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Abstract

PERSPECTIVES OF WHITE/NON-HISPANIC MALE SUPERINTENDENTS OF MAJORITY-HISPANIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN TEXAS

This study examines the dynamics and challenges which White/non-Hispanic male superintendents face in leading school districts where the majority of constituents come from a different ethnic or racial background than their own; specifically school districts where the constituency is majority Hispanic. It also identifies the career paths and educational experiences of value of White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority Hispanic student populations as well as ascertains the general leadership theories and/or styles these men subscribe. This study advances the understanding of school leadership in majority Hispanic school districts that are led by White/non-Hispanic males, how they ascended to their current positions, as well as what perceived considerations were made by the school board members that selected them.

Recent data obtained from the Texas Education Agency (TEA)) shows that 84% of the public school superintendents in Texas are White/non-Hispanics. At a time when the superintendency is dominated by male, White/non-Hispanics, the demographics of many school districts is changing to reflect the growing number of minority students. These demographic trends indicate that an increasing number of superintendents will be leading school districts with majority Hispanic school populations. This trend is especially noticeable in the state of Texas where the Hispanic student population in many school districts is increasing to the point that they are the dominant group. Non-
border school districts in Texas are also being affected by these demographic changes. Currently, 64.3% of the public school students in Texas are members of minority groups (TEA, 2007).
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Background

For almost 90 years the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) has studied the public school superintendency by surveying members of the profession approximately every 10 years. Studies were conducted in 1923, 1933, 1950, 1960, 1970, 1982, 1992, 2000, and 2006. The 2006 study was a mid-decade study conducted by Glass and Franceschini. In each of the studies the data collected has shown that the race/ethnicity of public school superintendents in the United States is predominately White/non-Hispanic. The most recent national data indicate that 93.8% of superintendents are White (Glass & Franceschini, 2007).

The same pattern has been true in Texas. The most recent data obtained from the Texas Education Agency (TEA) shows that 84% of the public school superintendents in Texas are White/non-Hispanics.

Public school superintendents are predominantly male. Glass and Franceschini (2007) reported that in 2006, 78.3% of the superintendents in the United States were male and 21.7% were female. In Texas, the corresponding percentages are 82.2% and 17.8% respectively (TEA, 2006).

At a time when the superintendency is dominated by male, White/non-Hispanics, the demographics of many school districts are changing to reflect the growing number of minority students. These demographic trends indicate that an increasing number of superintendents will be leading school districts with minority-majority school populations.
This trend is especially noticeable in the state of Texas where the Hispanic student population in many school districts is increasing to the point that they are the dominant group. Non-border school districts in Texas are also being affected by these demographic changes. Currently, 64.3% of the public school students in Texas are members of minority groups (TEA, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

The increase in minority student enrollment means that many White male superintendents may soon be leading school districts where the majority of the student population is from a cultural, ethnic, or racial background different from their own. In addition, the changing characteristics of the student population, including differences in culture, disabilities, and socioeconomic status are increasing demands for interagency collaboration for delivery of services to families and children. According to a report compiled by a task force from the American Educational Research Association, the University Council on Educational Administration, and the Laboratory of Student Success at Temple University, “the increasingly complex environment in which public schools are embedded is radically changing the work of school administrators and how they lead” (Hoyle, et al., 2005). The report also stated that “successful school leaders must respond productively to the opportunities and challenges of educating diverse groups of students” (Hoyle, et al., 2005). With such demographically complex school contexts, school leaders must be prepared to best serve the needs of all students.

Understanding the context of culturally diverse school settings may not be the only factor to influence effective leadership, the type of leadership that is necessary to successfully lead majority-Hispanic school districts may also be of much significance.
The type of leadership and philosophy that a superintendent brings to a school district or campus will most likely have a direct impact on the curricular decisions that are made, as well as how resources will be allocated to support these decisions. James MacGregor Burns identified two types of leadership styles: transactional and transformational (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). Burns stated that transactional leadership is when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of something valued, or an approach with an eye toward exchanging. Another way to look at transactional leadership is that it is mainly concerned with the necessary activities of a leader that takes up most of his or her day, or more of a managerial approach (Waterman & Peters, 1992). In a majority-Hispanic school district, additional skills may be necessary that go beyond that of a manager. A deeper understanding of the history and dynamics of a school community may be required as well as the leader’s ability to build trust and foster productive relationships that unite the district for a common purpose. Burns described transformational leadership as a style that involves shifts in the beliefs, needs and the values of the followers and engages them in a relationship of mutual dependence in which contributions of both sides are acknowledged and rewarded (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). The transformational leader is one who builds on man’s need for meaning and seeks to create an overall institutional purpose. This type of leader is not only concerned with the day to day activities but also with “tricks of the pedagogue, the mentor, the linguist and is more successfully to become the value shaper, the exemplar and the maker of meanings” (Waterman & Peters, 1992). It may be expected that superintendents possess certain skills which enable them to both manage and lead. It is also possible that many of these district
leaders are being further influenced by the outside pressures of accountability policies causing many resources to be allocated to test prep materials as they attempt to “manage” test scores and increase student performance on high-stakes tests. Whether or not this is a truly effective use of resources is a question that deserves more investigation.

For a superintendent to build the level of trust necessary to successfully lead and perhaps be considered a transformational leader, many variables must be considered. Some of these variables may be magnified when White/non-Hispanic male superintendents lead majority-Hispanic school districts, particularly if an approach is taken that does not consider the minority culture and past educational experiences. For example, to make assumptions and attempt to force the philosophies of a dominant culture onto a minority culture with a history of oppression may not be effective. According to John Ogbu, the theory that the more a minority group is like the dominant culture, the better they will do is not valid and can be explained by the history of the relationships between the minority and dominant groups involved (Finn, 1999). Ogbu distinguished between immigrant minorities and involuntary minorities where immigrant minorities are people who have come to America for improved economic, political, or social opportunities. They encourage their children to adopt the mainstream characteristics necessary for social and academic success. Involuntary minorities are people who became Americans through slavery, conquest, or colonization and who were relegated to an inferior position and denied assimilation. They experience discrimination as a permanent reality and see themselves as oppressed. Although many recent Mexican immigrants do fall into this voluntary immigrant classification,
many Mexican-Americans are from southwestern states that were annexed to the United States through conquest. As a result their relationship with the dominant group began as that of citizens in an occupied country (Finn, 1999).

Ogbu’s position may be strengthened by examining the history of public education in Texas and the relationships between Whites and Mexican-American Hispanics. Mexican-Americans were frequently treated as second-class citizens and relegated to blue-collar, menial labor and lower paying jobs and Mexican parents sent their children to segregated schools. Attitudes toward the education of Mexican children can be summed up by a statement made by the wife of an Anglo rancher in the 1920s: “Let him (the Mexican) have a good education but still let him know he is not as good as the white man. God did not intend him to be; He would have made them white if he had” (Takaki, 1993). It can be argued that attitudes such as these existed many years ago and that segregation and this type of discrimination no longer exists. However the parents and the grandparents who experienced these attitudes are currently community members in Texas school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations and their children and grandchildren are currently students in Texas districts. Taking this phenomenon into consideration, it may be argued that getting the school community to place their trust in a white Non-Hispanic superintendent to lead in the best interest of their children may not be an easy task.

Is it mandatory that White/non-Hispanic superintendents who effectively lead majority-Hispanic school districts have an understanding of this history and interaction between the culturally dominant and minority groups? If this is true, another twist may be added to the concept of transformational leadership that perhaps raises it to yet
another level. Moral transformational leadership that is concerned with social justice focuses on education and educational leadership from the progressive or critical theory standpoint as well as on the uses and abuses of power in institutional settings (Dantley & Tillman, 2006). The concept of social justice is mainly focused on marginalized groups who are often underserved and under represented and face various forms of oppression in schools. According to Dantley and Tillman, leadership for social justice “interrogates the policies and procedures that shape schools and at the same time perpetuates social inequalities and marginalization due to race, class, gender and other markers of otherness.” Individuals who see themselves as transformative and moral leaders should also be public intellectuals who seek to examine ways in which schools and other systems contribute to maintaining the social, political, and economic status quo. Another practice that is characteristic of such leaders is social justice praxis, which involves activities such as research and scholarship, conference presentations, and pedagogical methods that can be used to articulate a broader discourse on leadership for social justice and moral transformative leadership (Dantley & Tillman, 2006).

A challenge for non-Hispanic White males is to be truly embraced by the majority-Hispanic school district in which they lead. The challenges of serving the needs of students in majority-Hispanic school districts may be magnified by an oppositional identity which, according to Ogbu, has been created through a history of oppression. “For involuntary minorities, the dominant group is not only different, it is the enemy” and “for these children, for these involuntary minorities, school was not and would never be their home turf” (Finn, 1999). One cannot truly lead if he has no followers. Many educators continue to state that education has all the answers for all of
our “minority problems” and believe that if education is successful, the involuntary minorities will become fully assimilated and their separate cultures will disappear. A problem with this theory is that involuntary minorities do not believe they will be accepted even if they surrender their identity. The connection between hard work, good grades, and life success are not as apparent to them as they are to the culturally dominant group. Changing in this mindset, as a White/non-Hispanic male superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district, may require an understanding of the history that has brought education to where it is today as well as a sincere commitment to break the cycles of educational practices that have failed. In addition, a superintendent not only must effectively communicate and lead the internal community of a school district, but also communicate with the entire community in which the district is located. Many of these communities are located on the United States-Mexico border and have a history of class and racial struggle for political and cultural dominance.

The instructional practices and programs adopted by a school district will have a major impact on the success of a superintendent in serving the needs of the students in any school district and may be particularly crucial in serving the needs of students in majority-Hispanic school districts. Researchers suggest that a major way in which the superintendent may influence decision-making and practices involving teaching and learning is through resource allocation. The district’s use of resources is constrained by what administrators make available and the use of these resources directly affects the academic programs and instructional practices that impact student learning. The decisions that are mainly affected by resource allocation are the physical environment, personnel assignments, class size, and the choice and selection of curricular materials
Since school boards rely heavily on the expertise and recommendations of the superintendent and his staff on decision-making and resource allocation in a school district the philosophy and beliefs of the superintendent weigh heavily on the curricular programs offered.

An important factor to consider in resource allocation is the impact of state and federal accountability policies. During the recent era of high-stakes testing and accountability, the nation’s public schools have faced much scrutiny, with student performance a primary focus of attention. High-stakes testing policies, such as those tied to NCLB, place tremendous pressure on public school superintendents to increase student performance on standardized tests or face sanctions, which may result in the loss of funding and quite possibly the loss of their job. A major criticism of accountability models that use high-stakes testing as a major determinate of school success is the probable impact they have on resource allocation as it is tied to curricular decisions. Possible impacts are the narrowing of the curriculum and decreases in academic rigor that are the detrimental effects of “drill and kill” instructional practices and materials designed to improve student performance on these tests (McNeil & Valenzuela, 2000). In addition, even though many argue that disadvantaged children are the primary beneficiaries of accountability systems such as NLCB, children in minority and low-income communities are disproportionately likely to fail these high-stakes exams (Hess, 2003). With these statistics in mind, it may be predicted that administrators in low income and majority-Hispanic school districts are faced with even more pressures to focus the curriculum on only what is tested and purchase resources that contribute to this practice.
Superintendents who are seeking change and charged with leading majority-Hispanic school districts may find themselves in a serious moral dilemma due to accountability policies, such as those contained in NCLB. NCLB requires schools to show Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year, to include all subgroups, or face sanctions. Schools that do not measure up will be listed as “in need of improvement” and parents will have the option to move their children to another school within the district. Schools that do not improve after 5 years will be “restructured” and all or most of the personnel may be replaced on a particular campus not meeting standards (West & Peterson, 2003). With high-stakes testing being a primary measuring device which is tied very closely to school credibility and quite possibly school funding, many school leaders find themselves pressured to reduce the number of failing students or reduce the consequences of failure. In addition, even though accountability may yield some long term systemic benefits, a meaningful high-stakes testing system will inevitably fail some students and thereby create some clear losers (Hess, 2003). Since children in minority and low-income communities are disproportionately likely to fail high-stakes exams, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) has officially opposed decisions to withhold diplomas or grade promotion on the basis of test results, deeming such policies as an effort to blame the victim (Hess, 2003). Because of factors such as these, leaders in schools with a large percentage of economically disadvantaged and minority students may find themselves with even more of a moral dilemma when decisions are made that involve the allocation of resources that directly impact the curriculum. School leaders who are primarily concerned with test scores may tend to allocate too much of the limited school resources on test-prep and drill-and-
kill type materials. This may lead to teachers focusing their instruction on the tests themselves, which can have a detrimental and narrowing effect on the overall curriculum (McNeil & Valenzuela, 2000). In addition, subjects such as those in the fine arts would suffer since resources are being allocated to subjects that are tested.

The effectiveness of the U.S. public education system has been questioned since the Sputnik era resulting in a gradual loss of faith in public schools and the effectiveness of district superintendents. This has resulted in “increased micromanagement for boards of education and inadequate compensation” when compared to leaders of other organizations of equal size (Hoyle, et al., 2005). Because of these societal trends and their influence on public education policies, the role of the public school superintendent will continue to change as demographic trends dictate changes in America’s schools. How a superintendent allocates resources, navigates the political climate, and communicates with school boards and the community within a majority-Hispanic context will play a large part in his or her success, as well as the success of the students and the district as a whole.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of this study was the Critical Race Theory (CRT). The Critical Race Theory places race at the center of critical analysis but there are no set of doctrines or methodologies that specifically define critical race theory (NCCU, 2005). The theory emphasizes the socially constructed nature of race, considers judicial conclusions to be the result of the workings of power, and opposes the continuation of all forms of subordination (Lopez, 2003). Critical Race Theory is a concept that originated in the legal arena and then proceeded to influence literature
within the social sciences. CRT has been explored in education most notably by Ladson-Billings, Tate, Lyn, Parker, Solórzano, Yosso, Dixson, Rousseau, and Chapman. Critical Race scholarship in education has occurred in three waves. The first wave of studies was conducted in the mid 1990s with the introduction of CRT to the field by Ladson-Billings and Tate. Parker and Solórzano’s contributions followed soon thereafter. The second wave of scholarship occurred in the late 1990s and continued through the year 2004. Younger scholars such as Lynn, Duncan, and Yosso became key players. Dixson and Rousseau represent the third wave of new scholars who are attempting to re-introduce CRT to the field while creating stricter standards for how critical race theory in education is defined (www.questia.com/PM). The critical race theoretical paradigm underscores an important point within human culture and psychology-race still matters (West, 1992).

**Purpose of the Study**

The purposes of this study were: 1) identify the characteristics of the White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations; 2) to identify the career pathways and experiences of value of White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations; 3) to ascertain what these men consider to be major challenges they have faced, how they dealt with these challenges as well as what impact, if any, state and federal accountability policies have had on their decision-making and resource allocation processes; and 4) to ascertain the general leadership theories and/or styles these men subscribe to and how the theories are applied to their decision-making process.
Significance of the Study

This study contributed to the research literature about leading districts with majority-Hispanic student populations and by advancing the understanding of those who lead these schools. A preliminary search of current literature revealed that there was little current research to explain how White/non-Hispanic male superintendents have succeeded in successfully serving the needs of students in school districts where the majority of constituents come from a different ethnic or racial background than their own. A unique aspect of this study is that it reveals perspectives of White/non-Hispanic male superintendents who are serving in majority-Hispanic communities where the ethnic make-up of the majority of the constituents is of Hispanic origin. The results of the study may be of interest to practicing or future superintendents in Texas or throughout the nation. As the demographics of many school districts change, district leaders must be prepared to serve the needs of all students.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of the White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?

2. What are the career pathways of White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?

3. What are the demographic characteristics of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations who have White/non-Hispanic male superintendents?
4. What is the gender and ethnic makeup of the school boards who hire White/non-Hispanic males to serve as superintendents of districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?

5. What are the leadership styles and/or theories to which White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations subscribe?

6. What are the challenges White/non-Hispanic male superintendents face in leading and serving the needs of students in districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?

7. To what degree does the awareness of the cultural and social history of a school district/community impact the decision-making of a White/non-Hispanic male superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district?

8. What major influences have federal and state accountability policies had on the decision-making and resource allocation processes of White/non-Hispanic male superintendents of majority-Hispanic school districts?

Definition of Terms

A research study should define the terms that are unique or specific to that study.

For the purpose of this study, the pertinent terms are defined as:

1. **Career-pathway**: The progression of one’s working life or one’s professional achievements.

2. **Critical Race Theory**: A field of inquiry that argues that preserving the interests of power, rather than the demands of principle and precedent. CLS theorists suggest that the existing precedents are indeterminate, allowing those in power
3. **Culture**: A body of beliefs, usage and sanctions which are transmitted entirely by social means and administered to growing individuals by example, precept, and discipline...It constitutes the milieu, a body of influences which are necessary for the development of the individual mind in such functions as language, spoken and written forms. (Ortiz, 1982 quoting Baldwin, J., 1913a: p. 129-130).

4. **Education preparation**: A combination of course work and work experience designed to prepare an individual to attain the next highest level of an organization.

5. **English Language Learners (ELL)**: Term used to describe or characterize children whose second language is English.

6. **Ethnicity**: Classification or affiliation of a person based on race and history. Based on the Census 2000, a number of choices may describe what a person considers himself/herself to be, including the terms: White, Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian, or Pacific Islander, as well as combination of races. According to the APA Manual, preference for nouns referring to racial and ethnic groups change often.

7. **Hispanic**: A person of Spanish or Latin American descent.

8. **Majority-Hispanic School District**: A school district in which the majority of the students served are from a minority group(s). The Civil Rights Act of 1968, as part of the Fair Housing Laws, describes a minority as any group, or
9. **SBOE:** State Board of Education (see school board).

10. **School Board:** A state or local board organized to govern and manage schools in a state or municipality.

11. **School District:** A geographic district and the public schools of which are administered together (American Heritage Dictionary, 2006).

12. **Superintendent:** The chief executive administrative officer of a school district who directs and coordinates the educational, administrative, and counseling activities of that district in accordance with governing board policy as well as state and federal statutes (U.S. Department of Labor, 1991).

13. **Texas Education Agency:** TEA, is a branch of the state government of Texas in the United States. The agency is headquartered in the William B. Travis State Office Building at 1701 North Congress Avenue in Austin, Texas. TEA is responsible for the oversight of public primary and secondary education in the state of Texas, involving over 1,000 individual school districts in the state as well as charter schools. However, unlike counterpart bodies in other states, TEA has no jurisdiction over the activities of private schools (whether or not accredited) or home schools in Texas.
14. White/non-Hispanic: A person of European (except Spanish), North African, Middle Eastern (i.e.- Turkey through Afghanistan) descent who is not of Hispanic origin.

Delimitations

Delimitations are defined as “factors that affect the study over which the researcher generally does have some degree of control. Delimitations describe the scope of the study or establish parameters or limits for the study” (Baron, 2007). This study was delimited to the White/non-Hispanic male superintendents of Texas public school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations and the boards of trustees that hired them. For the sake of clarification, it should be noted that this study did not address school districts with majority-minority student populations other than majority-Hispanic populations. Further, this study does not distinguish between immigrant and native born students or the economic structures of the majority-Hispanic school districts.

Limitations

Although the research methodology and design for gathering information for this study was carefully planned and organized, there are several limitations that must be disclosed. According to L. R. Gay, a limitation is defined as “some aspect of a study that the researcher knows may negatively affect the results, or generalizability of the results, but over which he probably has no control” (Gay, 1992). The following were the limitations of this study:

1. The number of superintendents who was identified and elected to respond to the survey, however, every effort was made to ensure maximum participation.

2. The willingness of respondents to provide accurate information.
3. Because this study is delimited to Texas superintendents, the limited
   generalizability of the results.
4. The possible bias of the researcher related to the topic under study.

Summary

This chapter presented the context of the study by highlighting the fact that public
school superintendents are predominantly White males. At a time when the
superintendency is dominated by male, White/non-Hispanics, the demographics of
many school districts are changing to reflect the growing number of minority students.
The increase in minority student enrollment means that many White male
superintendents may soon be leading school districts where the majority of the student
population is from a cultural, ethnic, or racial background different from their own.

Since there is little current research to explain how White/non-Hispanic male
superintendents have succeeded in successfully serving the needs of students in school
districts where the majority of constituents come from a different ethnic or racial
background than their own. A unique aspect of this study is that it revealed
perspectives of White/non-Hispanic male superintendents who are serving in majority-
Hispanic communities where the ethnic make-up of the majority of the constituents is of
Hispanic origin. The study also identified the career paths of White/non-Hispanic males
who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student
populations.

Chapter 1 contains a description and rationale of the study, including an overview
of the factors influencing the topic of the study and several reasons that support the
study. An articulation of the purpose and the research questions was presented. A
discussion on the significance of the study was included as well as a scope of the study, definitions and the limitations of the study concluded the first chapter.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

This chapter includes a review of the professional literature related to the following topics: (1) local school governance: a historical perspective; (2) reforms, legislation, and trends impacting the superintendency and school boards; (3) accountability models; (4) leadership theories; and (5) Critical Race Theory.

Local School Governance: A Historical Perspective

The transformation of the position of superintendent, for the most part, parallels the development of the graded school (Kowalski, 2006). To better appreciate the position of superintendent, a brief review of the historical perspective of local school governance is provided in order to gain an understanding of how the position of superintendent evolved to its current status.

The local school board is the primary governing body of a school district. A primary responsibility of the school board is the selection of the superintendent to oversee the day-to-day operations of the district. Many experts on school board effectiveness identify these key characteristics of effective school boards:

1. An appropriate overarching focus which includes focus on students’ academic achievement and attention to policy, not administration.
2. Good relations with the superintendent, between board members, with other local agencies and with the public and state.
3. Effective performance in the areas of policymaking, leadership and budgeting.
4. Adequate evaluation and training with research being presented wherever possible.
Unfortunately, the majority of research shows that many school boards do not exhibit these characteristics which are deemed critical for effective governance and to positively affect students’ academic achievement (Land, 2002).

Challenges that school boards face vary but often tend to follow common themes such as:

1. An ill-defined role which impairs effectiveness.

2. Competing political interests that hinder a board’s impact.

3. Board selection processes which limit a board’s representational nature.

4. Boards which are constrained by the information they receive from the superintendent and district (Villegas, 2003).

Micromanagement is also very often cited as a negative activity in which many school boards engage. Without a clear role, school board members often blur the line between governing a school system and operating it. Most district staff members contend that board members should focus on long-term policy decisions and leave the day-to-day operations to the superintendent and central office staff (Villegas, 2003).

The concept of the local school board dates back more than 200 years to the Massachusetts’ system of a local governance by select men. School boards were comprised of lay individuals who were vested with authority from the state to govern public education. Originally, these select men governed both the local affairs of the community as well as the communities’ educational needs. As population and local governance responsibilities increased, however, these select men separated educational governance from the general local governance and appointed a committee in each town to govern education (Land, 2002).
Massachusetts established the first State Board of Education in 1837 to give states a greater role in education, but local school boards continued to retain most of the control over their schools. This was mostly due to public distrust of having far away political bodies serve the needs of individual localities. Because of this, separate school districts, funded by local taxes, were formed as more schools were built to accommodate the continuing population growth. From the mid 1800s through the early 1900s the number of local school boards rapidly increased. While there may have been variances in each local governance structure, it was local school boards that primarily looked after and managed public education, with the members being selected by their local neighborhood community (Land, 2002).

In response to suspicions of corruption in the late 1800s, as well as the belief that schools were not adequately educating an increasingly diverse student population, urban school districts looked to reform school boards by modeling centralized city school boards after corporate boards designed to be more focused on policy and less involved in daily administration. This led to the first official superintendent being hired in 1837 in Buffalo, New York (Kowalski, 2006). The role of the superintendent at that time was very much different than today in that boards of trustees attempted to continue to direct the schools and the superintendent was a teacher who was paid only to oversee instruction and advise the board of trustees (Land, 2002). A major responsibility of the superintendent was to ensure that state requirements were being met (Kowalski, 2006). At the time, these superintendents usually had no formal training as leaders and they were not licensed in educational administration. Their role continued to be restricted by community elites who believed the superintendent should remain a servant, rather than
a leader. The elites had little confidence that the superintendent could be an effective manager due to the fact that he/she was a teacher with little academic preparation in human and resource management (Kowalski, 2006). The reason for the appointment of individual superintendents varied. Some were merely appointed because they “look like leaders.” This was important politically because the public would view these office holders as being competent. Others were appointed because they were good teachers and could ensure the state curriculum was being followed and effective instructional strategies were being used. Virtually none of the superintendents were being selected because of managerial skills (Kowalski 2006).

The industrial revolution, combined with the large influx of immigrants to the United States, created significant cultural and educational problems for the nation's school system in the early 1900s. As the number of immigrants grew, American citizens relied on public schools to assimilate immigrant children into their version of Americanism (Lazerson, 1987). In addition, as school districts began getting larger, emphasis on standardized practices began to increase which created a need to formalize a specialization in school administration. This created a need for formal university-based training. With this demand for increased professionalism, master's degree programs and licensing were beginning to be required (Murphy & Hallinger, 1986). According to E.W. Eaton, professionalism is defined as “a concerted effort, over time, to create a distinct occupational role and then persuade others to accept this role as the standard.” He went on to state that both actual skills and preferred behaviors are involved and that “in exchange for systematic training and endorsement of a code of ethics, the professional demands autonomy in the process of exercising judgment over
practice” (Kowalski, 2006). Superintendents sought this standing not only to gain status, but also because (1) the economic and social successes of industrial management were viewed positively by the general public, thus the idea of being classified as a professional manager was appealing to many school administrators; (2) professionalism almost always produced individual powers for those who were classified; and (3) breaking free of the big-city bureaucracies made it more likely that the key decisions could be made on the basis of educational rather than political considerations (Kowalski, 2006).

Reforms, Legislation, and Trends Impacting the Superintendency and School Boards

From the point of the formalization of the superintendency and into the 1950s, the position of superintendent began emerging as one of a social agent with preparation focusing mainly on social foundations with the view of an administrator as a mediator and sometimes a politician. The launch of Sputnik in 1957 changed this and the fear of falling behind the Soviet Union moved into the mainstream of thought in America. This created a widespread demand for major curriculum reform with an emphasis on reading, writing, and arithmetic (Rueda, 2002). Even though educational supervision had been considered mostly authoritarian, it was slowly moving toward a more democratic perspective. Expectations were changing such that superintendents were now to educate teachers and involve them in planning, executing, and evaluating educational practices. Superintendents also began to provide direction for curriculum and classroom experiences and served as arbitrators of value and morality (Rueda, 2002).
During the 1960s, an emerging priority for the superintendent was to be less concerned about being democratic and more concerned with whether effective change was occurring. One of the primary roles of the position was to identify problems, priorities, and bring about change. A slide in SAT scores also contributed to the development of The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) that did in fact, confirm losses in student performance. The idea of schools being more accountable for student performance also led to the emergence of changes in instructional methodologies during this time period that included expanded uses of team teaching, audiovisual aids, open classrooms, and textbooks that promoted more positive images of ethnic and racial minorities. This continued into the next decade with the creation of the Department of Education in the 1970s. During this time period, superintendents continued to focus on equity issues as well as research and evaluation, information dissemination, and federal program accountability (Kowalski, 2006). Also in the late 1970s, it became more evident that school superintendents and chief executives in business tended to have different orientations to the social dimensions of their work. Top business managers spent a large amount of time interacting with persons outside the organization and superintendents tended to primarily interact with subordinates. Because of this, superintendents tended to find themselves insulated from outside organizations which drew much criticism from reformers who believed that school officials were insensitive to community needs and indifferent to changing economic, political and social conditions (Kowalski, 2006).

As with Sputnik in the 1950s, the release of “A Nation at Risk” in 1983, caused the American public to once again become alarmed about the declining quality of
American education and urged continued reforms. These reforms were led mainly by state legislatures and typically expanded regulatory controls over school districts and schools reaching all the way into the classroom. Accountability became even more of a priority which continues to present day. As a result of “A Nation at Risk” there was a call for higher graduation requirements, improving student performance on standardized tests, assessing school-level performance and progress, lengthening the school day and year, and tightening teacher licensure requirements. The pressure for more accountability also shifted policy making from the district to the state level of government, constrained local discretion and reinforced a centralized, bureaucratic control of the schools. Literature exploring the nature of leadership and concerned with identifying relevant criteria for evaluating leadership effectiveness also arose during this time period as superintendents became the subject of research and compared against Corporate Executive Officers of the business world (Hoyle, et al., 2005).

Reports during this period of reform in the late 1980s not only called for increased accountability, they also broke new ground by calling attention to national increases in the number of Hispanic and Asian students, students from lower income families, and students with special needs (Hoyle, et al., 2005). These reports called for addressing the needs of all children and recommended that teaching and learning processes be radically redesigned to address diversity in the students’ cultures and learning styles. In addition, they also pointed out that the “stultifying effects of school bureaucracies contributed to low academic performance and high failure rates.” The call for decentralization initiatives such as school-based management (SBM) also arose
in an effort to increase teacher professionalism through participation in school governance and decision-making (Hoyle, et al., 2005).

In addition to an increased emphasis on for school accountability, the 1990s continued to see a significant variety of groups focus attention on educational issues. Primary concerns formed around such issues as standards, textbooks, taxes, curriculum, religion and educational issues which posed significant challenges to the superintendency (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). Included in relevant issues of the 1990s were outcome-based learning, school prayer, family-life education, portfolio assessment, technology and authentic learning. As superintendents attempted to address these issues they faced vigorous challenges based upon economic, political and social, or religious values. What was significant to these challenges is that interest groups were better organized and financed than during any period in the past (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). There was also a large push to address these challenges at the local and campus level.

With encouragement from President Bill Clinton, The Goals 2000: Educate America Act was passed in 1993 which encouraged communities to develop their own reform plans and provided funding to support these efforts. It also required innovation in teaching and learning, increased parent and community involvement, professional development of teachers and reduction in educational bureaucracy (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). President Clinton also encouraged Congress to place accountability mandates on the states in Goals 2000. This called for reforms such as annual progress toward state designated standards. Accountability became known as a “tripod” made up of standards, testing and penalties. At the federal level “Title I” was,
and continues to be used as the centerpiece of federal aid to provide the “dangling carrot” for schools to comply with these standards. Other educational trends which emerged during this time period were increased inclusion, block scheduling, school choice and charter schools. In the context of decentralization and Site Based Management, superintendents were being further pressured to decentralize and democratize public education, by involving campus administrators, teachers, and parents in determining what will work best for their schools. District leadership entailed having to support and facilitate school-based decisions, shared leadership and other site based approaches. “In describing the important role of the superintendents in building effective schools, Joseph Murphy (1991) says ‘the chief executive officers of reformed schools act, not as they traditionally have, as directors and controllers, but as coordinators and enablers-their job is to facilitate, not dictate. One of their major functions is serving and assisting schools. In this role, central offices act as service providers or support centers that offer technical assistance to schools’” (Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

The City of Chicago’s Public Schools (CPS) underwent a period of major reform during the late 1980s and early to mid 1990s which gained much national attention. Anthony S. Bryk and Brian A. Jacob reviewed these reforms in separate articles and indicated how the CPS model is significant because it later had a major impact on influencing The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2002. Many of the policies contained in NCLB have been at the core of the Chicago Public School reform since the mid 1990s. The initial reform began in 1988 with major decentralization and major physical improvements shortly followed in 1995. In a direct assault on district
leadership, the School Reform Act turned control of the city’s schools over to the mayor. As later used in NCLB, high-stakes testing was implemented, social promotion was put to an end and schools were sanctioned if established standards were not met. CPS used the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) as their main assessment in monitoring the achievement of students and progress of individual campuses. Early trends showed the CPS made some great improvements with this high-stakes reform effort. There was some evidence, however, that some campuses may have been “gaming” student results.

The validity and effectiveness of the CPS reforms were not always viewed in a positive light. Brian A. Jacob stated that the school system may indeed have been adding much to student learning but a steady influx of weakly prepared students caused test score reports to miss positive growth. In addition, improving school productivity does not necessarily mean that all test scores will be high because of the existence of such phenomena as this. According to Jacob, however, little evidence exists that shows any major overall improvement in Chicago schools during this time period. He saw a decrease in the quality of intellectual work in the classroom and reported that gains in mathematics scores occurred disproportionately in areas of computation and basic skills—not in areas that require complex thinking (Bryk, 2003).

Additional challenges for the superintendency arose in the 1990s from concerns that a growing number of children were not being well cared for by their parents. In “Beyond Rhetoric, the National Commission on Children” (1992) the state of American children was characterized as follows “…among all races and income groups, and in communities nationwide, many children are in jeopardy. They grow up in families
whose lives are in turmoil. Their parents are too stressed and too drained to provide the nurturing structure, and security that protects children and prepares them for adulthood. Some others are unsafe at home and in their neighborhoods. Many are poor. And some are homeless and hungry” (Carter & Cunningham, 1997).

Accountability was the prevailing theme which continued into the 21st century. Educational reports from the time period of 1989 through 2003 criticized earlier reports for narrowly focusing on structural and professional issues rather than emphasizing the well being and learning of all children. The main characteristics of these reports were that reforms must ensure children’s well-being and that no child should be academically left behind which led to The No Child Left Behind Act. This landmark legislation ushered in a new age of accountability where school effectiveness would be closely monitored through a variety of statistical measures with high-stakes standardized testing being at the core. The unusual characteristic of the NCLB legislation is that key members of both the Democratic and Republican parties embraced it. In 2000 both George Bush and Al Gore incorporated NCLB and school accountability into their platforms. This, as well as other prominent and unusual alliances were key ingredients for its successful passage in 2001 (Rudalevige, 2003). Andrew Rudalevige stated that traditionally “Republicans don't like ‘national' and Democrats don't like ‘test'.”

Under NCLB, each year schools and districts are required to show Adequate Yearly Progress, to include all subgroups, or face sanctions. Schools that do not measure up will be listed as “in need of improvement” and parents will have the choice to move their children to another school within the district. Schools that do not
improve after 5 years will be “restructured” through a process by which district personnel will be replaced on failing campuses.

The history of education is intertwined with reform initiatives that have impacted the role of the superintendents and school district leadership. This is particularly true within the last 30 years. One goal of role reform, not previously discussed, is that it is also intended to provide some guidance to board members who want to more clearly define the line between policy and operational decision-making and govern according to this distinction (Villegas, 2003). This requires board members to commit to being a policy board. John Carver, a governance theorist, developed the Policy Governance approach in which board members must take time to identify what types of decisions are their responsibilities as trustees in sustaining the progress of the school district. Some specific steps boards may take in adopting Policy Governance include: (1) developing a test to determine what makes a policy decision different from an operational one; (2) holding the superintendent accountable for clear measurable district goals while allowing the superintendent to set performance goals for district and school staff; and (3) developing policies for handling constituent concerns that reflect the board’s responsibility to all students rather than powerful special interests (Villegas, 2003). Supporters of such role reform efforts contend that they bring much needed clarity to the function of school boards.

Issues related to school accountability and student performance must be a primary concern when school boards reevaluate their own purpose. It is a reality that policies such as the NCLB have put tremendous pressure on school superintendents to take a larger leadership role in instructional issues rather than only focusing on
managing the district. To assist the superintendent, however, school board members must also focus on enacting policies that support broad instructional goals. In a recent national survey, school board members identified student achievement as their foremost concern. In addition, in a survey of 92 Wisconsin school districts board presidents, superintendents, and high school principals, it was frequently recommended that a concentration on student achievement and school improvement would increase the effectiveness of their school board (Land, 2002).

**Accountability Models**

Reforms in the last 30 years have been increasingly tied to school accountability, therefore, a review of accountability models and research used in developing legislation is relevant. It is also important to consider the possible intended and unintended effects these models pose on school district leadership, decision-making and resource allocation.

Terry M. Moe provided an interesting point of view, which suggests the need for accountability. He outlined the Classic Agency Model, which revolves around a principal-agent relationship. As applied to the superintendency, the principal (superintendent) wants to attain certain goals and hires campus administrators and teachers (agents) to act on his, or her behalf. The agents, however, have their own interests that may not line up with the goals of their superiors and this is critical because it is the campus level employees who have the greatest impact on student learning. Since teachers are heavily protected by civil service and union rules, those who are mediocre or incompetent are never removed from their jobs. Moe goes on to state that many union interests have nothing to do with what is best for children (Moe, 2003).
Another interesting argument Moe provided is that there are properties of the field of education that attract the “wrong types” of people into the profession. Properties such as autonomy, job security and lack of accountability have traditionally been accepted aspects of education. Organizations that do not reward productive performance will be attractive to workers who are less productive and the more productive workers will seek out opportunities elsewhere. Those who stay find these properties to their liking. Therefore, “wrong types” may have been attracted to education and the “right types” repelled.

In status models of accountability, which are the most common, schools are measured by the average student performance on assessments from one year to the next. As a result, schools are capable of weeding out students who are poor performers over time, which will indicate an overall rise in student performance. This typically happens the most in the first year. Using a longitudinal approach, however, cohorts are tracked year to year through schools and changes in performance are reported accordingly, either by cohort gain or individual gain. This type of system is more desirable because the weeding out process is less likely and the added value of particular teachers and overall grade levels can be monitored. A concern with status models such as these, however is that they do not account for any changes in the “other” which looms large in the school’s overall accountability ratings.

Eric A. Hanushek and Margaret E. Raymond offered another perspective in their evaluation of accountability systems. Their model of student achievement is written as follows: \( student \text{\ achievement} = school + other. \)
In this equation, “school” is defined as the contribution of a particular school in student outcomes and achievement. This contribution is in the form of added value and learning. The “other” in this equation represents a variety of factors that include student ability, family, peers, and history as well as a standard measurement of error. These are factors that may well be out of the school’s control. In majority-Hispanic districts, these factors may be amplified by such implications as socio-economic status, language, education level of parents and other factors related significantly to urban school settings as educators try to improve student achievement.

Fredrick Hess noted that a major concern of accountability systems revolves around the actual implementation and enforcement of these standards as well as the consequences for not meeting them. Historically, as the “teeth” of accountability begin to bite and sanctions go into effect, intense complaining and political pressures cause standards to be lowered, exceptions granted and penalties postponed. In addition, unions have extensive grievance procedures and in the end, union positions will carry great weight. There were also concerns that there frequently is not any direct burden on students themselves and too little attention is given to hold them accountable. Hess believes it is significant to point out that if a student is attentive, curious, enthusiastic, and hardworking, much can be accomplished. This is even so with limited resources. In addition, student performance may reflect family and cultural background, educational experience as well as other factors beyond state and local control (Hess, 2003).

When attempting to evaluate what impact the recent accountability movement may have on our educational system, some authors reviewed possible impacts of
previously instituted models and systems. Beginning in 1975, nearly every state introduced Minimum Competency testing (MCT). Near the same time period, Course Graduation Requirements (CGR) were also being reviewed and requirements were being raised across the nation. In reviewing possible impacts there was evidence to indicate that MCT lowered the probability of graduating from high school. No significant effect on the probability of attending college was noted, however. Although the results of raising CGR were generally positive and led to academic upgrading, the results also indicated that raising course graduation requirements led to reductions in educational attainment, particularly in African American students. In addition, MCT was seen as linked to lowered curricular effort, particularly in math and science. Factors such as these, as well as high failure rates, led to the eventual lowering of standards on these assessments. The raising of CGR had a more lasting impact.

Hess (2004) defined standards-based accountability as “a determination regarding what all children will be required to learn and how the performance of schools and educators will be assessed.” A large part of the accountability system is based on high-stakes testing, where test scores are used to evaluate both schools and their students. The tests themselves have had real effects, both intended and unintended, on the curriculum being taught in the classrooms by teachers.

A further review of the literature on high-stakes testing revealed an impact in three major areas. The scope of curriculum, dictated by outside sources, is narrowed to fit the test. Test preparation activities are extremely common, and students learn isolated concepts out of context. In addition, the utilization of higher order thinking skills and the inclusion of multicultural topics have all been affected by high-stakes testing. It
is suggested that these changes have been most pronounced in schools that serve poor students, and thus the testing has had an even greater negative impact on students who perhaps most need a quality education (Hess, 2003).

When legislatures and outside agencies determine what is to be tested, they in part determine what is to be taught, and thus limit the range of decisions available to educators. “Policy-makers…use them to manipulate educational systems, to control curricula and to impose new textbooks and new teaching methods” (Chang, 2000) While this may not always be negative, one has to question if the policy-makers have a clear understanding of the education system. Chang also found that when teachers feel that they lose the ability to make curriculum decisions they feel that they have lost much of their autonomy. In some areas, teachers have also been given standards by experts from within their field. For example, DeBoer described science standards that define what it means to be “scientifically literate.” While teachers have flexibility in determining how to teach the standards, there is little mechanism for incorporating student interest in the choice of topics (DeBoer, 2002). He argues that “when knowledge is specified too precisely it inevitably becomes the focus of instruction and takes on an importance beyond what it deserves (DeBoer, 2002).

The curriculum that is the result of high-stakes testing also tends to leave out any multicultural perspective or framework for learning. Barnhardt, Kawagley, and Hill (2000) argued that “building an education system with a strong foundation in the local culture appears to produce positive effects in all indicators of school success.” DeBoer (2002) also wrote that problems that are practical and based in the real-world experiences of the students themselves are more likely to be intrinsically motivating.
Standards imposed from the top that do not allow teachers to take these elements into consideration make this type of system difficult. McNeil and Valenzuela (2001) stated that the curriculum pushed by the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS), which was the primary standardized instrument in Texas in the 1990s, was “divorced from children’s experiences, language and cultures.” Hess (2004) argued that when nationwide curriculum standards are implemented, multicultural topics get “watered down” so as not to offend any of the stake-holders. This means that most material that is personal to students, especially minority students, is not likely to be included in the tests and therefore not likely to be emphasized, if it is even taught at all.

The impact on the curriculum of limited scope interims of content, increased test preparation, teaching out of context, reduction in higher-order thinking skills, and minimization of multicultural topics as a result of high-stakes testing is likely to be most strongly felt in the weakest schools that serve students who are already not receiving the highest quality education. Amrein and Berliner (2002) argued that the limits placed on graduation because of failure to pass an exit exam are more likely to affect African Americans and Hispanics, if for no other reason than states with higher percentages of minority students are more likely to have some type of exit exam (Amrein & Berliner 2002). Limited English Proficient (LEP) students pass these exams at lower rates, according to Garcia and Calhoun (2002). As a result, schools are put in a position of increasing test preparation in order to be considered acceptable (in Texas, literally “acceptable”) and to help these students graduate. This is the very type of “teaching to the test” instruction which has been shown to be ineffective for comprehensive learning. “Some student populations may participate in instructional practices that focus more on
test preparation than on well-rounded and standards-based instruction appropriate to course curriculum” (Garcia & Calhoun, 2002). McNeil and Valenzuela (2001) concurred with this argument, arguing that the TAAS pushed LEP students into classes designed to “focus on English vocabulary and English reading without regard to their prior academic training.” While it does not happen at every school, LEP students are likely to find it difficult to move beyond basic skills because of the structure of the curriculum imposed by the high-stakes exam. They extend their argument to include students who are poor. They contend that wealthier students are successful within the normal curriculum to which poor children do not get access because they spend time in test preparation (McNeil & Valenzuela, 2001). As a final argument, Taylor, Shepard, Kinner, and Rosenthal (2002), found that there was no sense that the imposition of high-stakes testing had increased the resources for those with the greatest learning needs. (Sheppard, et. al. 2002).

From a quite different perspective, Thomas S. Dee (2003) listed some potential benefits from these reforms. One is that they limited “nerd harassment” because expectations were raised for everyone and the increased expectations resulted in increased productivity. He states that even potential dropouts might generate more effort with curricular mandates and testing standards. Some of the downfalls he listed were that these reforms had disproportionate effects on low socioeconomic and disadvantaged students; there were threats of stereotype for minority students and a narrowing of curriculum and teaching styles. Dee stated that “minimum competency” would also become the maximum standard and have an effect of actually lowering
expectations for high-ability students. This resulted in a lowered effort in many core
courses, particularly in math and science (Dee, 2003).

Ludger Wößmann used international evidence to research the possible impact of
high-stakes testing in the form of central exit exams. These are assessments that must
be passed for a student to meet graduation requirements. Wößmann used the Third
International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and TIMSS-Repeat in order to
evaluate possible impacts of central exit exams and whether the extent of school
autonomy, teacher influence and parental involvement have different consequences in
education systems with and without central exams. Like Terry M. Moe, he looked at
principal-agent relationships. Unlike Moe, Wößmann saw the parent as the principal
with several agents, one being students.

Wößmann stated that it is very difficult for the principal (parent) to monitor the
agents in this relationship. For one, the student (agent) knows best how much effort is
required to accomplish assigned task and that principal-agents have different interests.
For example, students may be more interested in leisure than the parent would want. In
addition, educators may be more interested in their own finances and workloads than
parents and administrators would prefer. Therefore by using central exams, principals
can be provided the information that would otherwise not be available to monitor agents’
behavior.

In analyzing the results of the TIMSS, Wößmann recognized the existence of
many possible variables ranging from the level of the individual to the entire country
level. What he found was that students in countries with central-exam systems scored
40.9 percent of a standard deviation higher on the TIMSS-95 than counties without
these systems. Other positive effects were that the impact of central exams is 2/3 greater in science and twice as large in math. Central exams also seemed to send incentive signals down to lower grades that generated increased achievement and resulted in more informed and effective parent involvement. Wößmann believes that limitations of local school autonomy are far outweighed by positive incentive effects such as these. A limitation of central exams, however, was that central administrators might lack necessary information to intervene in poor performing schools in a beneficial way because schools have different backgrounds, customs and experiences (Wößmann, 2003).

There is a vast amount of literature available on accountability models and their implementation through school reform movements and trends which transformed U.S. public education to its current status. These movements not only affected how public education is perceived in society but also had a great impact on transforming the role of the superintendent and how school districts are lead.

Leadership Theories

When recent trends in public school accountability are coupled with the changing multicultural characteristics of the American public school student, the dynamics and skills needed to successfully lead a school district must be examined and reevaluated. There have been very few studies that have focused on the multicultural competencies needed to lead school districts with culturally diverse identities. According to Orvando and Troxell, superintendents themselves believe that they should have multicultural competencies and greater in-depth knowledge about the “emerging tapestry of diverse cultures in schools” (Hoyle, et al., 2005). These researchers also stated that a greater
knowledge of multicultural issues and diversity of opinion can enhance school executives’ mediation and leadership skills. Other studies have suggested that all school administrators should possess the following skills to be effective in providing education for the many ethnic groups in American schools:

1. Finding data sources in the community to monitor demographics;
2. Understanding and celebrating the cultural backgrounds of the members of the school community;
3. Developing networks with church leaders and social service agencies to reach all sections of the community;
4. Seeking curriculum materials and textbooks relevant to a multicultural student body;
5. Making every effort to hire and maintain faculty and staff who mirror the ethnic, racial, and cultural composition of the community;
6. Conducting staff development to inform staff about the racial, cultural, and individual needs of all students in the district (Hoyle, et al., 2005).

When analyzing the overall impact of accountability policies and changing demographics on decision-making in schools, it is important to consider how schools are organized as well as some theories of leadership that are significant in decision-making. Because of the weak organizational structure of public schools, many theorists have found it very difficult to apply traditional organizational theories and models to public schools. This structural looseness is one of several factors that make it difficult to control work through conventional bureaucratic procedures and hierarchies, as with many conventional organizational models. Because many groups within the school
organization act independently, with limited contact and interaction with each other, some theorists have come to describe the school organizational structure as a “loosely coupled” system (Gamoran & Dreeban, 1986). Others have used the term “organized anarchy” to describe school structure. Many of those who classify educational organizations under these types of models also readily cite evidence that documents the weak authoritative control that school administrators have over the teachers’ work within the school (Gamoran & Dreeban, 1986). With the visual created from descriptions such as these, one would question the degree of impact that any school leader could possibly have on the organization when it come to decision-making, resource allocation and the overall philosophy and implementation of the curriculum which would directly impact the quality of education a district offers.

When discussing the type of leadership and philosophy that a school administrator may bring to a school district it is relevant to examine the reasons given as to why a board selects a particular superintendent to lead a district as well as the career pathways of superintendents. The American Association of School Administrators has conducted an authoritative State of the Superintendency report every decade since 1923. This report is a source of statistical data which provides insight into the changing role of the superintendency. Table 1 presents the results of multi-year surveys regarding why the school boards hired a superintendent.
Table 1. Reasons School Boards Hire Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be a change agent</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain status quo</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leader</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A specific task</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No particular reason</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Association of School Administrators (2007, p. 6)

Table 1 shows a dramatic change in the reasons school boards select superintendents, from “personal characteristics,” which was most clearly the most important factor in 1980 is now replaced to “instructional leader” in 2006. At the beginning of the period under study A Nation at Risk was released and near the end NCLB was put into effect which included high-stakes testing and school accountability as major features.

An examination of career pathways also indicates that the role of the superintendent in the instructional program has received significant attention in recent years. Table 2 shows the positions held for more than one year at some point prior to becoming a superintendent.
Table 2. Positions Held by Superintendents Prior to Assuming Their Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position held</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Superintendent - Business</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Superintendent - Curriculum/Instruction</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Superintendent - Human Resources</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Superintendent - Operations</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Superintendent - Personnel</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Program Director</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Dept. of Education staff</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another position in public education</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Association of School Administrators (2007, p. 34)

Table 2 reveals that a significant number of superintendents held positions closely related to instruction (e.g. principal, associate superintendent-curriculum and instruction) before their appointment.

Superintendents are indeed being held increasingly more accountable for student performance in school districts. Many superintendents discover, however that the current bureaucratic structure does not work for them in that they are expected to create school improvement strategies and at the same time discipline the subordinates beneath them in the hierarchy. This can become an almost impossible task as many superintendents find that their nominal subordinates have firm political and economic bases, control of categorical funds, alliances with elected officials (to include school board members), support in local community or ethnic organizations and close ties with teachers unions. This type of bureaucracy does not promote school quality, but isolates and diffuses responsibilities (Hill, 2003).

As many school boards struggle with state and federal mandates to improve low performing schools, many adopt the logic that "if we are going to be held accountable for something, we had better control it." This does not work with schools because,
according to Paul Hill, school boards face one certainty and one uncertainty. The certainty is that they cannot, by imposing general prescriptions, make all schools in their district effective. The uncertainty is that they do not know for sure what it will take to provide effective schools for all poor and disadvantaged children (Hill, 2003). Due to such phenomena, school boards have traditionally never been effective stewards of school performance.

It is also relevant to discuss the relationship of local school board members with the superintendent and how this affects the structure of power of the district leadership. Taken as a whole, reports from the last decade underscore the importance of school leadership and its role in redesigning teaching to enhance student learning, particularly for at-risk children (Hoyle, et al., 2005). When examining the relationship between school board members and the superintendent, it is important to look at behaviors that may enhance or deteriorate the overall effectiveness of the school district. Both entities typically engage in distinct behaviors when making decisions that can influence the overall effectiveness of the district. A superintendent may have an inclination for high control and continually seek to persuade board members to follow his or her recommendation. This would be the ideal situation in which the system was designed to operate as long as the superintendent has the necessary skills, vision and intentions. As previously stated, the school board’s main concentration should be on policy making and the board should rely on the professional superintendent for management patterned after a corporate board of directors with a CEO.

In many district power structures, the superintendent may develop a relationship that is inclined to lesser control. Here the superintendent may allow board members to
cultivate a wide range of information sources and solicit many opinions throughout the community and district. As long as the school board continues to rely on the superintendent’s recommendations, this type of power structure can still be effective. However, where this relationship can deteriorate is where board members use their information sources to engage in micromanagement and the oversight of management activities (Kowalski, 2006). When this occurs, political interest and allegiances may play a large role in decision-making rather than what is in the best interest of the district or students.

Throughout the United States, board behavior exists on a continuum from acts that resemble a corporate board to a style that may be considered more familial. The most harmony exists when a corporate superintendent style is matched with a similar board and a familial superintendent style is matched with a similar board style that favors relationships (Kowalski, 2006). Failing to discuss personal philosophies and misrepresentations are the two most common causes of value incompatibility and the breakdown of board-superintendent relationships. Usually, differences in philosophies between a school board and the superintendent do not surface until serious problems in the district arise (Kowalski, 2006). In rural districts, superintendents tend to get dismissed because of personal shortcomings such as financial mismanagement, poor communication and marital immorality. In urban districts their dismissal is usually for political reasons such as not mollifying critics who demand radical change and power changes. To avoid problems, school boards and superintendents should periodically reevaluate their relationship. In addition, school boards should also do self-
assessments and clarify their own purpose and evaluate this purpose as it relates to previous actions (Kowalski, 2006).

The leadership style that a superintendent brings to a district will most likely have a direct impact on the decisions that are made that impact key areas such as daily operations, curriculum, morale, as well as how resources will be allocated to support these decisions. James MacGregor Burns identified two types of leadership styles: transactional and transformational (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). He stated that transactional leadership is when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of something valued, or an approach with an eye toward exchanging. Another way to look at transactional leadership is that it is mainly concerned with the necessary activities of a leader that takes up most of his or her day, or more of a managerial approach (Waterman & Peters, 1992).

According to Bernard Bass, transactional leadership occurs when the leader rewards or disciplines followers depending on the adequacy of the followers’ performance (Bass, 1998). It depends on contingent reinforcement based on either positive Contingent Reward (CR) or more negative rewards of management-by-exception (MBE) (Bass, 1998).

Bass stated that Contingent Reward (CR) has been found to be reasonably effective in motivating others to achieve higher levels of development and performance. With CR the leader assigns or gets agreement on what needs to be done and promises a reward or rewards others in exchange for satisfactorily carrying out an assignment. The corrective form of transactional leadership, Management by Exception (MBE) tends to be more ineffective than contingent reward or any component of transformational
leadership. Bass states that MBE may be active (MBE-A) or passive (MBE-P). With MBE-A the leader arranges to actively monitor deviances from standards, mistakes and errors in the follower’s assignments and takes corrective action as necessary. With MBE-P, the leader passively waits for deviances, mistakes and errors to occur and then takes corrective action. This usually occurs when leaders must supervise large numbers of employees who report directly to the leader (Bass, 1998).

The most extreme form of passive or inactive leadership is classified as Laissez-Faire Leadership (LF). This is defined as the avoidance or absence of leadership and is according to most research, the most ineffective. Under this style, authority remains unused and actions are delayed, responsibilities of leadership are ignored and decisions are not made (Bass, 1998).

Burns described transformational leadership as a style that involves shifts in the beliefs, needs and the values of the followers and engages them in a relationship of mutual dependence in which contributions of both sides are acknowledged and rewarded (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). The transformational leader is one who builds on man’s need for meaning and seeks to create an overall institutional purpose. This type of leader is not only concerned with the day-to-day activities but also with “tricks of the pedagogue, the mentor, the linguist, and is more successful in becoming the value shaper, the exemplar and the maker of meanings” (Waterman & Peters, 1992).

The transformational leaders do more with colleagues and followers than set up simple agreements. According to Bass, they behave in ways to achieve superior results by employing one or more of four components of transformational leadership (Bass, 1998). The first component would fall under that of Charismatic Leadership, or
Idealized Influence (CL or II). This style of transformational leadership involves the leader serving as an example and being a role model for his or her followers. These leaders are admired, respected and trusted and can be considered consistent rather than arbitrary. They are looked on as demonstrating high standards of ethical and moral conduct (Bass, 1998).

Bass’s research indicated that a second component of transformational leadership is Inspirational Motivational (IM). Here, transformational leaders behave in ways to inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers’ work which arouses team spirit, enthusiasm and optimism. A vision of future states of the organization attracts followers and expectations are clearly communicated. Followers demonstrate commitment to goals and a shared vision. Bass states that both charismatic and inspirational leadership are usually combined to form a single factor of charismatic-inspirational leadership (Bass, 1998).

Bass classified the third component of transformational leadership as Intellectual Stimulation (IS). The leader stimulates followers to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems and thinking about old problems in a new way. Creativity is encouraged and there is no public criticism of individual member’s mistakes which encourages new ideas and creative problem solving (Bass, 1998).

The fourth component of transformational leadership is listed as Individualized Consideration (IC). In addition to encouraging innovation, the transformational leader pays special attention to each individual follower’s need for achievement and growth by acting as a coach and mentor. Followers are developed to successively higher levels of potential. According to Bass, transformational leadership demonstrates acceptance to
individual differences and manages followers according to their individual characteristics and needs (Bass, 1998).

Continuums of effective and ineffective leadership developed by Bass and Avolio (1994) differentiate these styles in terms of passive and active leadership. The Passive styles include that of MBE-P and LF and are shown to be the least effective. The active styles are MBE-A, CR and the I’s. The most effective on these continuums are the active forms of leadership with the I’s, which include Charismatic (Idealized Influence), Inspirational Motivational, Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration, being found to be the most effective. Studies have also been completed in various type of organizations in business and industry, government, military, educational institutions and nonprofit organizations that have examined the models of the full range of leadership. Some of these studies have shown that developing transformational leadership with training in its components can enhance effectiveness and satisfaction as a leader. In addition, transformational leadership, as measured by subordinates’ ratings, correlate more highly with effectiveness than ratings associated with transactional leadership. Studies have also shown that transformational scores were higher among innovative school principals Howell & Higgins (1990), Marine Corps commanders of more highly effective helicopter squadrons (Salter, 1989), and Methodist ministers with greater Sunday church attendance and membership growth (Onnen, 1987) (Bass, 1998). Other relevant studies that have resulted in similar findings include Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein (1988), Howell & Avolio, (1993), Hater & Bass, (1988) and Yammarino & Bass, (1990) (Bass, 1998).
Even though school district leaders may possess skills and competencies that would characterize them as transformational leaders, it is possible that many campus and district leaders are being influenced by the outside pressures of accountability, and many resources are being allocated to test prep materials as they attempt to “manage” test scores and increase student performance on high-stakes testing. Because of these policies, many school leaders may face moral dilemmas in decision-making and resource allocation taking the concept of transformational leadership to yet another level. Moral transformational leadership that concerns itself with social justice concentrates on education and educational leadership from the progressive or critical theory standpoint as well as focuses on the uses and abuses of power in institutional settings (Dantley & Tillman, 2006). The concept of social justice is mainly focused on marginalized groups who are the most often underserved and under represented and face various forms of oppression in schools. According to Dantley and Tillman, leadership for social justice “interrogates the policies and procedures that shape schools and, at the same time, perpetuate social inequalities and marginalization due to race, class, gender and other markers of otherness.” Individuals who see themselves as transformative and moral leaders should also be public intellectuals who seek to examine ways in which schools and other systems contribute to maintaining the social, political and economic status quo. Another concept of this definition is social justice praxis, which involves activities such as research and scholarship, conference presentations and pedagogical methods that can be used to articulate a broader discourse on leadership for social justice and moral transformative leadership (Dantley & Tillman, 2006).
Many school leaders, who may be classified as moral transformative leaders, may find themselves in a serious moral dilemma due to accountability policies, such as those contained in NCLB. As previously stated, NCLB requires schools to show Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) each year, to include all subgroups, or face sanctions. Schools and districts that do not measure up will be listed as “in need of improvement” and parents will have the choice to move their children to another school within the district. Schools that do not improve after 5 years will be restructured and personnel will be replaced on failing campus (West & Peterson, 2003). With high-stakes testing being a primary measuring device and tied very closely to school credibility and quite possibly school funding, many school leaders find themselves pressured to reduce the number of failing students or reduce the consequences of failure. In addition, even though accountability may yield some long term systemic benefits, a meaningful high-stakes testing system will inevitably fail some students and thereby create some clear losers (Hess, 2003). Since children in minority and low-income communities are disproportionately likely to fail high-stakes exams, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) has officially opposed decisions to withhold diplomas or grade promotion on the basis of test results, deeming such policies as an effort to blame the victim (Hess, 2003). Because of factors such as these, leaders in schools with a high degree of economically disadvantaged and minority students may find themselves with even more of a moral dilemma when decisions are made that involve the allocation of resources that directly impact the curriculum.

In the current educational climate, a superintendent must be more than just a manager. He or she must understand the culture of the organization as well as that of
the community and students. In a study conducted by Angela Valenzuela, academic achievement and schooling orientations among immigrant Mexican and Mexican-American students was examined. In studying a large urban school district with a large minority population, she concluded that “rather than functioning as a conduit for the American dream, the large, overcrowded, and under-funded urban school reproduces Mexican youth as a monolingual, English-speaking, ethnic minority, neither identified with Mexico nor equipped to function competently in America’s mainstream” (Valenzuela, 1999). A very significant aspect of her study was that it discussed how generational status plays an influential role in school experiences and the success of immigrant children, or their descendants. First and often second-generation students academically outperform their third and later-generational counterparts (Valenzuela, 1999). Valenzuela pointed out that there have been attempts to explain this phenomenon by comparing the attributes/attitudes of immigrants to those of their later generational counterparts. She found some major drawbacks to this approach which includes the notion of how the interrelatedness of immigrant achievement gets obscured. In her study, a major assumption made was that achievement is a social process whereby orientations toward schooling are nurtured in familiar contexts among those with similar dispositions. Valenzuela’s research suggests that schools, such as the one in her study, “are organized formally and informally in ways that fracture students’ cultural and ethnic identities, creating social, linguistic, and cultural divisions among students and between the students and the staff” (Valenzuela, 1999).

The number of students living in poverty in a majority-Hispanic school district is also a crucial attribute that any school leader must understand. Each year, increasing
numbers of children are enrolled in schools and have needs due to circumstances, such as poverty, that schools are not prepared to meet (Pellino, 2007). Because of this phenomenon there is a great need to strengthen and support parents and families through connecting with programs and services of outside organizations. In addition, home-school collaboration is particularly important for children of poverty in helping facilitate better educational outcomes and school leaders must be prepared to make special efforts to reach out to parents and families of poverty, helping them to help their children (Pellino, 2007).

The notion that most of the superintendents in Texas that lead school districts facing this phenomenon are also from vastly different backgrounds and experiences than the communities they serve may be significant. As a leader of a majority-Hispanic school district, one should be familiar with phenomena as previously discussed, as well as, how decisions that are made affect the well being of all of the students served and their overall academic performance. One way of examining this significance is by examining a concept known as the “Ladder of Inference.” What this suggests is that people base their actions and beliefs on their own personal experiences. These experiences greatly influence the selected data and experience that one will pay attention to which may lead to a distortion of true reality. As these beliefs become more and more rigid, the selected data and experience that one is willing to acknowledge will become a smaller and smaller portion of reality (Bellinger, 2004). It can be assumed that most of the white-male superintendents leading Texas schools districts have vastly different backgrounds and experiences than the constituents they lead. An important question to ask is how one goes about the short circuiting of reality of ones own
personal experiences and beliefs which would enable one to address existing issues realistically (Bellinger, 2004). This would then greatly influence the decisions that are made as well as the allocation of resources to best serve the needs of the students of a particular community.

Superintendents who consider themselves as transformative leaders may be faced with challenges in finding ways to balance the demands of accountability policies as well as ensure that all students are being served to their maximum capacity. By influencing the members of the school community and engaging them in relationships of mutual interdependence in which all values are acknowledged and considered, the transformational leader could achieve buy-in from his constituents to achieve high standards in a system of conflicting interests. The school community must not only be seeking high test scores, but also recognizing other rewarding accomplishments that benefit the students and school as a whole. The entire school community must also have input in how the resources are allocated in order to develop ownership in the overall mission of the school and to ensure that the needs of all students are being met. Having a true understanding and cultural awareness of a community is crucial for any school leader.

**Critical Race Theory**

When investigating leadership theories in the educational arena as well as implications for minority students, it may be necessary to examine them through the lens of critical race. Critical Race Theory (CRT) is a concept that originated in the legal arena and then proceeded to influence literature within the social sciences. It is not a theory that has received a significant amount of study within the field of educational
leadership, “where the discourse on diversity has failed to penetrate the salience of racism in schooling” (Lopez, 2003). According to the Critical Race Theory, race is placed at the center of critical analysis and there are no sets of doctrines or methodologies that specifically define critical race theory (North Carolina Central University, 2006). CRT emphasizes the socially constructed nature of race, considers judicial conclusions to be the result of the workings of power, and opposes the continuation of all forms of subordination (Lopez, 2003).

Delgado and Stefancic (2001) state that the most agreed upon propositions of critical race theory would most likely fall into three basic tenets. The first is that racism is ordinary, not aberrational. It is “normal science,” the usual way society does business, the common, everyday experience of most people of color in the United States. The second tenet theorists would most likely agree upon is that our system of white-over-color ascendancy serves important purposes, both psychic and material. Delgado and Stefancic break this tenet down into two basic features. The first of these features is ordinariness which means that racism is difficult to cure or address. The second feature of white-over-color ascendancy is sometimes referred to as “interest convergence,” or material determinism. This adds a further dimension because racism advances the interest of both white elites (materially) and working class people (psychically) and large segments of society have little incentive to eradicate it (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

The third tenet of critical race Delgado and Stefancic lists as most likely agreed upon is known as the “social construction” thesis. This idea holds that race and races are products of social thoughts and relations and correspond to no biological or genetic reality. Instead, races are categories that society invents, manipulates, or eradicates
when convenient. People with common origins share common physical traits, but these
traits constitute only an extremely small portion of their genetic endowment and are
dwarfed by that which we have in common. These physical traits have little or nothing to
do with distinctly human, higher order traits, such as personality, intelligence and moral
behavior. This tenet also suggests that society frequently chooses to ignore these
scientific facts, creates races and perpetuates them with pseudo-permanent
characteristics which are of great interest to critical race theorists (Delgado & Stefancic,
2001).

CRT has been increasingly applied to the field of public education. In 1991,
Jonathan Kozal pointed out great inequities that exist between the schooling
experiences of white middle-class students and those of poor African American and
Latino students (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006). According to Ladson-Billings & Tate,
social inequity, and particularly school inequity, is based on three central propositions:

1. Race continues to be a significant factor in determining inequity in the United
   States.
2. U.S. society is based on property rights.
3. The intersection of race and property creates an analytic tool through which we
can understand social (and consequently school) inequity (Ladson-Billings &
   Tate, 2006).

Ladson-Billings & Tate state that these propositions are easily documented in
both statistical and demographic data and pointed out that Hacker’s (1992) study of
education and life chances such as high school dropout rates, suspension rates, and
incarceration rates echo earlier statistics which were compiled by the Children’s
In other studies, Omi and Winant (1993) argued that there are epistemological limitations concerning race as either an ideological construct or an objective condition. “Thinking of race strictly as an ideological construct denies reality of a racialized society and its impact on ‘raced’ people on their everyday lives. On the other hand, thinking of race solely as an objective condition denies the problematic aspects of race: How do we decide who fits into which racial classifications? How do we categorize racial mixtures?” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006). Ladson-Billings and Tate argue that the paradigms of race have been fused with notions of ethnicity, class and nation because “the theories of race-of its meaning, its transformations, the significant of racial events-have never been a top priority in social science” and that although the ‘founding fathers’ of American sociology… were explicitly with the state of domestic race relations, race remained one of the least developed fields of sociological society” (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006).

Daniel Solórzano (1997, 1998) identified five tenets of CRT for the field of education that can inform theory, research, pedagogy, curriculum and policy. They are:

1. The intercentricity of race and racism.
2. The challenge to dominate ideology.
3. The commitment to social justice.
4. The centrality of experiential knowledge.
5. The utilization of interdisciplinary approaches.

Detailing the intercentricity of race and racism with other forms of subordination, Bell (1992) and Russell (1992) believe that CRT starts from the premise that race and racism are central, endemic, permanent and fundamental in defining how U.S society
functions. Other research indicates that CRT also acknowledges the inextricable layers of racialized subordination based on gender, class, immigration status, surname, phenotype, accent and sexuality (Yosso, 2005).

In breaking down Solórzano’s second tenet of CRT for the field of education, the challenge to dominate ideology, Yosso (2005) pointed to other research which states that CRT challenges white privilege and refutes the claims of educational institutions to objectivity, meritocracy, color-blindness, race neutrality and equal opportunity. She stated that “CRT challenges notions of ‘neutral’ research or ‘objective’ researchers and exposes deficit-informed research that silences, ignores and distorts epistemologies of People of Color. CRT argues that these traditional claims act as a camouflage for the self-interest, power and privilege of dominant groups in U.S. society” (Yosso, 2005).

Solórzano’s third tenet, the commitment to social justice, is based on the premise that CRT is committed to social justice and stopping oppression. Social justice research can expose the “interest-convergence” of civil rights “gains” in education and works towards the elimination of racism, sexism and poverty, as well as the empowerment of People of Color and other subordinate groups (Yosso, 2005).

The fourth tenet, the centrality of experiential knowledge, recognizes that the experiential knowledge of People of Color is legitimate, appropriate and critical to understanding, analyzing and teaching about racial subordination. CRT has a focus on the lived experiences of People of Color by including methods such as story telling, family histories, biographies, scenarios, parables, cuentos, testimonios, chronicles and narratives (Yosso, 2005).
Solórzano's fifth tenet of CRT for the field of education, *the utilization of interdisciplinary approaches*, rests on the premise that CRT goes beyond disciplinary boundaries to analyze race and racism within both historic and contemporary contexts. CRT draws on scholarship from ethnic studies, women's studies, sociology, history, law, psychology, film, theatre and other fields. Some relevant studies in CRT are Delgado (1984 & 1992), Garcia (1995), Gotanda (1991), Gutierrez-Jones (2001), Harris (1994) and Olivas (1990) (Yosso, 2005).

Many critical writers in law and social science have recently drawn attention to the ways that the dominant society radicalizes different minority groups at different times in response to shifting needs such as the labor market. Examples cited by Delgado and Stefancic include that at one time society had little use for blacks, but much need for Mexican or Japanese agricultural workers. At another time, the Japanese, which included long standing citizens, may have been in intense disfavor and removed to war relocation camps while society cultivated other groups of color for jobs in war and industry or as “common fodder” on the front. There has also been a shift in common stereotypes of minority groups over time which includes depictions of people of color to be “happy-go-lucky, simpleminded and content to serve white folks.” After later changes of conditions, the very same group may be depicted as menacing, brutish, out of control by various forms of media. These depictions indicate the notion that this group requires close monitoring and repression (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

Differential racialization is the idea that each race has its own origins and ever evolving history is closely related to the notion of intersectionality and anti-essentialism. In other words, no person has a single, easily stated unitary identity which is easily
defined. Another element is the notion of a unique voice of color which holds that because of their different histories and experiences with oppression, black, Indian, Asian, and Latino writers may be able to communicate to their white counterparts' matters that whites are unlikely to know. Stated differently, minority status brings with it a presumed competence to speak about race and racism (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

There is a common historical assumption held by many that if the philosophies, attitudes and beliefs of a dominant culture are forced onto a minority culture, the better they will do in society. According to John Ogbu (1991), this theory that the more a minority group is like the dominant culture, the better they will do is not valid and can be explained by the history of the relationships between the minority and dominant groups involved (Finn, 1999). Ogbu's work put a deeper perspective in the notion of differential racialization by distinguishing between immigrant minorities and involuntary minorities. He explains that immigrant minorities are people who have come to America for improved economic, political, or social opportunities. They encourage their children to adopt the mainstream characteristics necessary for social and academic success. Involuntary minorities are people who became Americans through slavery, conquest, or colonization and who were relegated to an inferior position and denied assimilation. They experience discrimination as a permanent reality and see themselves as oppressed. This has led to an “oppositional identity” which, according to Ogbu, has been created through this history of oppression. “For involuntary minorities, the dominant group is not only different, it is the enemy” and “for these children, for these involuntary minorities, school was not and would never be their home turf” (Finn, 1999). Although many recent Mexican immigrants do fall into this voluntary immigrant
classification, many Mexican-Americans are from southwestern states that were annexed to the United States through conquest. As a result their relationship with the dominant group began as that of citizens in an occupied country (Finn, 1999).

Ogbu’s position may be strengthened by examining the history of public education in Texas and the relationships between Whites and Mexican-American Hispanics. Mexican-Americans were frequently treated as second class citizens and relegated to blue-collar, menial labor and lower paying jobs and Mexican parents sent their children to segregated schools. Attitudes toward the education of Mexican children can be summed up by a statement made by the wife of an Anglo rancher in the 1920s: “Let him (the Mexican) have a good education but still let him know he is not as good as the white man. God did not intend him to be; He would have made them white if he had” (Takaki, 1993). Materialists explain that these types of attitudes emerged due to the idea that conquered nations generally demonize their subjects in order to feel better about exploiting them. Many Texas and southwest ranchers often circulated notions of Mexican inferiority at roughly the same time period that they found it necessary to take over Mexican lands, or later to import Mexican people for back-breaking labor (Delgado and Stefancic, 2001).

Angela Valenzuela (1999) conducted a study at Juan Seguin High School (a pseudonym) where data were collected and analyzed on the generational differences in academic achievement among Mexican youth. The primary goal of this study was to determine the extent to which generational status helped to explain the various levels of achievement of youth of Mexican decent. According to Valenzuela, analyzing the data on grades reporting in her survey allowed her to establish these basic facts. The first
being that students from her study school conform to the general pattern observed elsewhere among first generation Mexican immigrants and U.S. born Mexican American youth. The achievement of the immigrant youth was significantly higher than that of their U.S.-born, second- and third-generation counterparts. She found no significant statistical difference among the generations of U.S. born youth (Valenzuela, 1999).

Her second finding was that females in every generational group tended to outperform their male counterparts and that this gender difference was only evident among youth in the regular college-bound track. Her data also indicated that placement in the college bound track may have had a leveling effect and erased these differences. This particular finding was also reported by Matute-Bianchi (1991) in a similar study of Mexican immigrant and non-immigrant youth regarding both factors of generation and gender. The results in this study not only pointed to females’ higher levels of aspirations and hours of dedication to homework but to the groups more positive rating of school climate as well (Valenzuela, 1999).

Matute-Bianchi’s study also reinforced Valenzuela’s third finding in that immigrant youth experience school significantly more positively than their U.S. born counterparts. This occurred regardless of gender or track placement. They see the teachers as more caring and accessible and rate the school climate as more positive compared to their second and third generation counterparts (Valenzuela, 1999).

Lastly, Valenzuela conducted a survey which showed the students’ parents’ educational levels to be extremely low. The highest average educational attainment peaked around nine years for the parents of the third generation which pointed to the ninth grade as a “watershed year” (Valenzuela, 1999). This corresponded to the results
of a study by Lareau (1989) who found that parents had little educational “advantage” to confer (Valenzuela, 1999).

Lareau (2003) correlated factors related to parental support and “advantage” more to socio-economic class rather than racial or ethnic background. One of the primary findings in her research was that the white and black middle class parents engaged in practices of concerted cultivation where children’s talents, opinions and skills were fostered and assessed. A “sense of entitlement” was observed among the children from the upper-middle class families. According to Lareau, they acted as if they had a right to pursue their own individual preferences and to actively manage interactions in institutional settings. A key to this was how they interacted with adults and authority figures. Lareau stated that the middle class children were taught the “rules of the game” that govern interactions with institutional representatives. Family activities revolved around the schedules of middle class children’s activities and this was generally the rule rather than the exception (Lareau, 2003).

Working class and poor children, on the other hand were usually left to plan their own activities as they generally interacted with other children of the same age group. These parents viewed child rearing as unfolding spontaneously and basic needs were the primary concern. Lareau labeled this form of child rearing the “accomplishment of natural growth.” Although this may prove advantageous in social settings and peer interactions, their interaction with adults and authority figures was limited which can prove to be a disadvantage when these children enter into adult society (Lareau, 2003).

Another key difference found between children of different socioeconomic classes was the use of language and vocabulary in the interaction between children and
adults. The children from working class families tend to be more respectful towards adults as there are clear boundaries between adults and children. The parents in working class and poor households tend to be able to issue directives without being questioned or having to justify their reasoning. This can be advantageous when considering the value of respect for elders; however it may prove to be a disadvantage when considering how interactions occur in society, particularly in higher level and paying occupations. The children of middle class families are taught the skills of debate and discourse as well as the use of a larger vocabulary through concerted cultivation that occurs in everyday interactions. These types of skills will prove useful when competing for upper level jobs. Lareau stated that “one of the benefits of middle class status appears to be the transmission of exceptional verbal skills that enable children to make special requests of adults in positions of power” (Lareau, 2003). On the other hand, the lack of these types of interactions and taking directives, such as in the home of the poor and working class children, is more prevalent in the general labor force and lower paying occupations (Lareau, 2003).

The awareness of economic resources and their availability was also a key difference when comparing families from different socioeconomic classes. In addition, the parents’ economic resources are a primary factor in creating the class differences discussed in the study. How these economic resources are negotiated and discussed within the households was also an interesting phenomenon revealed in this study. In most of the families from the middle class homes, money was rarely discussed and seemed readily available to fit the needs and lifestyles of those children. Many of the activities that these children participated in were very costly in both time and money.
Even though some of the middle class parents showed concern about their future economic well-being, this was rarely shared with the children, which most likely contributed to their sense of entitlement (Lareau, 2003).

Valenzuela also found that there were competing definitions of caring at Seguin. Even though teenagers often lament that “Nobody cares,” she found it to be a more complex reality and found this perspective at various levels throughout the school. This was found to be significant because Nodding's (1988) concept of authentic caring was viewed in sustained reciprocal relationships between teachers and students as a basis for all learning (Valenzuela, 1999). Nodding (1984, 1992) also argued that teachers’ ultimate goal of apprehending their students’ subjective reality is best achieved through engrossment in their students’ welfare and emotional displacement. This implies that authentically caring teachers’ goals are directed by their students’ needs and their energy flows toward these projects and needs (Valenzuela, 1999).

Valenzuela found that the predominantly non-Latino teaching staff at Seguin saw students as not caring about school, while students saw teachers not as caring sufficiently caring for them. She stated that “teachers expect students to demonstrate caring about schooling with an abstract or aesthetic commitment. Immigrant and U.S born youth, on the other hand, are committed to an authentic form of caring that emphasizes relations of reciprocity between teachers and students” (Valenzuela, 1999). She also discussed how the view that students do not care about school stems from several sources, including social and cultural distance in student-adult relationships and their school culture itself. Valenzuela stated that “most of the school’s staff neither live nor participate in their student’s predominantly Mexican community. The non-Latino
teachers who constitute the majority (81 percent) are doubtful and even defensive about the suggestion that more Latino teachers would make a difference in school climate" (Valenzuela, 1999).

The concept of the “caring” teacher and its impact on student engagement has been researched in various studies. Mercado’s (1993) research illustrated how beliefs about students shape the instructional behaviors of teachers. She contended that the accomplishments of the middle school Latino students, which she and her colleagues worked with, resulted as much from the ethic of caring the instructional team demonstrated as from promoting academic learning. One common theme that emerged with African American students about their experiences in segregated schools was the interpersonal caring of the teachers and administrators.

“…they remembered these schools as ‘homes away from home,’ places where they were nourished, supported, protected, encouraged and held accountable. The students recalled their teachers having faith and conviction in the students’ abilities; being demanding, yet supportive and encouraging; and insisting that students have high aspirations to be the best they can be” (Gay, 2000). Mercado also found that the teachers and administrators did not limit their interactions with students to merely teaching subject matter. “They demonstrated concerns for the students’ emotional, physical, economic, and interpersonal conditions as well. In so doing, a consistently caring climate was created that made students more willing to participate in learning tasks and encouraged higher levels of achievement” (Gay, 2000). These findings are
similar to findings reported by Jones (1901) Siddle-Walker (1993), and Sowell (1976).

This research supports the concept that caring looms large in the overall performance of the students. Caring teachers honor students’ humanity, hold them in high esteem, expect high performance and use strategies to fulfill their expectations. When teachers sincerely care about student performance, they are willing to take risks and attempt new strategies to enhance classroom instruction (Gay, 2000).

As stated by Geneva Gay, “caring is concern for person and performance.” Teacher interactions should not be limited to teaching only subject matter. The effective teacher should be concerned with establishing a consistently caring environment, which encourages the students to be more willing to participate in the learning tasks, and facilitates higher levels of achievement. The positive learning environment which is established includes the attitudes, expectations and accountability standards that are set forth by the teacher. Caring teachers are demanding but facilitative; supportive and accessible both personally and professionally. Also, when teachers fail to demand high accountability they are essentially abdicating their pedagogical responsibilities. In addition, “racial biases, ethnic stereotyping, cultural ethnocentrism, and personal rejections cause teachers, who don’t care to devalue, demand, and even fear some African American, Latino, Native American, and Asian American students in their classrooms. These devaluations are accompanied by low or negative expectations about their intellectual abilities, which have disastrous effects on student achievement” (Gay, 2000).
The concept of caring in general, whether it is in education or society, can be tied to a particular school of critical race theorists who may be referred to as realists or economic determinists. At one point in history this school was in a large majority in CRT. This school of thought holds that though attitudes and words are important, racism is much more than having an unfavorable impression of members of another group. For the realist, racism is a means by which society allocates privilege and status and these hierarchies determine who gets tangible benefits including the best jobs and the best schools (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Realists point out that prejudice sprung up with slavery, and prior to that time, educated Europeans held a generally positive attitude toward Africans, recognizing that African civilization was highly advanced with vast libraries and centers of learning.

What may be true for the subordination of minorities may also be true for the relief of it. Delgado and Stefancic stated that civil rights “gains” for communities of color coincide with the dictates of white self-interest and that little happens out of altruism alone (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Derrick Bell argued in the Harvard Law Review that civil rights advances for blacks always coincided with changes in economic conditions along with the self-interest of elite whites. Citing Brown v. Board of Education (1954) as an example, Bell argued that world and domestic considerations were key factors in this decision, rather than moral issues involving blacks. He contended that by 1954 the United States had ended the Korean War, which was not long after World War II, and that African American Servicemen had performed gallantly in both wars. These American soldiers returned to the U.S., having experienced for the first time a setting where cooperation and survival took precedence over racism.
Because they were not likely to return to menial labor and social vilification, the possibility of domestic unrest loomed. The U.S. was also locked into the Cold War and trying to win the loyalties of the uncommitted Third World, much of which were people of color. Even though Bell’s article was greeted with outrage, Mary Dudziak carried out extensive research on U.S. governmental archives ten years later and found Bell’s intuition to be correct (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

When various actions, occurring throughout the history of public education, are examined through the lens of critical race, many argue that law makers, schools and leaders continue to be insensitive to the backgrounds and experiences of minority students. A study by Harmon Zeigler and Michael Boss (1974) identified a concern that had arisen with school board members’ and superintendents’ recognition of, or sensitivity to, racial problems in the schools in the 1970s (Zeigler & Boss, 1974). They asked two open-ended questions during interviews to gain school leader perspectives on the kinds of major problems within the school district followed by the kinds of racial problems in the school district. A large number of school board members and superintendents who responded reported that they recognized no racial problems within their schools. According to Zeigler and Boss, given the general characteristics of race relations in society at the time of their study, it would be very surprising if there were not some minor racial difficulty in most school districts with some non-white students. They also stated that “school governors apparently do not recognize such difficulties as being ‘problems,’ a fact that undoubtedly upsets the black citizen.” Another finding in their study was that school governors appeared to recognize racial problems only where major issues or crises have evolved and that “there appears to be a fundamental
ambiguity in what constitutes a racial problem” (Zeigler & Boss, 1974). In addition, their research pointed out that among school board members and superintendents who do report recognizing some racial problems, a large number related these problems to integration and race. “The general integration problem was cited by school board members or superintendents in nearly 70 percent of the school districts.” Even though some school districts did recognize problems such as these, well over one third of the school board members and superintendents recognized no racial problems. Some of the reasons cited for this phenomenon were that “racial distinctions are precluded by the prevailing ‘rational’ ideology within the educational system and therefore are unidentifiable within the educational system.” A second reason cited was that the civil rights movement throughout the United States during this time period had been “highly symbolic in nature and the grievances about the schools, expressed through the movement, have not clarified the substantive nature of racial problems in the schools” (Zeigler & Boss, 1974).

Ladson-Billings & Tate (1995) asserted that race remains a significant factor in general and in education in particular. They also argued that race remained un-theorized as a topic of scholarly inquiry in education and contended that CRT could be employed to examine the role of race and racism in the educational context. Ladson-Billings & Tate specifically detailed the intersection of race and property rights and how this construct could be used to understand inequity in schools and schooling (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006).

A theoretical construct often outlined in the legal literature on CRT is the concept of “whiteness as property.” Ladson-Billings & Tate based their work on that of Cheryl
Harris' in the construct of “whiteness and property.” Here Harris (1993) argued that “although the popular conception of property is in terms of some tangible object—a home or a car, for example—many theorists hold that, historically within the U.S. society, property is a right rather than a physical object. When property is conceived this way, it is possible to examine property value (in terms of rights) of whiteness” (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006). Harris’ core characteristic of whiteness as property is “the legal legitimation of expectations of power and control that enshrine the status quo as a neutral baseline, while masking the maintenance of white privilege and domination” (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006).

It can be argued that one of these privileges and benefits of property is the absolute right to exclude. The manifestations of this property function of whiteness in education were outlined by Ladson-Billings & Tate as follows:

“In schooling, the absolute right to exclude was demonstrated initially by denying blacks access to schooling altogether. Later, it was demonstrated by the creation and maintenance of separate schools. More recently it has been demonstrated by white-flight and the growing insistence on vouchers, public funding of private schools, and schools of choice. Within schools, absolute right to exclude is demonstrated by segregation via tracking” (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006).

Dixson and Rousseau (2006) argued that tracking can therefore be viewed as one of the current means through which the property right of whiteness is asserted in education. They contended that African American and Latino students are disproportionately placed in the lowest tracks and afforded fewer educational
opportunities as a result and use of studies by Darling-Hammond (1997); Oaks (1995) and Oaks, Muir and Joseph (2000) to support this assertion (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006).

Garrett Albert Duncan examined the socio-temporal aspect of education and justice to examine schooling and equality 50 years after *Brown v. Board of Education*. He asserts that CRT is an especially useful tool for examining how socio-temporal notions of race inform the naturalization of oppression and the normalization of racial inequality in public schools and society. Duncan stated that in contemporary times, concepts like “inner city” and “urban” reiterate the “savage,” “primitive,” and “barbaric” in the present and that the application of these concepts to certain schools and students indicate the allochronism that informs public education (Duncan, 2006). The term allochronism coined by Johannes Fabian, describes “a denial of the dialectical relationship between subject and object that divests the object of knowledge (whether person, body, art form, culture, or race) of the ability to act in and occupy the same temporal space as the observing subject of knowledge.” According to Fabian, “a clear conception of allochronism is the prerequisite and frame for a critique of racism” (Barnhart, 2006).

An indication that the subject of racism remains alive and well in education was a 2005 headline in Memphis, Tennessee which read, “Herenton hits racial nerve on schools.” This originated from a statement by the mayor, who was advocating for school consolidation of city and county public school districts, where he told state legislators his view of school funding: “You know when the funding mechanism is going
to change – it’s when the education of White students in suburbs begins to suffer” (Rousseau, 2006).

There were many responses both for and against Herenton’s comments. Many claimed the he was a racist and condemned his remarks while others argued that there was truth in the mayor’s words. The main point that was made, however, is that race remains an issue in American public education. Ladsen-Billings and Tate wrote in 1995 that “race continues to be a significant factor in determining inequity in the United States.” They also asserted that the significance of race is reflected in the school experience and performance between white students and students of color (Rousseau, 2006). Rousseau stated “that the examination of this CRT moment is significant for what it reveals about the power of the realist/materialist perspective” and quoted Delgado (2001) on the distinction between the idealist and the realist perspective. Delgado offered the following:

“Suppose…extraterrestrials leave behind a…pill that eliminates unkind thoughts, stereotypes, and misimpressions harbored by some individuals toward persons of other races. Perhaps an enterprising entrepreneur develops ‘The ultimate Diversity Seminar’ capable of producing the same result. The president’s civil rights advisor prevails on all the nation’s school system to introduce this seminar into every K-12 classroom, and the major television networks feature it on prime time. Would life improve very much for people of color?” (Rousseau, 2006).

Rousseau stated that the case in Memphis is an example of what Delgado described and stated that “in particular, the answer to the question at the conclusion of Delgado’s hypothetical is clearly ‘no.’ In this case, the end of symbolic subordination (in the form of
*de jure* segregation) did not bring about significant improvement in the material conditions of African Americans in Memphis, specifically with respect to education" (Rousseau, 2006).

Occurrences such as Memphis’ provide serious implications to the modern superintendency and school leadership and are clear indications of the complex competencies required to be successful. How a superintendent is prepared to lead districts in a multicultural setting may have a direct impact on his or her success which should be a focus for educational administration programs across the country.

The history of preparatory and graduate programs in educational leadership is rather brief, and its development is not as well defined as that of preparatory programs of other professions such as law, medicine and dentistry which have state and national boards that influence program standards, content, instructional programs and licensing. In addition, the profession has not conducted a definitive study of superintendent programs, faculty, and student enrollment and characteristics in the last decade even though many scholars have made some general observations. What has been observed is that preparation is usually protracted over several years and is characterized as serving individuals who are midcareer, in their mid-30 to mid-40 and married with family responsibilities. Because of this, the typical students are part-time commuters who pursue graduate degrees or administrator certification by attending evening and summer school classes. Even with these limitations, however, there has been an increase in the number of superintendents who have been pursuing advanced graduate degrees over the past thirty years, particularly the doctorate (Hoyle, et al, 2005).
Although the competencies of district leaders are complex, they can be broken down into eight basic standards. These standards include various indicators of what the modern executive superintendent should be able to do. These standard competencies include the following areas:

1. Strategic Leadership and District Culture
2. Policy and Governance
3. Communication and Community Relations
4. Leadership and Organizational Management and School Finance
5. Curriculum Planning and Development
6. Instructional Management
7. Staff Evaluation and Personnel Management

Even though the competencies of working in a multicultural or majority-Hispanic context may fall under one or more of these standards, the emphasis seems to be lacking as public school demographics change. The influence of the community environment has a strong influence on both school districts and superintendents. It is rare that effective, high-achieving school districts are found in communities with weak leadership, conflict, and low expectations for public education (Hoyle et al, 2005).

When planning curriculum, leaders and planners face a huge challenge to include multicultural elements of customs, beliefs, traditions, history, and successes of all constituents in a community. “Rising numbers of young Hispanics, African Americans and Asians will soon strip the word “minority’ from its dictionary meaning” and these changes of demographics have propelled chief school officers into deep
study of the cultures and ethnic groups of their states, their nation, and the world (Hoyle, et al, 2005). There is much research that points to ways that a student’s gender, class, and race influence how he/she responds to the school curriculum in a dominant culture. According to Lee (2003):

“First, they reject it as alien and distance themselves from it. Second, they may see it as something to be memorized or circumvented in order to avoid public humiliation; third, they may accommodate themselves to it and be dismissive of their own experiences and perspectives; or fourth, they may feel relatively ‘at home’ with it and be critical of it” (Hoyle, et al, 2005).

It is important for a superintendent to be aware of such dynamics to ensure that the curriculum respects all cultures and lifestyles and that school executives practice full multi-cultural inclusion. According to Ramsey (1987), there are eight goals for creating inclusive curriculum for all learners:

1. Help children develop positive identities and become effective members of diverse groups
2. Enable children to see themselves a part of a large society that involves equal membership in a variety of groups.
3. Respect diversity in how people live.
4. Encourage cooperation among diverse student groups.
5. Help students develop a sense of social responsibility beyond their own group.
6. Empower students to be critical social activists.
7. Promote the development of educational and social skills needed to effectively live in a larger society.
8. Develop positive school-family relationships (Hoyle et al., 2005).

There continues to be a vast amount of research that is developing on multicultural education. Sleeter (1999) stated that “educators must learn to listen to and learn from the students and their parents; they must learn about the community from which the students come. This means inviting dialog and listening non-defensively” (Hoyle, et al., 2005). According to Banks, et al. (2001), the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington and the Common Destiny Alliance at the University of Maryland sponsored the Multicultural Education Consensus Panel. This panel set forth 12 principles of multicultural education:

1. Professional development programs should help teachers understand the complex characteristics of ethnic groups within U.S. society and ways race, ethnicity, language and social class interact to influence student behavior.

2. Schools should ensure that all students have equitable opportunities to learn and to meet high standards.

3. The curriculum should help the students understand that knowledge is socially constructed and reflects researchers' personal experiences as well as social, political, and economic contexts in which they live and work.

4. Schools should provide all students with opportunities to participate in extracurricular and co-curricular activities that develop knowledge, skills, and attitudes that increase academic achievement and foster positive interracial relationships.

5. Schools should create and make salient super-ordinate or cross-cutting groups in order to improve intergroup relations.
6. Students should learn about stereotyping and other related biases that have negative effects on racial and ethnic relations.

7. Students should learn about the values shared by virtually all cultural groups (e.g., justice, equality, freedom, peace, compassion and charity).

8. Teachers should help students acquire the social skills needed to interact effectively with students from other racial, ethnic, cultural and language groups.

9. School should provide opportunities for students from different racial, ethnic, cultural and language groups to interact socially under conditions designed to reduce fear and anxiety.

10. A school’s organizational strategies should ensure that decision-making is widely shared and that members of the school community learn collaborative skills and dispositions in order to create a caring learning environment for students.

11. Leaders should ensure that all public schools, regardless of their locations, are funded equitably.

12. Teachers should use multiple culturally sensitive techniques to assess complex cognitive and social skills.

Another important item that superintendents must monitor is the dynamics of state leadership which governs curriculum development and standards. In 2008, Texas officials rejected a plea for Latino input on the state curriculum. State Board of Education Chairman Don McLeroy proclaimed that there is neither time nor a reason to slow down a plan to update English language arts and reading curriculum for public
schools. Representative Abel Herrero, who represents the House Mexican American Caucus, asked Mcлерoy to include experts in Latino culture and stated “there is no way that ignoring such a sizable chunk of this population from consideration of education policy will do anything but harm the opportunity of a generation” (Scharrer, 2008).

According to the Texas Education Agency, Hispanic children now make up 47 percent of the 4.7 million students attending public schools with 35 percent being White and 14 percent being African American. Because of this, Mary Helen Berlanga, the senior member of the State Board of Education, stated that the refusal of her colleagues to include Latino experts in developing a new curriculum amounted to malice. She stated “it’s ignorance on their part…we’re trying to teach (minority children) English language arts, and all we want is someone who has researched these children and their learning styles to find out where they are deficient and where we can help them…we can save a whole population of children” (Scharrer, 2008).

Recent debates such as these indicate that the subject of race in education and educational leadership continues to be a significant topic of concern and school leaders must be prepared to meet the needs of all students. Ladson-Billings and Tate identified a necessary tension that exists between CRT in education and what they term as the “multicultural paradigm” (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006 p 24). Multicultural education has originated as a reform movement designed to affect change in education so that students from diverse racial, ethnic and other social-class groups will experience education equally. Banks (1973) stated that practical demonstrations of multicultural education in schools, however, often reduce this to “trivial examples of artifacts of cultures, such as eating ethnic or cultural foods, sing songs or dancing, reading folktales
and other less than scholarly activities substituted for pursuing the fundamentally
different conceptions of knowledge or quest for social justice” (Dixson & Rousseau,
2006). Whether or not much has changed in 2008 remains a topic of discussion.

American public education has been undergoing an unprecedented period of
transformation. Superintendents are the most visible advocate of reason and support
for the schools, meeting with parent and student councils, business alliances,
government officials, and others to advocate and support the cause of education (Carter
& Cunningham, 1997). They must analyze their systems, diagnose problems and make
changes as well as be aggressive in addressing inadequate performance by students,
teachers and schools.
Chapter 3

Methodology

Chapter 3 includes a review of the purpose of the study and a description of the participants, research design, instrumentation, data analysis, and ethical considerations.

The purposes of this study were: 1) identify the characteristics of the White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations; 2) to identify the career pathways and experiences of value of White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations; 3) to ascertain what these men consider to be major challenges they have faced, how they dealt with these challenges as well as what impact, if any, state and federal accountability policies have had on their decision-making and resource allocation processes; and 4) to ascertain the general leadership theories and/or styles these men subscribe to and how the theories are applied to their decision-making process.

Participants

The participants in this study were White/non-Hispanic male superintendents of Texas public school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations who were employed during the 2008-2009 school year. This researcher generated a list of the Texas public school superintendents by utilizing a database obtained from the Texas Education Agency. Identification criteria were:

a. Racial background of the superintendent

b. School districts in Texas with majority-Hispanic student populations.
Of the 145 potential participants, 41 were eliminated because of the unavailability of e-mail addresses; the e-mails sent to them were kicked back due to incorrect e-mail addresses or rejection due to spam. Also, five respondents indicated that they were not a White/non-Hispanic superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district. Therefore, the total number of potential participants was 99.

**Research Design**

The sampling strategy used in this study was purposive sampling. Patton (1990), in his book, *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nd ed.), described purposive sampling as a qualitative research methodology in which some participants are selected because of some characteristic. According to Patton, the categories of purposive sampling include: Extreme or Deviant Case, Intensity, Maximum Variation, Homogeneous, Typical Case, Stratified Purposeful, Critical Case, Snowball or Chain, Criterion, Theory-Based or Operational Construct, Confirming or Disconfirming, Opportunistic, Random Purposeful, Politically Important Cases, Convenience, and Combination or Mixed Purposeful. Based on Patton’s categories, the sampling strategy used in this study will “Stratified Purposeful.”

Before describing the design of this study, the key aspects of both quantitative and qualitative methodology is discussed. Quantitative research is the systematic scientific investigation of properties and phenomena and their relationships. The objective of quantitative research is to develop and employ mathematical models, theories and/or hypotheses pertaining to natural phenomena. It is widely used in both the natural sciences and social sciences, from physics and biology to sociology and
journalism. It is also used as a way to research different aspects of education (Johnson, et. al., 2004).

The process of measurement is central to quantitative research because it provides the fundamental connection between empirical observation and mathematical expression of quantitative relationships. Quantitative purists believe that social observations should be treated as entities in much the same way that physical scientists treat physical phenomena. They also contend that the observer is separate from the entities that are the subject of observation and that social science inquiry should be objective (Johnson, et. al., 2004).

Qualitative research is a field of inquiry that transcends disciplines and subject matter. It involves an in-depth understanding of human behavior and the reasons that govern human behavior. Qualitative researchers typically rely on four methods for gathering information: (1) participation in the setting, (2) direct observation, (3) in-depth interviews, and (4) the analysis of documents and materials (Adler & Adler, 1987).

This study involved two aspects of qualitative research: first, the use of purposive sampling, and second, the use of open-ended questions in the measurement instrument which makes the study a quasi-mixed methods inquiry. The formal definition of mixed methods research is “the class of research where the researcher mixes or combines quantitative research techniques, methods, approaches, concepts or language into a single study.” The primary goal of mixed methods research is not to replace either of these approaches but rather to draw from the strengths of each as well as to minimize the weaknesses of both in single research studies and across studies (Johnson & Onwuegbuzi, 2004).
Instrumentation

Participants were asked to complete a survey (see Appendix 1) designed to answer the research questions posed in Chapter 1. The survey, included a Likert-type scale and solicited information from the participants regarding their school district and school board, biographical information, career pathway, the experiences that were of value to them as a superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district as well as educational experiences, a self rating of their performance as a superintendent, their leadership style, and the challenges they face as superintendents of majority-Hispanic school districts.

The researcher estimated that the survey would not take more than 30 minutes to complete. The licensed website, Survey Monkey ® was utilized by participants to respond to the researcher-developed survey.

A Likert-type scale was utilized to identify additional trends. The Likert scale is a bipolar scaling method which measures the degree of agreement, positive or negative, with a statement. Qualitative open response items were included in the survey instrument which allowed for the development and expansion of the participating superintendents’ responses.

Data Analysis

The data collected through the use of the survey instrument were primarily descriptive in nature. Therefore, descriptive statistics were reported in Chapter 4 (Results). The responses to the open-ended questions were reported using qualitative methodologies to identify themes.
Ethical Considerations

Participants in this study were identified through a database obtained from the Texas Education Agency. Superintendents were contacted through e-mail which also explained the purpose of the study and encouraged participation. A follow-up e-mail was also sent to further encourage participation in an effort to increase the response rate. The e-mails contained a link to the survey. Participation was voluntary and responses were confidential. Neither individual respondents nor school districts were identified in the final research report.

Participation in this study carried minimal potential risks. One possible risk was the loss of confidentiality of the participants’ responses which may have impacted a participant’s standing in the school community in which he leads. This risk was minimized and highly guarded against since responses were secure and the data was only used in an anonymous compilation format. The researcher obtained permission from the Institutional Review board at the University of Texas at El Paso to conduct this study.

The licensed website (Survey Monkey ®) was utilized by participants to respond to the survey. This is a secure site which requires an access code which will only be available to the researcher. Data were stored in an electronic database and were analyzed, sorted and compiled by the researcher. At the completion of the research, the database will be stored by the researcher and will be destroyed after a period of five years.
Chapter Summary

This chapter has included an overview of the purpose of the study and information regarding participants, the research design, instrumentation, data analysis, and ethical considerations.
Chapter 4

Results

This chapter includes a review of the purpose of the study, a description of the subjects who were the focus of the study, and the results for each research question posed in Chapter 1.

The purposes of this study were: 1) identify the characteristics of the White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations; 2) to identify the career pathways and experiences of value of White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations; 3) to ascertain what these men consider to be major challenges they have faced, how they dealt with these challenges as well as what impact, if any, state and federal accountability policies have had on their decision-making and resource allocation processes; and 4) to ascertain the general leadership theories and/or styles to which these men.

The participants in this study were White/non-Hispanic male superintendents of Texas public school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations in 2008-2009. The participants were identified by utilizing a database obtained from the Texas Education Agency. Of the 145 potential participants, 41 were eliminated because of the unavailability of e-mail addresses; the e-mails sent to them were kicked back due to incorrect e-mail addresses or rejection due to spam. Also, five respondents indicated that they were not White/non-Hispanic male superintendents of majority-Hispanic school districts. Therefore, the total number of potential participants was 99. Responses were received from 33 superintendents for a response rate of 33.3%.
Results to Research Questions

**Research Question #1**: *What are the characteristics of the White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?*

Tables 3 through 7 present data regarding the characteristics of the White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations. Table 3 presents the age of the respondents by age group.

Table 3. **Age of Respondents by Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 – 29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 – 59</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows that almost 70% (69.7%) of the respondents are age 40 to 59 and more than one quarter (27.3%) are age 60 and over.

Table 4 presents the educational background (highest earned degree) of the respondents.

Table 4. **Respondents’ Highest Earned Degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 shows that almost 60% (59.4%) of the respondents' highest earned degree is a master's degree.

Table 5 presents the educational background (types of institutions attended) of the respondents.

Table 5. Type of Institution Attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Public #</th>
<th>Public %</th>
<th>Private #</th>
<th>Private %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that more than nine of ten (90.8%) of the degrees received by the responding superintendents were awarded by public institutions.

Table 6 presents a breakdown of the major fields of study of the respondents at each level of educational attainment.

Table 6. Major Fields of Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total resp.</td>
<td>Bachelors = 27, Master’s = 31, Doctorate = 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows that at all educational levels, education was the major of choice of the respondents [BA (51.9%), MA (96.8%), Doctorate (100%)].
Table 7 presents the respondents’ perceptions of their fluency in Spanish.

Table 7. Respondents’ Fluency in Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Fluency</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very limited Fluency</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Fluent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Fluent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 shows that over one half of the respondents (54.6%) have no fluency in Spanish and only 3% rate themselves as “very fluent.”

Tables 3 through 7 show that the typical White/non-Hispanic superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district is age 50-59, has a master’s degree in education from a public institution, and is not fluent in Spanish.

**Research Question #2:** What are the career pathways of White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?

Tables 8 through 24 present data related to the career pathways and educational experiences of value to White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations. These tables include data regarding previous positions held as well as the number of years served in majority-Hispanic school districts. This section includes graduate courses these men considered beneficial in preparing them to serve as a superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district. lead in their current context. Table 8 presents the respondents’ years in their current superintendent position.
Table 8. **Respondents’ Years in Current Position**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows that more than a third (33.4%) of the responding superintendents had been in their present position for three or fewer years. Approximate two-thirds (65.6%) of the respondents had held their current position for four or more years.

Table 9 presents data regarding the number of superintendencies the respondents held during their careers.

Table 9. **Number of Superintendencies During Career**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superintendencies</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows that more than half of the respondents (53.3%) were in their first superintendency. More than 83% (83.3%) of the respondents had held three or fewer superintendencies during their careers.

Table 10 shows the number of years the respondents have served as a school superintendent.
Table 10. **Years Served as School Superintendent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows that almost two thirds (65.7%) of the responding superintendents have served as a superintendent for seven or more years. More than one in five (21.9%) have served as a superintendent for three or fewer years.

Table 11 shows the number of years the respondents have served as a school superintendent in a majority-Hispanic school district.

Table 11. **Years as Superintendent in Majority-Hispanic School District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows that almost a third (31.3%) of the respondents have served as a superintendent in a majority-Hispanic school district for three years or less.

Table 12 shows the years of teaching experience of the respondents.
Table 12. Respondents’ Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 12 indicate that more than half of these men (51.6%) have 4 – 9 years of teaching experience. More than 12% (12.1%) indicated they had three or fewer years of teaching experience or no such experience.

Table 13 shows the number of years the respondents served as a teacher in a majority-Hispanic school district.

Table 13. Years Teaching in Majority-Hispanic School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 indicates that more than two thirds of the respondents (68.8%) had three or fewer years of teaching experience in a majority-Hispanic school district or no such experience.
Tables 14 through 17 show the number of years of campus-based administrative experience of the responding superintendents including the years of campus-based experience in a majority-Hispanic school. Table 14 shows the years the respondents served as a vice or assistant principal.

**Table 14. Respondents’ Years as a Vice/Assistant Principal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows that more than one in five (21.9%) of the respondents’ career pathways did not include service as an assistant/vice principal. Further, one in four of the respondents (25.0%) served as an assistant principal for less than one year.

Table 15 shows the number of years the respondents served as an assistant/vice principal of a majority-Hispanic school.
Table 15. **Years Vice/Assistant Principal in Majority-Hispanic School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows that more than 77% (77.4%) of the respondents served as an assistant principal in a majority-Hispanic school.

Table 16 shows the respondents’ years of experience as a campus principal.

Table 16. **Respondents’ Years as a Principal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows that approximately one in ten (9.1%) had no experience as a principal prior to becoming a superintendent. An additional 9% (9.1%) had less than one year of experience as a principal. Almost 50% (48.5%) of the respondents had one to six years of experience as a campus principal before becoming a superintendent; whereas, more than one third (33.4%) had seven or more years of experience as a principal.
Table 17 shows the number of years the respondents served as a principal of a majority-Hispanic school.

Table 17. Years as a Principal of a Majority-Hispanic School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 17 shows that almost 44% (43.8%) of the respondents’ career pathway does not include service as a principal of a majority-Hispanic school. Another 19% (18.8%) served as a principal of a majority-Hispanic school for less than one year.

Table 18 presents the years of central office administrative experience of the responding superintendents.

Table 18. Years of Central Office Administrative Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18 shows that nearly two of three (63.3\%) of the respondents had one or more years of central office administrative experience before becoming a superintendent. Over one third (36.7\%) served in the central office for less than one year or responded not applicable (NA) to this item.

Table 19 presents the respondents’ years of central office administrative experience in a majority-Hispanic school district.

Table 19. Years of Central Office Administrative Experience in a Majority-Hispanic School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows that almost one in five (18.8\%) of the respondents had no central office administrative experience in a majority-Hispanic school district before becoming a superintendent. More than half of the respondents (50.1\%) served as a central office administrator in a majority-Hispanic school district for three or fewer years prior to becoming a superintendent.

Table 20 presents the respondents’ perceptions of the assignments that best prepared them for their current position of superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district.
Table 20. Assignment that Best Prepared Respondent for Current Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous superintendent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 shows that almost 45% (44.9%) of the respondents perceived that their central office administrative experience best prepared them to serve as a superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district. Over one quarter (27.6%) of these men perceived that their previous experience as a coach best prepared them for their current position.

Table 21 presents the respondents’ perceptions of the value of the courses in their superintendency preparation program (in rank order).

Table 21. Perceived Value of Courses in Superintendent Certification Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Law</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Finance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Policy Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent Internship</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Multicultural Studies)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Ethics)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21 shows that the top five rated courses were: education law, school finance, community relations, educational policy development, and organizational development. Over 40% of the respondents who selected the category “other” listed multicultural studies in their top five list.

In response to the open-ended survey question regarding additional courses, that if provided, could have been of value to the respondents in preparing them to serve as a superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district, almost 43% listed multicultural courses serving the need of ELL students. There were no other themes or patterns to the responses to this open-ended question.

Table 22 presents the Likert-type scale responses to items related to the career paths or educational experiences that prepared the respondents to lead majority-Hispanic school districts. Note: SA = strongly agree, A = agree, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree, NA = not applicable.
Table 22. Responses to Likert-type Scale Items Pertaining to Career Path and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My previous work experience prepared me for this position.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My professional work experience in majority-Hispanic school districts</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributed to my selection in my current position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My graduate/superintendent coursework prepared me to lead a majority-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic school district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My graduate/superintendent coursework prepared me to meet the needs of ELL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 shows that almost all (96.8%) of the respondents believed that their previous work experience prepared them for their current position, with almost half (48.4%) responding strongly agree to this item. Almost two thirds (63.6%) believed that their experience in majority-Hispanic school districts contributed to their selection in their current position. Over 60% (60.6%) did not believe that their graduate/superintendent coursework prepared them to lead a majority-Hispanic school district and over two-thirds (68.9%) perceived that their graduate/superintendent coursework did not prepare them to meet the needs of ELL students.

Table 23 presents the respondents’ perceptions (open-ended response format) of the most important reason they were employed by their present board of trustees.
Table 23.  Most Important Reason Why Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason (in rank order)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience/background/skills</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to be a change agent/vision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to be an instructional leader</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 shows the reasons the respondents believed they were hired, as categorized by the researcher. Almost half of the respondents (47.8%) believed that they were hired by their present board because of their experience, background, or skills. In this age of accountability, it is interesting to note that only 13% of the respondents believed that they were hired because of their ability to serve as an instructional leader.

**Research Question #3:** What are the demographic characteristics of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations who have White/non-Hispanic male superintendents?

Table 24 addresses the type of community in which the school districts of the respondents are located.

Table 24.  Type of Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban/Rural</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24 shows that almost three quarters (73.3%) of the respondents serve in majority-Hispanic school districts located in rural communities. Apparently, the common assumption that rural school districts are populated primarily by White/non-Hispanics and that only urban school districts contain large percentages of minority students is not completely accurate in Texas.

Table 25 shows the enrollment, by enrollment category, of the majority-Hispanic school districts lead by the respondents. Note: the enrollment categories listed in Table 25 were developed by the Texas Association of School Administrators (TASA) and the Texas Association of School Boards (TASB).

Table 25. District Enrollment by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 499</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 – 999</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 – 1,599</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,600 – 2,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 – 4,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 – 9,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 – 24,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 – 49,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the nature of the school districts shown in Table 24, it is not surprising that more than 46% (46.4%) of the school districts have an enrollment of less than 1,000 students; and, almost 90% (89.3%) of the school districts have an enrollment of less than 5,000 students.
**Research Question #4:** What is the gender and ethnic makeup of the school boards who hire White/non-Hispanic males to serve as superintendents of districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?

In response to the question regarding the size of the respondents’ school boards, all respondents indicated that their school boards consisted of seven members.

Table 26 shows the total number of Hispanics who served on the school boards of the respondents when they were hired as superintendent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic Board Members</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that almost one in five (19.4%) of the school boards of the majority-Hispanic school districts had no Hispanic members.

Table 27 presents the total number of female board members serving on the respondents’ school boards.
Table 27. Female Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female Board Members</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the fact that the ratio of adult men to adult women is approximately one to one, it is interesting that more than half (53.4%) of the respondents’ school boards had one or no female board members. Ninety percent of the school boards had three or fewer female board members.

Research Question # 5: What are the leadership styles and/or theories to which White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations subscribe?

Table 28 presents the respondent’s perceptions of their leadership style.
When the respondents were asked to select their leadership style(s) from a list of ten categories, more than half of the respondents (53.1% each) selected participative/democratic and people/relationship. It is interesting to note that only five of the 32 respondents (15.3%, rank 7/10) selected transformational as their leadership style.

**Research Question # 6:** What are the challenges White/non-Hispanic male superintendents face in leading and serving the needs of students in districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?

Table 29 presents the respondents’ perceptions of their most effective and most challenging proficiency areas. It should be noted that these areas of proficiency are the major foci of a superintendent’s annual evaluation in the state of Texas.

---

**Table 28. Respondents’ Perceptions of their Leadership Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic/authoritarian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative/democratic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant leadership</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task oriented</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People/relationship</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total respondents</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29. Respondents’ Ratings of Their Performance/Challenges (Rank Order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proficiency Area</th>
<th>Most Effective</th>
<th>Most Challenging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional management</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student performance (AEIS)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School organizational climate, improvement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/personnel management</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and fiscal facilities management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School community relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/Superintendent relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth and development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 shows that the two proficiency areas that superintendents of majority-Hispanic school districts believe their performance is *least effective* and correspondingly *most challenging* are *instructional management* and *student performance (AEIS)*. It is interesting to note that the two proficiency areas where they believe they are most effective (*school community relations, board/superintendent relations*) are the two areas they consider least challenging.

Table 30 presents the reasons the respondents indicated that they left their last superintendency.
Table 30. **Respondents’ Reasons for Leaving their Last Superintendency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to move to a larger district</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher salary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-renewal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Termination</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction with position</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses (excluding 17 N/A)</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the N/A responses (17) were eliminated, there were 24 responses to this item which involved a *check all that apply* format. The two most common reasons the respondents indicated they left their last superintendency were *higher salary* (45.8%) and *opportunity to move to a larger district* (41.7%). It should be noted that these two reasons may be linked. Only 8.5% of the respondents to which this item applied left their last superintendency because of *problems with board* or *problems with community*.

Table 31 presents the respondents’ level of agreement/disagreement with challenges to their position.
Table 31. Response to Likert-style Scale Items Pertaining to Challenges Facing Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Total Resp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building trust with the community is more challenging because of my White/non-Hispanic background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language/communication is an obstacle in community relations.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Hispanic community members hesitate to approach me because I am a White/non-Hispanic.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current State accountability system disproportionately affects low income and minority students.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income and minority students are affected positively by TAKS.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income and minority students are disproportionately placed in lower level, remedial settings because of TAKS.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31 shows that almost three of four (74.2%) of the respondents did not perceive that building trust with the community is more challenging because of their White/non-Hispanic background. Almost 42% (41.9%) of the respondents indicated, however, that Some Hispanic community members hesitate to approach me because I am a
White/non-Hispanic. More than three of four respondents (78.1%) perceived that the current State accountability system disproportionately affects low income and minority students and more than 60% (61.3%) did not perceive that low income and minority students are affected positively by TAKS. However, more than two thirds of the respondents (67.7%) did not perceive that low-income and minority students are disproportionately placed in lower level, remedial settings because of TAKS.

Table 32 presents the superintendents’ responses to an open-ended question regarding the additional challenges they face in leading a majority-Hispanic school district. It should be noted that the responses to this item were categorized by the researcher.

Table 32. Additional Challenges in Leading a Majority Hispanic District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Challenges</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent/community involvement/communication</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty/socioeconomics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School finance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and dropout rate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative perceptions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher recruitments/retaining bilingual teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional challenges compared to other districts.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 32 shows that more than one third of the respondents (36.8%) perceived the area of parent/community involvement/communication as a challenge.
Research Question # 7: To what degree does the awareness of the cultural and social history of a school district/community impact the decision-making of a White/non-Hispanic male superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district?

Table 33 presents the results of a Likert-type scale item that solicited the respondents' perception of the degree to which awareness of the cultural and social history of the district/community impact decision-making.

Table 33. Response to Likert-type Scale Items Pertaining to Decision-making and Resource Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Total resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of the cultural and social history of the district/community impacts decisions I make.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33 shows that almost all of the respondents (96.7%) believe that their decision-making is impacted by their awareness of the cultural and social history of the district/community they serve.

Research Question # 8: What major influences have federal and state accountability policies had on the decision-making and resource allocation processes of White/non-Hispanic male superintendents of majority-Hispanic school districts?

Table 34 presents respondents’ perceptions of the degree to which federal and state accountability policies impact their decision-making and resource allocation.
Table 34. The Impact of Federal and State Accountability Policies on Decision-making and Resource Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Total resp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The current state accountability system has a direct impact on how I allocate resources.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current Texas accountability system is helpful in improving student achievement of Hispanic students.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current Texas accountability system has made my job more difficult.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34 shows that 29 of the 31 respondents (93.5%) believe that the current state accountability system directly impacts how they allocate resources. Also, 27 of the 31 respondents (87.1%) believe that the current Texas accountability system has made their job more difficult. More than 45% (45.2%) of the respondents believe that the Texas accountability system is helpful in improving the achievement of Hispanic students.
Chapter 5

Discussion

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study, including the purpose of the study, research questions, and a description of the methodology; conclusions based on the results of the study presented in chapter 4; links to the literature; recommendations for further research; and implications for practice.

Summary

The purposes of this study were: 1) identify the characteristics of the White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations; 2) to identify the career pathways and experiences of value of White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations; 3) to ascertain what these men consider to be major challenges they have faced, how they dealt with these challenges as well as what impact, if any, state and federal accountability policies have had on their decision-making and resource allocation processes; and 4) to ascertain the general leadership theories and/or styles to which these men.

The following research questions provided the focus for this study:

1. What are the characteristics of the White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?
2. What are the career pathways of White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?
3. What are demographic characteristics of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations who have White/non-Hispanic male superintendents?
4. What is the gender and ethnic makeup of the school boards who hire White/non-Hispanic males to serve as superintendents of districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?

5. What are the leadership styles and/or theories to which White/non-Hispanic males who serve as superintendents of school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations subscribe?

6. What are the challenges White/non-Hispanic male superintendents face in leading and serving the needs of students in districts with majority-Hispanic student populations?

7. To what degree does the awareness of the cultural and social history of a school district/community impact the decision-making of a White/non-Hispanic male superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district?

8. What major influences have federal and state accountability policies had on the decision-making and resource allocation processes of White/non-Hispanic male superintendents of majority-Hispanic school districts?

The participants in this study were White/non-Hispanic male superintendents of Texas public school districts with majority-Hispanic student populations who were employed during the 2008-2009 school year. This researcher generated a list of the Texas public school superintendents by utilizing a database obtained from the Texas Education Agency. Identification criteria were:

a. Racial background of the superintendent

b. School districts in Texas with majority-Hispanic student populations.
Of the 145 potential participants, 41 were eliminated because of the unavailability of e-mail addresses; the e-mails sent to them were kicked back due to incorrect e-mail addresses or rejection due to spam. Also, five respondents indicated that they were not a White/non-Hispanic superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district. Therefore, the total number of potential participants was 99. Responses were received from 33 superintendents for a response rate of 33.3%.

Participants were asked to complete a survey (see Appendix 1) designed to answer the research questions posed in Chapter 1. The survey, included a Likert-type scale and solicited information from the participants regarding their school district and school board, biographical information, career pathway, the experiences that were of value to them as a superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district as well as educational experiences, a self rating of their performance as a superintendent, their leadership style, and the challenges they face as superintendents of majority-Hispanic school districts.

The researcher estimated that the survey would not take more than 30 minutes to complete. The licensed website, Survey Monkey ® was utilized by participants to respond to the researcher-developed survey.

A Likert-type scale was utilized to identify additional trends. The Likert scale is a bipolar scaling method which measures the degree of agreement, positive or negative, with a statement. Qualitative open response items were included in the survey instrument which allowed for the development and expansion of the participating superintendents’ responses.
After approval to conduct the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board at the University of Texas at El Paso, a cover letter was e-mailed to 145 male, White/non-Hispanic superintendents of majority-Hispanic school districts in Texas. Superintendents were asked to complete the questionnaire electronically utilizing Survey Monkey®. The researcher sent a reminder several days after sending the initial request.

Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from the results of the study presented in Chapter 4:

1. Based on the demographic data provided by the respondents, the typical White/non-Hispanic superintendent of a majority-Hispanic school district is age 50 – 59, has a master's degree in education from a public institution, and is not fluent in Spanish. He is in his first superintendency and has been in his current position four or more years.

2. The career pathway of the typical White/non-Hispanic male superintendent of a majority-Hispanic district in Texas includes 4 – 6 years teaching experience (three years or less in a majority-Hispanic school district), was an assistant principal for 1 – 6 years (three or fewer years in a majority-Hispanic school), has been a principal for 1 – 6 years (<1 year or no experience in a majority-Hispanic school), and 1 – 6 years of central office administrative experience (three or less or no years in a majority-Hispanic school district). He believes that the two assignments that best prepared him for his current position were central office administrative experience and coaching. Further, he believes that the courses in his superintendent certification program that best prepared him for the
3. The typical majority-Hispanic school district served by the respondent superintendents is rural, with an enrollment of less than 1,000 students.

4. The school boards of majority-Hispanic school districts that hired male, White/non-Hispanic superintendents typically included one or two Hispanic members and one or two females.

5. More than half of the respondents described their leadership style as participative/democratic or people/relationship.

6. The responding superintendents believed that they were most effective in the proficiency areas described as school community relations; board/superintendent relations; and school organizational climate, improvement. They considered themselves to be least effective in instructional management and student performance (AEIS). The proficiency areas that they considered to be most challenging were student performance (AEIS), instructional management, and administration of fiscal facilities management. The least challenging areas were
7. Almost all of the respondents believed that their decision-making is impacted by their awareness of the cultural and social history of the district/community they serve.

8. Almost all of the respondents believe that the current state accountability system directly impacts how they allocate resources and has made their job more difficult. Less than half of the respondents believe that the Texas accountability system is helpful in improving the achievement of Hispanic students.

**Links to the Extant Literature**

The results of this study indicate that state and national reforms and legislation have had an impact on the superintendency in majority-Hispanic school districts. These results coincide with the findings of Amrein and Berliner (2002) and Garcia and Calhoun (2002) in that high-stakes accountability policies are more likely to affect minority achievement and thus the decision-making process of minority-majority district superintendents.

The results of this study also coincide with the study by McNeil and Valenzuela (1998) as well as Valenzuela (2001) who assert that superintendents perceive accountability systems as disproportionately affecting low income and minority students. White, non-Hispanic male superintendents of majority-Hispanic school districts in Texas who participated in this study held the same perception.
The results of this study are also consistent with Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) in that race remains a significant factor in education. This study revealed that a significant number of majority-Hispanic school superintendents indicated that their background influenced their interaction with the community and that community members hesitated to approach them because of their White/non-Hispanic background.

The results of this study concur with the findings of Carter and Cunningham, (1997) in that the participating superintendents believed the most challenging areas they deal with are instructional leadership and student achievement. Also, superintendents face challenges based upon economic, political and social, or religious values revolving around the culture of the community.

The results of this study concur with the findings of Joseph Murphy (1991) who identified the most common leadership style of superintendents to be participative focusing on facilitative styles, rather than autocratic decision-making.

Also, the results of this study concur with Orvando and Troxell, who wrote that superintendents believe they should have multicultural competencies and greater in-depth knowledge about the diverse cultures in their school districts.

The results of this study concur with the results of the study conducted by the American Association of School administrators (2007) which identified career pathways of superintendents. Both studies indicate that superintendents held positions closely related to instruction (e.g. principal, associate superintendent-curriculum and instruction) before their appointment to the superintendency.
Recommendations for Further Research

Following are the researcher’s recommendations for further research:

1. Similar studies should be conducted in other states in order to generate comparative data.

2. Since the respondents in this study primarily represented rural school districts, further research should be conducted targeting specific school districts (i.e. border vs. non-border and rural vs. urban districts).

3. Further research should be conducted that includes site visits and interviews of district superintendents and board members to identify the dynamics of leading majority-Hispanic school districts.

4. In-depth studies of a qualitative nature should be conducted to further explicate the relationship between leadership/management style, and the strategies and decision-making processes superintendents utilize in leading majority-Hispanic school districts.

5. Future research should be conducted to identify other variables/factors that may be related to the strategies superintendents use to effectively serve the needs of minority students and English Language Learners in majority-Hispanic school district.

6. Further research should be conducted to determine the effectiveness of superintendent certification programs in preparing superintendents to lead majority-Hispanic school districts, particularly districts with large numbers of ELL students.

7. Further research should be conducted to determine the dynamics of school board elections and the extent that the school boards are representative of community demographics of majority-Hispanic school districts.
Implications for Practice

Following are the researcher’s recommendations for practice based on the results of this study:

1. Colleges of Education, especially in border areas, should re-evaluate their programs to assure that the course work and field experience components they provide enhance future superintendents’ ability to successfully lead majority-Hispanic school districts.

2. The college faculties who determine the content of superintendent preparation programs should consider the need for language acquisition (Spanish) for those who intend to lead majority-Hispanic school districts.

3. The college faculties who determine the content of superintendent preparation programs should consider the need for cultural awareness classes for those who intend to lead majority-Hispanic school districts.

4. Colleges of Education, especially those located in border and urban areas, should consider developing superintendent certification programs that specifically focus on leadership of majority-minority school districts.
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Appendix A
Perspectives of White/non-Hispanic Male Superintendents of Majority Hispanic School Districts in Texas

This study examines the views and perceptions of White/non Hispanic male superintendents of majority Hispanic school districts in Texas. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and responses will be confidential. Neither individual respondents nor school districts will be identified.

If you are not a White/non-Hispanic male superintendent of a majority Hispanic school district, please check the box below and submit the survey.

☐ I am not a White/non-Hispanic male superintendent of a majority Hispanic school district.

Directions: Please place an X or a √ in the appropriate box.

1. Type of community in which your school district is located
   Urban       Suburban       Rural       Suburban/Rural

2. Approximate student enrollment

3. Age
   20-29       30-39       40-49       50-59       60 and over

4. Highest degree earned
   Bachelor’s       Master’s       Doctorate

5. Type of institution attended
   Bachelor’s Degree:   Public       Private
      Major: ______________________________________
   Master’s Degree:   Public       Private
      Major: ______________________________________
   Doctoral Degree:   Public       Private
      Major: ______________________________________

6. Number of years in current position
   <1       1 - 3       4 – 6       7 – 9       10+

7. Total number of years as a superintendent
   <1       1 - 3       4 – 6       7 – 9       10+

8. Number of years as the superintendent of a majority Hispanic school district
   <1       1 - 3       4 – 6       7 – 9       10+
9. Number of superintendencies held during career, including current position ______

10. Number of years as a classroom teacher
   <1   1 - 3   4 – 6   7 – 9   10+

11. Number of years as a classroom teacher in a majority Hispanic school
   <1   1 - 3   4 – 6   7 – 9   10+

12. Number of years as a vice/assistant principal
   <1   1 - 3   4 – 6   7 – 9   10+

13. Number of years as a vice/assistant principal in a majority Hispanic school
   <1   1 - 3   4 – 6   7 – 9   10+

14. Number of years as a central office/district administrator
   <1   1 - 3   4 – 6   7 – 9   10+

15. Number of years as a central office/district administrator in a majority Hispanic school district
   <1   1 - 3   4 – 6   7 – 9   10+

16. Total number of school board members in your current district at the time you became superintendent ______
   Number of Hispanic board members in your current district ______
   Number of female board members in your current district ______

17. Rate your fluency in Spanish.
   very fluent      somewhat fluent     very limited fluency    no fluency

18. Reason(s) you left your last superintendency (check all that apply, underline #1 reason)
   N/A          Opportunity to move to a larger district
   Higher salary Dissatisfaction with the position
   Problems with the board Problems with the staff
   Problems with the faculty Problems with the community
   Nonrenewal    Termination
   Other: ________________________________
19. Previous assignment/position that best prepared you for the superintendency of a majority Hispanic school district

20. Please rank in order (from 1 to 5) the following courses in your superintendent certification program based on their value to you as a superintendent of a majority Hispanic school district (1 = course of most value, 5 = course of least value). Do not rank courses that were not in your program.

- Educational Law
- School Finance
- Facilities Management
- Organizational Development
- Educational Policy Development
- Community Relations
- Superintendent Internship
- Other (please specify)

21. As the superintendent of a majority Hispanic school district, rate your performance/challenges (check one from each column)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Effective</th>
<th>Least Effective</th>
<th>Most Challenging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student performance (AEIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School organizational climate, improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Effective</th>
<th>Least Effective</th>
<th>Most Challenging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; fiscal/facilities management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/community relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/Superintendent relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional growth &amp; development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. How would you describe your leadership style? Check all that apply.

- Situational
- Transactional
- Autocratic/authoritarian
- Transformational
- Participative/democratic
- Laissez-faire
- Delegative
- Servant leadership
- Task oriented
- People/relationship leadership
Please respond to the following questions using the scale below:

**SA= Strongly Agree   A=Agree   D=Disagree   SD=Strongly Disagree   NA=Not Applicable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. My previous work experience prepared me for the this position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My professional work experience in majority Hispanic school districts contributed to my selection in my current position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My graduate/ superintendent coursework prepared me to lead a majority Hispanic school district</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Awareness of the cultural and social history of the district/community impacts decisions I make.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Building trust with the community is more challenging because of my White/non-Hispanic background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Language/communication is an obstacle in community relations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Some Hispanic community members hesitate to approach me because I am a White/non-Hispanic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The current Texas accountability system is helpful in improving student achievement of Hispanic students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. The current Texas accountability system has made my job more difficult.

28. The current state accountability system has a direct impact on how I allocate resources.

29. The current state accountability system disproportionately affects low income and minority students.

30. Low income and minority students are affected positively by TAKS.

31. Low-income and minority students are placed in lower level, remedial settings because of TAKS.

32. What additional challenges do you face in leading a majority Hispanic school district?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

33. Why do you believe you were chosen by the school board to lead your current district?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

34. What additional graduate-level courses/experiences, if any, could your college or university have provided to better prepare you to lead a majority Hispanic school district?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time and participation.
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