &amp; Dominant</td>
<td>(+A+C)</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 shows the results for 14 subjects who chose the transformative leadership approach. The transformative leadership style of conflict resolution was chosen by 14 of the 147 respondents. The narrowest range associated with question #33 and within the conflict resolution choices shows in Table 5. Transformative leaders share a common value that yielding, HI with a range of 1.5, is necessary in conflict resolution. The second most narrow range also appears under transformative leadership, LM with a range of 2.5, showing the common confidence in being friendly when facilitating conflict resolution.
Summary Question #2

The summary data for question #2 shows that Nebraska administrators prefer to approach conflict resolution through transactional and transformational leadership strategies and from behind a computer screen, at least at the onset of a proposed solution. The data indicates a near equal distribution of subjects who choose transactional and transformational leadership strategies to initiate organizational change toward resolution. A minority of 14 subjects out of the 147 who responded to question 33 prefer to engage in transformative leadership when managing conflict resolution.

Question #3: How do Nebraska Administrators view themselves as transactional, transformational, and transformative leaders versus the data collected from the CSIE?

The results of the CSIE indicate that subjects have greater agentic than communal confidence. The transactional, transformational, and transformative leadership matrix (Shields, 2010) was used in this study to create a foundation for comparing agentic and communal data with the three pathways toward conflict resolution for survey question #33, the conflict scenario. Each of the three leadership styles contains key values associated with agentic and communal confidence in interpersonal situations.

The leadership matrix, (Distinctions Among Three Theories of Leadership) is used in this study to provide a framework from which to draw specific words and phrases used to guide administrators toward their leadership style in answering question 33 of the survey (Shields, 2010, p. 563).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting Point</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A desired agreement or item</td>
<td>Need for the organization to run smoothly and efficiently</td>
<td>Material realises &amp; disparities outside the organization that impinge of the success of individuals, groups, &amp; organization as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An exchange</td>
<td>Meet the needs of complex &amp; diverse systems</td>
<td>Critique &amp; promise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Deep &amp; equitable change in social conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate cooperation through mutual agreement and benefit</td>
<td>Understanding of organizational culture; setting directions, developing the organization, and managing the instructional program</td>
<td>Deconstruction and reconstruction of social/cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity, acknowledgement of power, &amp; privilege; dialectic between individual &amp; social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key values</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honesty, responsibility, fairness, and honoring commitments</td>
<td>Liberty, justice, equality</td>
<td>Liberation, emancipation, democracy, equity, justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement; mutual goal advancement</td>
<td>Organizational change; effectiveness</td>
<td>Individual; organizational; &amp; societal transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly ignored</td>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>Positional, hegemonic, tool for oppression as well as for action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensures smooth and efficient organizational operation through transactions</td>
<td>Looks for motive, develops common purpose, focuses on organizational goals</td>
<td>Lives with tension, &amp; challenge; requires moral courage, activism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related theories</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic leadership, Scientific management</td>
<td>School effectiveness, School reform, School improvement, Instructional leadership</td>
<td>Critical theories (race, gender), Cultural and social reproduction, Leadership for social justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1.** Distinctions among three theories of leadership

(Shields, 2010)
The bar graph in Figure 15 illustrates the tendency to resolve conflict using transactional or transformational leadership styles. There is an equal distribution of subjects who chose transactional and transformational strategies to initiate conflict management followed by a much smaller percentage of subjects who engage in transformative leadership in interpersonal situations and conflict resolution. The results of the CSIE are consistent with the majority of subjects choosing transactional leadership style because the majority of subjects have greater agentic confidence. Males and females both indicated greater agentic confidence than communal confidence in interpersonal situations and this matches the choice of transactional leadership. The results of the CSIE are also consistent with the next highest majority of subjects choosing the transformational leadership style. The 157 subjects’ overall communal confidence shows
the greatest statistical ranges in the transformational leadership style. The 157 subjects indicated that friendly and yielding interpersonal interactions were easily available choices within the framework of both transactional and transformational leadership styles.

**Demographic Questions 34 through 37**

Questions 34 through 37 provide demographic information used to compare responses from the 157 participants which will also be used to answer Research Question #3. The data from the CSIE will be compared to the results of the TTT interpersonal conflict solution. In addition, the ratio of male and female administrators, years in education, and years as an administrator will be considered and included in the results.
Table 14: Question 34: Are you male or female?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percent of Total Responses</th>
<th>Total Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.23%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.77%</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Table 14 shows that all 157 of the subjects in this study completed the survey.
### Table 15: Question 35: What is your age range?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Age</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Total Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 – 35</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 40</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 45</td>
<td>21.15%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 50</td>
<td>20.51%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 55</td>
<td>13.46%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 – 60</td>
<td>14.74%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 – 65</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The 156 of the 157 subjects in this study answered this question. One subject skipped this question.

Table 15 shows there is an equal divide between respondents over the age of 45 and under the age of 45. There are 75 respondents below age 45 and there are 81 respondents over the age of 45. This distribution of age range provides a strong representation of the generations of leaders currently working in the field of educational leadership in Nebraska.
Figure 16 shows subjects under the age of 45 have greater agentic than communal confidence in interpersonal situations.

Note: Figure 16 shows Communal \( \text{raw}_Y \) (mean = 0.16596156) and Agentic \( \text{raw}_X \) (mean = 2.58740892) for 75 subjects under the age of 45.
Figure 17: Communal rawY and Agentic rawX Ages 46 - 65 Years

81 subjects over age 45

Note: Figure 17 shows Communal rawY (mean = 0.137839) and Agentic rawX (mean = 2.458661667) for 81 subjects over the age of 45

Figure 17 shows subjects over the age of 45 have greater agentic than communal confidence in interpersonal situations. Communal confidence and agentic confidence decreased slightly after age 45.
Table 16: Question 36: How many years have you worked in education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>Percent of Subjects</th>
<th>Number of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 15</td>
<td>15.29%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>21.66%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 – 25</td>
<td>22.93%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>12.74%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 35</td>
<td>15.92%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 – 40</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 45</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: All 157 subjects responded to this question #36.*

Table 16 shows the range of years of experience of the subjects. Table 16 shows a strong representation of each age range within this study with the majority of subjects falling between the 11 years and 35 years of experience with the average number of years in the 21 to 25 range.
Table 17: Administrators with 0 – 25 years of experience in education. Total of 57 subjects. (Males 32; Females 43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Communal rawY mean</th>
<th>Agentic rawX mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>0.199193143</td>
<td>2.627136468</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Table 17 shows the Communal rawY mean and Agentic rawX mean for subjects with 0 - 25 years of experience.

Table 17 shows that the agentic mean is greater than the communal mean for both males and females in their first 25 years of experience in education.
Table 18: Administrators with 26 – 45 years of experience in education. Total of 57 subjects. (Males 32; Females 25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Communal rawY mean</th>
<th>Agentic rawX mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M / F</td>
<td>0.289746402</td>
<td>2.511876616</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table 18 shows the Communal rawY mean and Agentic rawX mean for subjects with 26 -45 years of experience.

Table 18 shows that male and female administrators with greater than 25 years of experience double their communal confidence while maintaining their agentic confidence.
Table 19: Question 37: How many years have you been in your current position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years Subjects</th>
<th>Percent of Responses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 Year</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 year but less than 3 years</td>
<td>12.74%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 3 years but less than 5 years</td>
<td>19.11%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 5 years but less than 10 years</td>
<td>31.85%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years or more</td>
<td>32.48%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All 157 subjects responded to this question

Table 19 shows the distribution of years of experience in administration and shows that nearly one third of the subjects have less than 5 years of experience.
Table 20: Years in Administration and Communal and Agentic Confidence Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Communal rawY mean</th>
<th>Agentic rawX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>-0.06636075</td>
<td>2.24117175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td>0.023923286</td>
<td>2.218034571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 to 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.2024529</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5678212</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 to 10</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.33247926</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.5443612</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>0.020852206</td>
<td>2.356770088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Table 20 shows Years in Administration and Communal rawY and Agentic rawX Confidence Means.

Table 20 shows the mean or average in the communal (rawY) and agentic (rawX) confidence range for level of experience in administration. It appears that there is a spike in agentic (rawX) confidence during the 3 to 10-year time frame. There appears to be a decline in communal confidence (rawY) during the 3 to 5 year period and an increase in communal (rawY) confidence after 5 years.
Table 21: Where communal confidence is greater than agentic confidence: The Outliers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Style</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years in Education</th>
<th>Years in Admin</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>16 – 20</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>21 – 25</td>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>36 – 40</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td>male</td>
<td><strong>16 – 20</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 – 10</strong></td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>26 – 30</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>31 – 35</td>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>36 – 40</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>transactional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Eleven Subjects with greater communal (rawY) confidence than agentic (rawX) confidence

Table 21 shows results for 11 subjects surveyed for this study that indicated that their communal confidence is greater than their agentic confidence. Eleven (11) out of the 157 subjects in this study indicated a greater communal (rawY) confidence than an agentic (rawX) confidence. The confidence, or interpersonal self-efficacy, is reflected in the ability to perform a specific type of interpersonal behavior in a given situation. The 11 subjects, the outliers, are also among the 147 subjects that answered Question #33 about the choice of leadership. Subject 102, a male, is highlighted in bold font as the single individual who has both greater communal confidence and who also chose transformative leadership style.
Summary Question #3

How do Nebraska Administrators view themselves as transactional, transformational, and transformative leaders versus the data collected from the CSIE?

The overall agentic confidence (rawX) is greater than the overall communal confidence for the 157 administrators who participated in this study. The first subgroup of 68 subjects (Males 37; Females 32) (46.26%) who chose the transactional leadership approach for resolving interpersonal conflict align with the overall higher agentic confidence. The second subgroup of 65 subjects (Males 32; Females 34) (44.22%) who chose transformational leadership also align with the overall higher agentic confidence. The third subgroup of 14 subjects (Males 7; Females 7) (9.52%) of the 147 responses showed a narrow statistical range indicating those who use a transformative leadership style are less flexible or more refined in their approach to leading and to conflict resolution.

Conclusion

The process for creating the survey for this study began with the discovery of the terms agentic and communal in the context of educational leadership. The work of Dr. Kenneth Locke and the Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy (CSIE) which aligned with this researcher’s study of agentic and communal traits and confidence was adopted to determine the rawX and rawY confidence of Nebraska administrators. Dr. Locke developed three inventories based on the interpersonal circumplex (ICP) but encouraged the use of the CSIE for this study. Further, and based on recommendation of Locke, the data is reported in binary form using descriptive statistics for the purpose of showing the results for this dissertation research study.
CHAPTER 5: Summary of Findings

Summary of Subjects and School Districts

Nebraska administrators (157 total; Females 75, Males 82; age range 31-65) working in educational leadership positions in the state of Nebraska responded to an online survey via SurveyMonkey.

Discussion of Research Questions, Results, Summaries

Question #1:

How do Nebraska Administrators self-report agentic and communal traits as evidenced from by the CSIE Instrument?

Information regarding this question was gathered by utilizing the CSIE instrument (Locke, 2000). The CSIE revealed the agentic and communal self-perceptions of subjects who currently occupy educational leadership positions in the state of Nebraska. CSIE results show each individual possesses a balance of agentic and communal traits which is consistent with similar results shown in previous studies. The CSIE integrates 8 segments pertaining to the unique aspects of agentic and communal confidences and provides insights into the subjects’ agentic and communal self-perceptions.

One of the most significant data results is that Nebraska administrators, both male and female, have greater agentic than communal confidence in their interpersonal interactions. Each person maintains a balance of agentic and communal traits and, as previous research shows, the balance of agentic and communal confidence shifts and evolves throughout the course of one’s life and career depending on current circumstances. The greater agentic confidence revealed in this study of Nebraska
administrators indicates that independence, masterfulness, assertiveness, dominance, power, and status are highly valued in educational leaders in Nebraska.

The results also show that male and female educational leaders share a greater agentic than communal confidence in their respective leadership roles. This important finding provides a substantial foundation for discussion about why there are significantly more male than female educational administrators in Nebraska when they share similar levels of agentic and communal confidence. Historically, and stemming directly from the Industrial Age, agentic traits have been highly valued and primarily associated with hierarchical leadership and specifically with male leaders. This stereotype has provided validation, and simultaneously justified, the long history of the majority of administrative and educational leadership positions held by males. A trend which continues today in Nebraska.

The results of this study show that females not only maintain the same high level of agentic confidence, but in some cases, they exceed their male counterparts’ agentic confidence levels. Female educational leaders are equally engaged in transactional and transformational forms of leadership as are their male colleagues.

Summary Question #1

The most important finding for Question #1 is that the subjects, 157 Nebraska educational leaders, have greater agentic confidence than communal confidence in how they engage interpersonally within their leadership roles and within the school environment, regardless of gender. The data set reported in Figure 1 shows that while a
range of agentic and communal confidence is present, agentic confidence is dominant for both males and females.

Figure 2 shows data for 82 male subjects and Figure 3 shows data for 75 female subjects. The male and female subgroups each show greater agentic confidence than communal confidence within their gender subgroups. In addition, Table 2 shows females agentic rawX mean is greater than males agentic rawX mean. This indicates that females participating in this study have greater agentic confidence than males.

The results shown in Table 2 are consistent with previous studies which show females become more like their male colleagues, that is, more agentic, when they work in educational leadership positions. Further, females may exceed their male colleagues in agentic confidence over time and as they gain experience. Another explanation for greater female agentic confidence is females may increase agentic confidence to compensate for the rejection which occurs when females behave in a manner that is incongruent with traditional gender roles. Additionally, female leaders must continually prove their capabilities in order to overcome negative stereotypes about female leaders.

The results in Table 2 also show that male communal rawY mean is slightly greater than female communal rawY mean. Previous research has shown that males may have more freedom and latitude to act on their communal confidence and the data here leads to a similar conclusion. Ability to act on communal confidence may be easier for male leaders because it is assumed that they possess agentic confidence based solely on their gender. In other words, males do not have to prove agentic confidence, it is presumed based on gender roles and stereotypes that they already possess this agentic confidence. Whereas females must exert greater effort and display agentic traits more
aggressively to be perceived as having agentic confidence based on female gender role expectations.

Figure 4 through Figure 11 show the binary data, agentic rawX and communal rawY, for each of the 8 areas within the CSIE. Below each graph are tables explaining the 157 responses along with the specific questions from the CSIE instrument used to calculate that data set. Figures 4 through 11 further illustrate the similarities and differences between male and female self-perceptions and the consistent dominance of agentic confidence over communal confidence for both genders.

The 75 females and 82 males differ with regard to agentic and communal confidence primarily because the females had greater agentic confidence. This finding reinforces previous research findings which indicate females must demonstrate greater agentic confidence than males in order to obtain and maintain leadership positions. The dominance of agentic confidence allows females the ability withstand the social and emotional rejection they may experience due to the double-bind when they deviate from traditional gender roles.

**Question #2:**

Which approach do Nebraska leaders utilize when solving an interpersonal conflict among staff members (transactional, transformational, and transformative)?

The goal of this question was to determine the subjects’ approach to conflict resolution. Subjects in this study chose the conflict solution that best fit their leadership style. A total of 147 of the 157 subjects who completed the survey responded to this question.
The interpersonal conflict problem was designed as a common issue in schools, casual email communication among staff that is not work related. The scenario was designed to be nontthreatening and to create a situation where some, but not all, members of the school community were conflicted. The question design was important because the conflict contained enough ambiguity to allow the subjects to interject their own experience, their own stereotypes, and their leadership habits of adherence to policies and procedures.

The conflict scenario pointed to three choices for a conflict resolution. The resolutions were grounded in the transactional, transformational, transformative (TTT) leadership matrix, which includes key categories under each of the three leadership styles. The resolutions were specifically designed to pinpoint three distinct styles of conflict resolution. Each of the three pathways toward resolution contained at least four key words from each of the three leadership matrix categories: *emphasis, processes, and key values.*

**The Key Words by Leadership Style**

**Transactional Leadership:** responsibility, fair, expectations, commitment

**Transformational Leadership:** organizational culture, motive, common purpose, setting direction

**Transformative Leadership:** power and privilege, social/cultural knowledge, democracy, moral courage
Summary Question #2

Data for Question #2 indicates a nearly equal distribution of subjects who chose transactional and transformational strategies to initiate organizational change. Figures 12, 13, and 14 show that Nebraska administrators prefer to approach conflict resolution through transactional (46.26%) and transformational (44.22%) leadership strategies, with a combined majority of 90.48% percent of the 147 who responded to this question. A small minority of the 147 subjects, 9.52% percent, preferred to engage in transformative leadership when managing conflict resolution.

It is not surprising that a greater percentage of subjects chose the transactional leadership resolution, which is based on agentic confidence (46.26%). It was somewhat surprising that almost the same percentage of subjects chose transformational leadership resolution, which is based on communal confidence (44.22%). Transactional and transformational leadership styles are almost equally preferred among the subjects in this study.

The rare educational leader chose the transformative resolution which includes an initial approach that would be indicate agentic confidence followed by communication that indicates communal confidence. The rejection of this complex two-step democratic approach to resolution may be an indication of less desire to engage in-depth in conflict resolution, or it may indicate a perception that not enough time exists for complex problem-solving strategies in the school environment. It is also important to note that two of the three pathways, transactional and transformational, utilized email communication as the means to initiate the conflict resolution, while the transformative approach does not
mention a specific communication modality. Transformative leadership resolution implies that the process is lengthy, demanding, and complex.

The traditional transactional leadership style is swift and efficient in its execution. Transactional and transformational leadership allows leaders to lead from behind a computer screen. Transformative leadership choice stands apart from the other two options because it is based on social justice processes and a democratic resolution goal which require ongoing face-to-face communication. In addition, transformative leadership shines a light on the ways power and privilege promote traditional hierarchy and demands greater social and cultural knowledge of the members in the school community. It is not surprising that the majority of the subjects chose the more expedient means toward conflict resolution and that the vast majority of subjects rejected the transformative process. Such processes require more time, discussion, and may produce unpleasant revelations about school climate. The transformative approach may also expose deeper issues, systemic defects or failings, and might require further actions to achieve meaningful and lasting systemic improvements.

Question #3:

How do Nebraska Administrators view themselves as transactional, transformational, and transformative leaders versus the data collected from the CSIE?

Responses to this question determined that the 157 subjects of this study perceive themselves as having greater agentic than communal confidence, as shown in Figure 1, Figure 2, and Figure 3. In concert with this finding, transactional leadership (46.26%) was the dominant choice among the 147 subjects who responded to Survey Question #33,
the conflict management scenario. Transformational leadership (44.22%) was a close second and, at a distant third, was the transformative leadership (9.52%) choice. These combined results, the CSIE, and the responses to Question #33, demonstrate Nebraska educational leaders perceive themselves as having greater agentic than communal confidence, however, they value and are inclined to utilize communal conflict resolutions in the school environment. In other words, this study shows the dominant agentic confidence levels of the subjects does not prevent them from choosing a communal leadership style when resolving conflict.

**Summary Question #3**

Figure 12 illustrates agentic and communal confidence levels of the transactional leaders (46.26%). In connection with Figure 12, Table 3 shows the range of responses occurring in two of the eight octants of the CSIE DE Distant (-C) (range 9.5); FG Distant & Yielding (-A-C) (range 7). The ranges for the transactional leaders might indicate that they are prone to highly agentic behaviors in certain situations. The descriptors for these two significant ranges are:

**DE**
- I can be tough
- I can be cold and unfriendly when I want to
- I can get them to leave me alone
- I can be cruel when the situation calls for it

**FG**
- I can hide my thoughts and feelings
- I can be submissive
- I can disappear into the background when I want
- I can be quiet
Figure 13 illustrates agentic and communal confidence levels of transformational leaders (44.22%). In connection with Figure 13, Table 4 shows the wide range of responses occurring in four of the eight octants of the CSIE: PA Dominant (+A) (range 7); BC Distant & Dominant (+A-C) (range 9); DE Distant (-C) (range 8.5); FG Distant & Yielding (-A-C) (range 8.25). These four ranges for transformational leaders might indicate that they are prone to communal actions as long as they maintain a highly agentic confidence level as the foundation for their actions. Descriptors for these four significant ranges are:

**PA**
- I can be assertive
- I can speak up when I have something to say
- I can take charge
- I can be forceful

**BC**
- I can keep the upper hand
- I can win any arguments or competitions
- I can be aggressive if I need to
- I can tell them when I am annoyed

**DE**
- I can be tough
- I can be cold and unfriendly when I want to
- I can get them to leave me alone
- I can be cruel when the situation calls for it

**FG**
- I can hide my thoughts and feelings
- I can be submissive
- I can disappear into the background when I want
- I can be quiet

Figure 14 illustrates agentic and communal confidence levels of transformative leaders (9.52%). In connection with Figure 14, Table 5 shows significant results in two of the octants of the CSIE: DE Distant (-C) (range 8.5); HI Yielding (-A) (range 1.5).
I can be tough
I can be cold and unfriendly when I want to
I can get them to leave me alone
I can be cruel when the situation calls for it

I can avoid getting into arguments
I can be a follower
I can avoid making them angry
I can let others take charge

The results of Figure 14 show the transformative conflict management choice employs a both agentic and communal confidence. Among the 14 subjects who chose transformative leadership to facilitate conflict resolution, there was only one subject who had greater communal than agentic confidence, a male with 5 to 10 years of administrative experience.

In addition to the unique group of 14 subjects who chose the transformative leadership solution, Table 21: Where communal confidence is greater than agentic confidence: The Outliers, shows that 11 subjects out of 157 have greater communal (rawY) confidence than agentic (rawX) confidence on the CSIE. There was one individual who showed up on both of these short lists, and this unique combination certainly indicates at least one individual who has found a place outside of the norms for educational leadership in Nebraska.
Summary of Purpose

The purpose of this research is to investigate agentic and communal confidence norms for educational leaders in the state of Nebraska. This study built upon past research and examined agentic and communal traits and confidences in educational leaders to determine whether males and females differ significantly in their leadership traits and confidences. The agentic and communal traits and confidences are measured based on the CSIE and that information is used to compare the choice of leadership style in a conflict management and resolution scenario for this study.

The most important findings are evident in two main areas. First, the results of the CSIE octants for agentic and communal traits and confidences. The female subjects show a higher level of agentic traits and confidences than males. Agentic traits are typically associated with masculine attributes and with the role of leadership. Since males hold the majority of educational leadership positions in Nebraska, it is evident that agentic traits are not essential for obtaining a leadership position. Therefore, female subjects surveyed for this study show they are equally, and more closely, aligned with the agentic expectations for leadership roles than the male subjects surveyed for this study.

The second important finding is the response to the conflict management scenario on question 33 of the survey. The two most common forms of conflict management were shared by both males and females. There was no indication that males or females preferred one approach (transactional or transformational) over the other. This finding is important because male and female subjects resolve conflicts in a similar manner, including the use of email to address interpersonal issues. Email management is an outgrowth of the Information Age and it is evident in this study that both males and
females utilize this tool in problem solving and management of staff. This may indicate commonalities in an area, specifically conflict management, that has traditionally been used to rationalize the hiring of males over females for educational leadership, particularly at the secondary level.

The Information Age does not appear to have influenced the need for both males and females to exhibit agentic preferences when in high-profile or leadership positions even though both genders understand the need for better and perhaps more communal communication. In the conflict management scenario, question 33 of the survey, the immediate feedback (digital communication) from the educational leader to the staff members via email may have unintentionally entrenched leaders in a kind of agentic behavior. Today, there is much more communication and it occurs at a much faster pace. There is also a greater need to explain how leadership conclusions are being reached, and email is a form of immediate documentation and record keeping. Educational leadership decision-making may often occur from behind a computer screen and this is largely due to the demands of the leadership positions and the enormous number of decisions that must be made in a timely fashion. In other words, the prevalence of agentic style leadership may be an unintentional result of digital communication in the Information Age.

The two most important findings of this research study call into question the structure of the educational system in Nebraska. They are that females have a higher agentic confidence level and that they lead in the same fashion as males in similar positions. In the fall of 2017, in Nebraska, of the 240 top leadership positions in education, superintendent positions, the Nebraska Council of School Administrators
(NCSA) reports that only 33 positions, less than 13%, are held by females. Nebraska’s educational system is deficient in terms of growth opportunities for females. The career trajectory in educational leadership is stagnant for females and, in a time when young females outnumber their male counterparts at colleges and universities, the prospect of a career in education is not alluring. Females and males are seeking a greater return on the investment in their education. The options for career paths in which females may advance has been profoundly influenced by the Information Age and, in a time when technology advancements afford more career options for females and males, the field of education must offer females more in terms of opportunities for advancement. This research shows that the traditional agentic traits and confidences exist in both males and females and it is evident that the balance of agentic and communal traits is not gender specific.

Traditional norms for jobs in education were founded on conventional gender roles and were guided by a general set of beliefs about masculine (agentic) and feminine (communal) attributes in the 1800’s. Since the 1800’s, when individuals such as Horace Mann and Catharine Beecher innovated to create the Common School and the Normal School Movements, feminization of the classroom teacher role and masculinization of the administrative role are norms from days gone by. In 1841, Beecher wrote about the importance of the female classroom teacher’s role in her most well-known work, *A Treatise on Domestic Economy*. In this work she advocates for women to assume responsibility for domestic services and also to find maternal fulfillment as teacher. Beecher advocated for females to pursue education but only to fulfill the duty shaping young minds in the eyes of God and in order to promote a democratic society. This research makes it evident that the agentic and communal traits for professional educators
are not gender specific and that we should consider the damaging effects on the future of the education profession if such norms are not abandoned and if gender equality in educational leadership is not achieved. The norms of the 1800’s are doomed to fail the 21st century educational system in the Information Age.

Today, females and males serving in their respective educational leadership roles continue to shape the educational environment in the Information Age, and yet, the educational system upholds gender roles for leadership that were established in the 1800’s. In terms of career advancement, males and females possess a similar balance of agentic and communal traits and confidences. The assumption that males, who have traditionally chosen for administrative roles, are better suited for leadership than females must be confronted and changed. The idea that females are better suited for subordinate roles is rooted in archaic beliefs and it is evident in that females possess highly agentic confidence levels. It is imperative, for the health and the future of the education profession, that this traditional model be openly challenged, and further study is clearly needed.

At a time when gender equity is at the forefront of the American national consciousness, educational leadership must make a clean departure from the philosophy that drove the development of schools in the mid-1800’s. There is a teacher shortage today in the United States, and in Nebraska. Young females may not see a career path in education as promising, thus, the educational system may not rely on the traditional gender role expectations to provide candidates for the jobs in education. Teacher education programs may no longer rely on the best and brightest young minds to choose a life-long career in the classroom. A woman’s career in education is all too predictable.
Women perceive a career in education as leading nowhere, regardless of their level of education or experience. In other words, the career trajectory for a female educator in Nebraska traditionally starts and stops in the classroom. There is little hope, in spite of earning advanced degrees, that female educators will have equal opportunities to lead at the highest levels of the educational system. The hope for career advancement impacts career choices and this research shows evidence that the artificial limitations and assumptions about females’ ability to lead are worth examining. Traditional limitations and expectations may not produce a healthy future for Nebraska’s educational system.

Males who choose a path in education have greater options for growth and prosperity which come naturally in the evolution of their career trajectory. If a male enters the classroom, he may be offered additional assignments such as coaching. If he obtains advanced degrees, the options for educational leadership will likely follow. The male educator relies on gender stereotypes to the calculate potential for growth, promotions based on advanced degrees, and for the prospective career trajectory. Females do not have similar hope. Their career trajectory is predictable, and predictably limited, because stereotypes do not work in their favor.

The results of this study demand a close examination of agentic and communal confidence and of past stereotypes about who is best suited for leadership. An imbalance of agentic and communal confidence may limit the ability of a leader, team, group, or organization to perform as well as possible. Perhaps more importantly, if gender parity in educational leadership is not corrected, it may adversely impact the future of education by limiting students’ hopes and aspirations about their own leadership potential or their choice to pursue a career in education. The research methodology analyzed agentic and
communal confidences of male and female Nebraska administrators, while focusing on how that confidence influences leadership decisions in the context of conflict management. The Information Age is not conducive to a “think manager, think male” model (Sczesny, 2003) and that mindset may impede progress and even create unnecessary barriers in the advancement of educational leadership development in the state of Nebraska.

**Conclusion**

Nebraska educational administrators self-report greater agentic than communal confidence. The subjects utilize similar strategies for resolving interpersonal conflicts and for addressing conflict management issues. They primarily utilize transactional and transformational leadership styles, while less than 10% utilize the transformative leadership style. Regardless of gender, age, or experience levels, the vast majority of Nebraska administrators view themselves as having highly agentic confidence levels. They are predominantly transactional and transformational leaders. The rarest of Nebraska administrators perceive themselves as transformative leaders and have strong agentic confidence even in the transformative leadership category.

A key finding is that males and females in educational leadership lead in similar fashion. Previous research also shows that females increase in agentic confidence and behave more like their male colleagues over time. Thus, males and females together lead school environments similarly and with traditional transactional and transformational leadership approaches, specifically in relation to conflict management.
If the goal is to transform educational environments and educational leadership in the 21st century toward the goals of the Information Age, then moving educational leadership in the direction of transformative style will be essential for such changes to occur. Females and males possess the same capacity for leadership and it is time to make a concerted effort toward gender parity and gender equity in educational leadership. Gender equity in leadership positions is key in the quest for meaningful changes in the Information Age educational environment.

Five decades of social science research demonstrates substantial evidence that stereotyping of females, particularly in the evaluation of those who seek high status in the workplace, exists and negatively affects their chances for selection and promotion. Because educators, teachers and administrators, are some of the first and most important influences in the lives of youth, it is incumbent upon those who seek to create healthy educational environments for all students to recognize that the traditional imbalances of males and females in the teaching and administrative ranks sends a clear message about the potential for leadership to both male and female youth.

Stereotypic thinking about whether males or females are best suited for educational leadership positions translates into discriminatory actions which have discriminatory consequences and perpetuate stereotyping for future generations. Stereotyping would be substantially reduced, and meaningful systemic changes in the future will be more likely, if young people observe males and females equally represented in educational leadership and thus perceive their own potential and future choices in a broader context.

2018 has already witnessed the evolution of two social justice movements toward the goal of equality for males and females. The #MeToo and #TimesUp social justice
movements have shed new light on the inequities in the workplace and beyond. In order to be a part of the Information Age, which is grounded in open communication, social justice, transparency, and movement toward equal opportunity, the “think manager, think male” model of the Industrial Age must finally, once and for all, be left behind. Females are equally capable of acting on their agentic confidence to lead educational reform in the Information Age. To acknowledge the need for equality is a vital and important message for all people, young and old, especially in our educational institutions. Educational environments are where democracy comes to life.

Agentic confidence drives the manner in which educational leaders guide others and determines how they manage interpersonal conflicts in the educational setting. Agentic leadership is hierarchical, traditional, and efficient in its execution, and this research shows that males and females possess dominant agentic confidence whether they lead in a transactional, transformational, or transformative style.

The lack of gender parity in administrative positions in Nebraska is not based on the ability to enact a traditional agentic leadership style but is instead based on prejudicial attitudes toward females and stereotypes about females’ ability to lead with agentic confidence. The lack of gender parity is the result of holding on to the think manager, think male stereotype. It is time to let go and to move forward toward greater opportunity for both males and females in the field of educational leadership even if that means embracing shifts in agentic and communal confidence and control.
Future Research

This study indicates that a departure from the two traditional standards of leadership, transactional and transformational, may be fertile ground for further study. In order to determine the balance of agentic and communal traits among educational leaders in the Information Age, additional research is necessary regarding agentic and communal leadership traits, and how those influence leadership in education. Meaningful change within the field of educational leadership will be limited as long as stereotypical hiring practices, and the “think manager, think male” model remain in play.

Systemic change begins at the top of a hierarchical system. There is a chain of command which must be utilized to promote equal opportunities for females and males to become educational leaders at the highest level of administration. In this study, the CSIE and the results of the conflict management question demonstrate that females are equally capable of maintaining the agentic confidence that is highly valued among educational leaders in Nebraska. The irony of the current inequities that exist in gender parity at the highest levels is that, without acknowledging the equity issue, the old cycle of males being associated with agentic qualities and transactional leadership will continue to prevent gender equality from being fully realized in educational leadership. This study shows that dominant agentic traits align with the dominant transactional leadership style among all Nebraska administrators, both males and females. Indeed, females have greater agentic confidence once given the opportunity to lead.
### A New Leadership Matrix 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting point</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership: The most common style for both males and females in Nebraska. Emphasis on agentic confidence</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership: The second most common style for males and females in Nebraska. Emphasis on communal confidence</th>
<th>Transformative Leadership: The least common style of leadership for both males and females. Emphasis on both agentic and communal confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td>A desired agreement</td>
<td>Need for the organization to run smoothly and efficiently</td>
<td>Material realities &amp; disparities outside the organization that impinge on the success of individuals, groups, and the organization as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>An exchange</td>
<td>Meet the needs of complex &amp; diverse systems</td>
<td>Critique &amp; promise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Immediate cooperation through mutual agreement and benefit</td>
<td>Understanding of organizational culture; setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing the instructional program</td>
<td>Deconstruction and reconstruction of social/cultural knowledge frameworks that generate inequity, acknowledgement of power, &amp; privilege; dialectic between individual &amp; social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Values</td>
<td>Honesty, responsibility, fairness, and honoring commitments</td>
<td>Liberty, justice, equality</td>
<td>Liberation, emancipation, democracy, equity, justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Agreement; mutual goal advancement</td>
<td>Organizational change; effectiveness</td>
<td>Individual, organizational, &amp; societal transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Mostly ignored because it is not to be challenged</td>
<td>Inspirational</td>
<td>Positional, hegemonic, tool for oppression as well as for action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Ensures smooth and efficient organizational operation through transactions</td>
<td>Looks for motive, develops common purpose, focuses on organizational goals</td>
<td>Lives with tension, &amp; challenge; requires moral courage, activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Theories</td>
<td>Bureaucratic leadership, scientific management</td>
<td>School effectiveness, school reform, school improvement, instructional leadership</td>
<td>Critical theories (race, gender), cultural and social reproduction, leadership for social justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Figure 18 (Shields, 2010; modifications to headings, Himes, 2018)

The revised matrix, Figure 15, is a new interpretation of the leadership matrix introduced in the literature review for this study (Shields, 2010). The descriptions of each leadership style provide valuable insights and are applicable to examining current
practices. This matrix is a new model for educational leadership in the Information Age because it shows leadership styles as they exist and as they may evolve. The continuum of the three leadership styles is aligned with the emerging values of the Information Age. The matrix prioritizes transformative leadership as it relates closely to critical theories of gender with a focus leadership for social justice. This version of the leadership matrix provides a foundation for further study and is modified to include new headings for agentic and communal confidence.

The most important aspect of the new matrix for 2018 is the concept of transformative leadership and the related theories. In American society today, there is an awakening. Individuals are focused on issues of gender and race. There are renewed demands for equality, reminiscent of events in decades past like the 1970’s women’s liberation movement. These demands are focused on existing organizational structures that constitute American society at every level. Activism about issues of power and privilege are bringing about historic events such as the Women’s March 2017 and social justice movements are gaining strength in areas such as immigration. Educational organizations have a ripe opportunity to be a part of, and perhaps to lead, the inevitable forthcoming changes in American society. In order to provide leadership, Nebraska must first examine its own inequities. The original intent of public school movement was to conquer the new frontier with knowledge, morals, religious values, and to spread the message of democracy. The transformative leadership approach is a modern interpretation of the original intent of public education as the means toward a more free, fair, and just American society.
Future research relies on opportunities to observe changes in, and the modernization of, ethics for educational leadership in the Information Age. Mainstream assumptions about gender roles may thwart progress in education and curtail gender equity in the greater society. The transactional leadership style of conflict management practiced by the majority of subjects in this study who are currently leading educational environments is rooted in the Industrial Age. The future of educational leadership in the Information Age will rely on changing the norms for educational leaders and in presenting opportunities for advancement rooted in social justice theory.

There is are new ways to lead in 21st century where males and females work collaboratively to achieve progress. The old clubs may not break open willingly so, in order to facilitate change and to avoid lost opportunities, males and females must work to bring a more complete set of diverse ideas to the table. The unflinching examination of the educational leadership model in Nebraska may help to improve gender equity. This examination may also lead to significant changes for career opportunities for males and females in the Information age. By opening more opportunities for leadership, such changes may address the teacher shortage because more females and males will choose a career path that offers greater potential for professional development and prosperity. The feminization of the teaching profession, which began in the 1800’s, is no longer a sustainable model. An inherently gender biased model will not survive in the Information Age because of the level of transparency available through technology. Females and males are demanding to be treated more fairly and equally. All people expect equitable career choices and a wider range of possibilities for their career trajectory in the Information Age.
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Appendix A: Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy and the Leadership Matrix

The data analysis technique for this study will be conducted with a purpose to determine whether the subjects, Nebraska administrators, perceive themselves as more agentic or communal and whether they lead in a transactional, transformational, or transformative style. The data analysis includes the Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy (CSIE) (a thirty-two-question form), followed by one narrative conflict resolution question with a prompt to choose one of the three options for leadership style, and four demographic questions about gender, age, and years of experience in education and leadership.

The CSIE inventory, the first section of the survey, is designed to efficiently assess each subject’s agentic and communal confidence to engage in a variety of interpersonal behaviors. The purpose of using the CSIE for this study is to gather data from Nebraska administrators about how they engage interpersonally within their leadership roles and within the school community. The scale of the CSIE has a circumplex structure, adequate internal reliability, and convergent validity with measures of interpersonal values and interpersonal problems. The data for this study will be reported in a binary measure of agentic (rawX) and communal (rawY) interpersonal traits. This will allow for a comparison of Nebraska administrators and their self-perceptions of their agentic and communal confidence (Locke & Sadler, 2007).
At the level of descriptors, agency and communion can be treated as orthogonal because they reflect separate features of behavior or clearly distinguishable behavioral interpretations. As discussed in Sections 1 and 2, inferences of communal traits are based on harmful-beneficiary goals of the target person, whereas inferences of agency traits are based on the effectiveness and efficiency of goal attainment. Locke states that “multiple scales can be summarized as a single point in the circumplex space” (Locke 2000, pp235 – 237).
Appendix B: District Superintendent and Research Committee Communication

Each district’s protocol was followed precisely in order to obtain permission to contact administrators and, following written approval from each district, the electronic survey was made available to the respective administrators based on the requirements of that district. Since each school district has a unique protocol for conducting evaluation, the first order of conducting research was to establish trust with district leadership and the evaluators or evaluation team in order to obtain the proper permissions. In some cases, numerous emails were exchanged with instructions and corrections in order to facilitate the process of obtaining approval. This initial step is critical to the success of the method by which the data was obtained. Without the kind and generous help of those in charge of research and evaluation within each of the ten school districts, this research and the findings would not have been possible. Responses from 157 administrators and from all ten school districts were received by December 21, 2017.

First, an electronic invitation to participate in the study, which included the link to the on-line survey (https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CSIEAmyHimes), was sent to Nebraska administrators and they read the following introduction:

Dear Nebraska Administrator:
My name is Amy Himes and I am a Doctoral Candidate at University of Nebraska - Omaha in Educational Leadership. I have obtained permission from your district leadership to request your participation in this survey. Your participation is completely voluntary. You may decide to withdraw from participation at any time and deciding not to participate will not harm your relationship with the researcher. You may skip items if you are not comfortable answering. There is no way to identify you, your district affiliation, or how you have responded to any of the 37 questions. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes. Please respond as candidly as possible. When you click "submit" you are giving permission for the responses to be used in aggregate form only. Your anonymous responses will be used to learn about current educational leadership styles in Nebraska.
Upon receiving the survey link, individuals followed the link and read the introduction to the on-line survey as follows:

My name is Amy Himes and I am a Doctoral Candidate at University of Nebraska - Omaha in Educational Leadership. I am extending a request that you kindly take the following survey on leadership styles.

Your anonymous responses will be used to learn about current educational leadership styles in Nebraska. The data will be reported in aggregate form only, no identifiers will be associated with you or with your responses. There is no way to identify you, your district affiliation, or how you have responded to any of the 37 questions. Your participation is completely voluntary. You can decide to withdraw from participation at any time and deciding not to participate will not harm your relationship with the researcher. You can skip items if you are not comfortable answering.

Instructions:

The 37-question survey will take approximately 10 minutes. Please respond as candidly as possible. When you click "submit" you are giving permission for the responses to be used in aggregate form only.

A. The CSIE is comprised of 32 questions:

For each of the following behaviors, rate how sure you are that you can act that way with other people.
Use the following rating scale:

0 - 1 ... I am not at all confident that...

2 - 3 ... I am mildly confident that...

4 - 5 - 6 ... I am moderately confident that...

7 - 8 ... I am very confident that...

9 - 10 ... I am absolutely confident that...

CSIE Sample Item:

When I am with others, 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ...I can express myself clearly

If you are absolutely confident that you can express yourself clearly, you would slide the bar to 10. If you feel not at all confident, you would slide the bar to 0. If you feel moderately confident that you can express yourself clearly, you would slide the bar to 5, and so on.

B. Interpersonal Problem/Solution:

You will choose one of the three leadership pathways to a solution based on which solution is most closely related to your own conflict-resolution style.

C. Four demographic questions:

gender; age range; years of experience in education; and years in administration.

The survey link remained open from October 1, 2017 through December 21, 2017. On December 21, 2017, a total of 157 subjects had completed the survey and the survey was closed.
Appendix C: Email communication with Dr. Kenneth Locke

Method

The process for creating the survey for this study began with the discovery of the work of Dr. Kenneth Locke and the Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy (CSIE) which aligned with the researcher’s study of agentic and communal traits and confidence. The CSIE is a 32-item inventory designed to complement existing interpersonal circumplex measures by efficiently assessing confidence that one can engage in a variety of interpersonal behaviors. Dr. Locke is a Licensed Psychologist and a Professor of Psychology at the University of Idaho. He studied cognitive, personality, social, and clinical psychology. He has also developed three inventories based on the interpersonal circumplex. Dr. Locke is a charter member and Past-President of the Society for Interpersonal Theory and Research and is a member and supporter of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. Dr. Locke gave permission to use the CSIE and also explained the differences in utilizing the CSIV and the CSIE in an email communication. The following is an excerpt from an email communication in April of 2017.

I have used a 32-item “short form” [CSIE] in a couple of papers. It worked fine (i.e., met standard psychometric / circumplex criteria), but the reason I have never formally presented it as the short form is that when I selected these 32 items (over 10 years ago) I did not use the most modern item-response selection criteria that I would use now, and I keep thinking (incorrectly) that someday I will have time to conduct some very careful analyses to increase my confidence that those 32 items do collectively constitute the very best short form. Nonetheless, as I said, they worked fine and have been found acceptable for use in published research, so you can feel comfortable using the short form if minimizing questionnaire length is an important consideration for you. (K. Locke, personal communication, April 7, 2017).
Appendix D: CSIE illustrations examples

The development of the CSIV (Circumplex scales of interpersonal values) grew from Locke’s concept that *interpersonal values* serve as preferences for certain interpersonal outcomes or modes of conduct. Specifically, the word *values* is generally defined as preferences for certain outcomes or modes of conduct. Accordingly, in developing the CSIV, Locke conceptualized *interpersonal values* as preferences for certain interpersonal outcomes or modes of conduct. The CSIE (Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy) is a short version of the original CSIV (Locke, 2000) will be used for this study.

The CSIE (Circumplex Scales of Interpersonal Efficacy) was designed in 2007 (Locke & Sadler), with a focus on efficacy in interpersonal relationships. The CSIE will be used for this research. Retrieved from:

[http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/klocke/csie.htm](http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu/klocke/csie.htm)
Figure 1. The interpersonal circumplex.