

2012

Charter School Principals' and Teachers' Leadership Perception Scores on the Five Dimensions of the Leadership Practices Inventory Instrument

Tamara B. Kirshtein

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kirshtein, Tamara B., "Charter School Principals' and Teachers' Leadership Perception Scores on the Five Dimensions of the Leadership Practices Inventory Instrument" (2012). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 1910.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/1910>

CHARTER SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' AND TEACHERS' LEADERSHIP
PERCEPTION SCORES ON THE FIVE DIMENSIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP
PRACTICES INVENTORY INSTRUMENT

BY
TAMARA B. KIRSHTEN

Dissertation Committee

Mary Ruzicka, Ph.D., Mentor
James Caufield, EdD., Committee Member
Meta Van Sickle, Ph.D., Committee Member
Janet Rose, Ph.D., Committee Member

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
Seton Hall University

2012
APPROVAL FOR SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES
OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES

APPROVAL FOR SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE

Doctoral Candidate, **Tamara Kirshtein**, has successfully defended and made the required modifications to the text of the doctoral dissertation for the Ed.D. during this **Spring Semester 2012**.

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE
(please sign and date beside your name)

Mentor:
Dr. Mary Ruzicka

Mary J. Ruzicka, Ph.D. 2/23/12

Committee Member:
Dr. James Caufield

James J. Caufield

Committee Member:
Dr. Meta Van Sickle

Meta Van Sickle

Committee Member:
Dr. Janet Rose

Janet Rose (mce)

External Reader:

The mentor and any other committee members who wish to review revisions will sign and date this document only when revisions have been completed. Please return this form to the Office of Graduate Studies, where it will be placed in the candidate's file and submit a copy with your final dissertation to be bound as page number two.

ABSTRACT

TAMARA B. KIRSHTEIN

Seton Hall University

Charter School Principals' and Teachers' Leadership Perception Scores on the Five Dimensions of the Leadership Practices Inventory Instrument

(Dr. Mary Ruzicka, Advisor)

The purpose of this study was to determine differences between the self-perceptions of principals in relation to the five leadership practices delineated by Kouzes and Posner's (2003) Leadership Practices Inventory in relation to the perceptions of their teachers on their (principal) leadership across the same five dimensions. The Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test was used to compare the median differences for statistical significance to address the four hypotheses of this study.

Hypothesis 1: Perception scores of charter school principals on themselves and teacher perception scores of their principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership. An analysis of the data in this study show that, with this population, there are statistically significant differences in three of the five leadership categories: *Model the Way*, *Challenge the Process*, and *Enable Others to Act*. However, there were no significant differences found in the two leadership domains, *Inspire a Shared Vision* and *Encourage the Heart*.

Hypothesis 2: Perception scores of charter school principals on themselves and teacher perception scores of their principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership according to the gender of the principal. Three tests for each leadership domain were conducted—one comparing female principal perceptions to those

of their teachers, one comparing male principal perceptions to their teachers, and one comparing the perceptions of teachers working for female principals to those of teachers working for male principals. An analysis of the data revealed that, for all but one condition, there were no statistically significant differences between groups based on the gender of the principal. The sole situation where significance was found was on the leadership domain of *Challenge the Process* in the group examining the differences between female principal's self-perceptions and the perceptions of their teachers.

Hypothesis 3: Perception scores of charter school teachers and principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership for principals having three or more years' tenure at their charter schools. An analysis of the data revealed that, for the leadership domains of *Model the Way* and *Encourage the Heart*, there were significant differences in perception scores with this sample population. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was rejected for these dimensions of leadership.

Hypothesis 4: Perception scores of charter school teachers and principals will differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership for principals having less than three years' tenure at their charter schools. No significant differences were found in any of the five leadership domains between principals with less than three years experience and their teachers. Therefore, this hypothesis was rejected.

INDEX WORDS: Charter School Leadership, Perceptions of Leadership, Principal Leadership, Educational Leadership, Instructional Leadership

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my family for their support, understanding, and confidence in me through this process.

To my parents Sol and Joyce Kirshtein, you always believed in me. You both saw something within me and allowed me to discover what that was. You both gave me a work ethic that I have stuck with that has enabled me remain focused and true to both my career and my education. Mom and Dad you have passed on to me the importance of using my moral compass so that even when faced with tough decisions, I have always been able to hold my head up high and stay true to what is really important in life.

To my daughter Katie, I dedicate this work for putting up with an absent Mom. Katie you are still my greatest work and always will be. You have a confidence and a talent for looking at the bright side of everything and seeing the best in everyone. For all of your marvelous qualities I dedicate this work to you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Mary Ruzicka for her advice, support, review, and extreme patience with me throughout this entire process. Her ability to keep me “on track” and concentrating on the bare bones of this study made it possible not only for me to complete this body of work, but also will be a model for me to follow in future research.

I would also like to thank Dr. James Caufield, for his support and belief in me from the beginning of this journey. His leadership and dedication to this program are an inspiration. The cohort model works, and the experiences I have had—from the incredible faculty and mentor to the relationships I have forged with other professionals in the community—are what will sustain me and keep me growing as a seeker of knowledge.

In addition, my appreciation to Dr. Meta VanSickle of the College of Charleston for being my grounding force in Charleston, South Carolina. Your wisdom, calm demeanor, and support helped keep me going. I would also like to thank Dr. Janet Rose for agreeing to be a reader and coming in with sound suggestions that helped advance this research.

Finally, I must thank my colleagues in the cohort, for without them, their support, laughter, tears, and friendship, this journey would have been stark, lonely, and less fulfilling. So, thank you to Drs. Jessica Luciano, Janice Strigh, and Mary Baier.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
List of Tables.....	x
CHAPTER	
I	NATURE OF THE STUDY 1
	Introduction..... 1
	Traditional principal development..... 2
	Principal development in charter schools 3
	Links between traditional and charter principal development 4
	Teacher perceptions of leadership 6
	Gender of school leader and leadership perceptions..... 6
	Tenure of school leader and leadership perceptions 7
	Statement of the Problem..... 8
	Purpose of the Study 9
	Variables 9
	Hypotheses 10
	Significance of the Study 10
	Delimitations and Limitations 12
	Definition of Terms 12
II	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE..... 14
	Introduction..... 14
	Charter Schools 15
	Contemporary Educational Leadership 23
	Instructional Leadership..... 23
	The Full Range Leadership Model 30
	The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership 32
	Transformational Leadership..... 36
	Distributed Leadership..... 44
	Teacher Efficacy and Collective Efficacy 45
	Leadership Practices Inventory..... 46
	Instructional Leadership..... 49
	Modeling Instructional Leadership 52
	Qualitative Research 53

	School Climate and Culture	57
	Teachers' Instructional Practices	57
	Commitment and Job Satisfaction	59
	Conclusion	63
III	METHODOLOGY	65
	Introduction.....	65
	Subjects	65
	Method	66
	Instrumentation	67
	Design and Statistics	71
IV	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	72
	Introduction.....	72
	Description of Sample.....	73
	Summary of Results	75
	Analysis of Data	76
V	FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	90
	Summary	90
	Discussion	92
	Implications	97
	Recommendations for Further Research	100
	References.....	103
	Appendices.....	113
A	Five Dimensions of the LPI	113
B	Questions on the LPI and the Five Dimensions They Represent.....	115
C	Teacher Responses on Perceptions of Their Principals across the Five Leadership Domains	118
D	Principal Self-Perceptions Across the Five Leadership Domains	125
E	Teacher Median Scores for Each Corresponding Principal	128
F	Female Principal Scores with the Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for Matched Pair Comparison	131
G	Male Principal Scores with the Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for Matched Pair Comparison	133
H	Raw Scores for Teachers of Principals with Less than Three Years Experience.....	135
I	Raw Scores for Principals with Less than Three Years Experience.....	138
J	Scores of Principals Having Less than Three Years Experience with	

	the Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for Matched Pair Comparison.....	140
K	Scores of Principals Having Three or More Years Experience with the Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for Matched Pair Comparison.....	142
L	Raw Scores for Teachers of Principals with Three or More Years Experience.....	145
M	Raw Scores for Principals with Three or More Years Experience	151
N	Permission to use instrument	154

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Internal Reliability Coefficients For the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership	69
2	Correlations of Positive Workplace Attitude with Five Leadership Practices.....	70
3	Education Industry Validity Test of LPI.....	71
4	Gender Breakdown of Principal Respondents.....	74
5	Tenure of Principal at Charter School.....	74
6	Gender of Principal Teacher Reports to.....	75
7	Tenure of Principal Teacher Reports to.....	75
8	Means and Standards Deviations of Sample.....	76
9	Principal's Self-Perception Scores of Leadership as Compared to Their Teacher's Scores.....	77
10	Comparison of Responses Based on Gender of Principal.....	79
11	Comparisons of Teacher and Principal Responses for Principals With Less Than Three Years of Experience.....	82
12	Comparisons of Teacher and Principal Responses for Principals With Three or More Years of Experience.....	85
13	Comparisons of Teacher Responses for Principals with Three or More Years Experience and Teacher responses for Principals with Less Than Three Years of Experience	87

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Across scholarly disciplines, leadership is arguably the most heavily researched aspect of human behavior. The educational literature is no exception. Principal leadership has been described as “possibly the most important single determinant of an effective learning environment” (Kelley, Thornton & Daugherty, 2005, p. 17). Sponsored by the Wallace Foundation, the six-year *Learning from Leadership Project* unequivocally demonstrated the pivotal role of educational leadership on teaching practices and educational outcomes (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson & Wahlstrom, 2004; Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom & Anderson, 2010; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). In the comprehensive research review that launched the ambitious research project, Leithwood et al. (2004) observed that virtually all cases where an underperforming school was successfully transformed involved “intervention by a powerful leader” (Leithwood et al., 2004, p. 5).

Kenneth Leithwood and his colleagues are among the pioneers of educational research on transformational and distributed leadership (Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris & Hopkins, 2006, 2007; Leithwood et al., 2004; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999, 2000, 2006). Conceptions of educational leadership have undergone a plethora of changes since the dominance of the scientific management paradigm in the early- to mid-20th Century (Hallinger, 2003; Louis et al., 2010; Murphy, Elliott, Goldring & Porter, 2007; Oplatka & Tako, 2009; Portin, Schneider, DeArmond & Gundlach, 2003). Arising in the 1980s and 1990s, respectively, instructional and transformational leadership are currently

the predominant modes of principal leadership. Distributed leadership is envisioned as the model of educational leadership for the future (Louis et al., 2010; Sheppard, Hurley & Dibbon, 2010).

Despite the sizable body of literature on educational leadership, researchers have observed a marked disconnect between the rhetoric of how principals should act as school leaders and what they actually do on the job (Louis et al., 2010; Portin et al., 2003). Portin and his colleagues and the Learning from Leadership team are among the few investigators who included charter schools in their research. A particularly glaring gap in the literature is the lack of attention to charter school leadership. Declaring that, “Schools’ success or failure is based largely on who is leading the organization,” Campbell (2010) argued that this is especially true in the case of charter schools (p. 2). Unlike traditional public schools, charter school success is contingent on their “fidelity to their mission (p. 2).” The Learning from Leadership team emphasizes the importance of context in educational leadership. Charter schools are founded with a unique mission and culture, and diverting from that path can compromise the school’s survival.

Traditional Principal Development

Learning from Leadership is only one of the research projects sponsored by the Wallace Foundation. An additional project is the *School Leadership Study: Developing Successful Principals*, an in-depth exploration of principal preparation programs designed to identify best practices for preparing principals to be excellent leaders of 21st-Century schools. Highlighting the challenges inherent in this role is the “job description” of the principalship presented by the School Leadership researchers:

Principals are expected to be educational visionaries, instructional and curriculum leaders, assessment experts, disciplinarians, community builders, public relations and communications experts, budget analysts, facility managers, special program administrators, as well as guardians of various legal, contractual, and policy mandates and initiatives (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe & Meyerson, 2005, p. 3)

The multifaceted role of the principal is evident in some of the terms that have been used to define contemporary principal leadership, including *cultural, political, moral, creative, collaborative, distributed, democratic, participative, developmental and strategic*, as well as *instructional and transformational*. (Leithwood et al., 2004; Oplatka & Tako, 2009). If the traditional public school principal faces a daunting array of challenges, these challenges are magnified for the charter school leader. All K-12 principals face the challenge of meeting accountability mandates. For charter school principals, *accountability* may mean justifying the school's very existence. Campbell (2010) added that charter school principals typically have less funding and fewer resources. Furthermore, contrary to the assertion (voiced by opponents of charter schools) that the creation of public charter schools would lead to "creaming" of the highest performing students, charter schools serve a majority of the ethnic and linguistic minority, economically disadvantaged and at-risk students (Allen & Consoletti, 2010). A disproportionate number of charter schools are classified as high-poverty schools, and the number of low-poverty charter schools has actually declined (Aud, Hussar, Planty, Snyder, Bianco, Fox, Frohlich, Kemp & Drake, 2010).

Principal Development in Charter Schools

In peer-reviewed journals, research on charter school leadership qualities is scarce. . The literature on charter schools is mainly available via the public media. *Education Week* entitled an article on charter school leadership “WANTED: The Perfect Person” (Robelen, 2008). According to the National Alliance for public Charter Schools (NAPCS), charter schools are projected to need some 6,000 to 21,000 new principals by the end of the present decade. According to Louis et al. (2010), when Eric A. Premack, Director of the Charter Schools Development Center in Sacramento was queried about the attributes of the ideal charter school leader, Premack commented, “I kind of joke that the perfect person is someone who has several years of experience as a superintendent of a small school district, has spent several years as executive director of a non-profit corporation, someone who is a founder and launch person, and is also a maintainer or refiner type of person” (p. S3). Louis et al. inserted this comment: “Inadvertently, Premack may have made an excellent case for distributed leadership, which perhaps not coincidentally is characteristic of high-performing schools” (p. S3).

Indeed, a study of Massachusetts charter schools found that high-performing charter schools employ distributed leadership, allowing teachers to assume some of the leader’s tasks (Robelin, 2008). Empowering leadership is part of a strategy by the schools, according to Merseth (as cited in Louis et al, 2010, p. S9), to “grow their own leaders”. There is increasing recognition of the vital importance of gaining teachers’ perspectives in understanding principal leadership (Kelley et al., 2005; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Oplatka & Tako, 2009). This strategy is especially true for charter schools, where success may hinge on collaboration and collective efficacy and teachers may be the key to advancing the school’s success by developing leadership from within

(Campbell, 2010; National Alliance for Public Charter Schools [NAPCS], 2008; Robelin, 2008).

Links Between Traditional and Charter Principal Development

The literature is replete with descriptions of good leadership and different names for seemingly similar leadership behaviors. For example, Bass and Avolio (1994) described the four I's of transformational leadership as *Idealized influence*, *Inspirational motivation*, *Intellectual stimulation*, and *Individualized consideration*. This transformational model gels nicely with Frumpkin's (2003) findings, as reported in *The Strategic Management of Charter Schools*, that charter leaders must secure support and legitimacy from external and internal stakeholders and uphold the mission of the charter. However, Frumpkin added that a leadership quality part of the transformational model, but more in line with Hallinger's (2003) Instructional Model. The quality is a leader's ability to mobilize operational capacity to provide requisite services (Frumpkin, 2003).

While transformational leadership is more of a collaborative and shared leadership with principals and teachers working together toward a common goal, historically instructional leadership, according to Lashway (2002), was top-down and very principal-centered.

Hallinger's (2003) Model of Instructional Leadership consists of three dimensions: defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and fostering a positive educational climate. This definition adds to the picture of charter leadership, in that the type of leadership it describes along with Frumpkin's (2003) charter leadership, and Bass and Avolio's (1994) transformational leadership.

In an extensive research project examining the *Seven Strong Claims about Successful School Leadership*, Leithwood et al. (2007) concluded that there is unambiguous support for the first claim: principal leadership is surpassed only by classroom teaching in influencing student learning. These two powerful forces on student learning are intertwined, and especially so in charter schools which are small by design and rely heavily on collaborative effort for success.

Teacher Perceptions of Leadership

Studies by Hoy, Tarter and Woolfolk-Hoy (2006), which have gone beyond socioeconomic status (SES) in the search for school-level factors that make a difference in student achievement, found that three concepts—*academic emphasis*, *teachers' perceived collective efficacy*, and *faculty trust*—combine to create a condition Hoy et al. (2006) coined as *Academic Optimism*. According to Hoy et al., if a school meets these criteria, regardless of SES, the students will achieve. Hoy et al.'s studies are really about the culture of schools that can raise student achievement, regardless of SES. Hoy et al. noted that the principals' perceptions and the teachers' perceptions, when in alignment, led to academic improvement in students. Do the teachers in charter schools have the same leadership perceptions as their principals?

Gender of School Leader and Leadership Perceptions

Responses on the Leadership Practices Inventory by Kouzes and Posner (2007), as cited in Posner (2010), have also shown significant differences between male and female responses overall in their self reports, as well as in data on male and female leaders from observers. However, a greater percentage of charter school principals, 53% nationally (Gates, Ringel, Santibanex, Chung & Ross, 2003) and 60% in South Carolina

(South Carolina Association of Public Schools [SCAPCS]), are women. Charter schools demand the leadership style of a chief executive officer (CEO) (NAPCS, 2008), and census data reveal that only 2.4% of top CEO's in this country are women [Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010]). So, this leads one to question whether there would be significant differences between male charter school principals' and female charter school principals' responses on the self-assessment as well as responses of their direct reports.

Tenure of School Leader and Leadership Perceptions

Research by Clark, Martorell and Rockoff (2009) indicated a positive relationship between a principal's experience and school performance, particularly for math test scores and student absences (p. 26). Principal effectiveness seems to have a steep learning curve over the first few years of principal experience. Studies have also shown that the longer a principal stays at a school, the more positive his or her effect will be (Clark et al., 2009).

Scores on the LPI for leadership practices by tenure or length of time with the organization do show significant differences in scores according to years of experience (Posner, 2010). Since years of experience has been shown to be a factor in principal effectiveness, one may assume that significant differences would also be found in charter school leadership perceptions of principals on the self-reports, as well as the observer reports, due to principal tenure at his or her school.

The picture of leadership becomes more mired when the gaps in research and the overlap in definitions are so varied. Is one type of leadership all inclusive of the perfect educational leader? Are the leadership types (i.e., transformational, instructional, distributed, transactional) completely separate, or is there overlap of defining terms as

suggested by the research? Which leadership type is most effective in the context of charter schools? Or are they all just as effective? While many of these questions are beyond the scope of this study, they do point to a gap in the plethora of leadership research.

Statement of the Problem

While there is agreement that the instructional leader of a school is crucial to transforming an underperforming school (Leithwood et al. [2004]), there is also little consensus about what leadership behaviors best facilitate this transformation.

It can also be said from *Seven Strong Claims about Successful School Leadership*, written by Leithwood et al. (2007), that principal leadership is surpassed only by classroom teaching in influencing student learning. However, in a study by Litchka (2003), perceptions of critical leadership behaviors of principals varied significantly, depending on whether the respondent was a principal or a teacher. If teachers and principals are not in congruence with leadership behaviors, then a school cannot be effective. How can a school, especially a charter school where collaboration of all stakeholders is considered a key role and mission buy-in is crucial, be effective or successful?

Because charter schools, though public, are considered schools of choice, leaders of these schools must balance traditional instructional leadership roles with satisfying parents, their primary consumers (Frumkin 2003). According to NAPCS (2008), charter school leadership demands “great passion, resourcefulness and resiliency,” fused with “an uncommon set of competencies, combining strong instructional leadership with solid business skills and management know-how” (p.4). This definition, similar to Premack’s

earlier assertion (NACS, 2008), the ideal charter school leader possesses, not only a set of competencies that go beyond simple instructional or transformational definitions, but also more of a synthesis of the two, combined with a political awareness and business savvy.

Charter schools that have parent buy-in, as previously described, also must have a teacher buy-in. Robelin's (2008) study delineated that high-performing charter schools employed *distributed leadership* by allowing teachers to assume some of the leader's tasks. This strategy of developing leadership from within, and collaborative leadership to increase collective efficacy, may indeed be the key to a charter school's success (Campbell, 2010; NAPCS, 2008; Robelin, 2008).

Because teachers are also considered key stakeholders in charter schools, it is imperative that, for a charter school to be successful in its mission, instructional leadership behaviors or perceived instructional leadership behaviors must be aligned across stakeholders.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there were significant differences between principals' and teachers' perceptions of effective instructional leadership behaviors in charter school principals.

Variables

The variables in this study were:

1. Charter school principals' self-perception scores on the five dimensions of leadership
2. Charter school teachers' perceptions of their principals on the five dimensions of leadership

3. Gender of principal
4. Tenure of principal at his/her charter school

Hypotheses

The following were the hypotheses in this study:

1. Perception scores of charter school principals on themselves and teacher perception scores of their principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership.
2. Perception scores of charter school principals on themselves and teacher perception scores of their principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership according to the gender of the principal.
3. Perception scores of charter school teachers and principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership for principals having three or more years of tenure at his or her charter school.
4. Perception scores of charter school teachers and principals will differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership for principals having less than three years of tenure at his or her charter school.

Significance of the Study

Instructional leadership is an area of concern in all public schools. However, in charter schools the research is scant. According to NAPCS (2008), charter schools are projected to need somewhere between 6,000 – 21,000 new principals by the end of the current decade. The NAPCS also reported that conventional educational leadership programs fail to cover the unique characteristics, demands, and responsibilities involved in effectively leading a charter school.

Currently, public charter school principals tend to fall in two age categories, under the age of 40 and over the age of 55 (Aud et al., 2010). As principals head toward retirement, younger, less experienced, principals will be left to take the helms of the growing number of charter schools. The fact that charter schools also serve a growing number of high poverty and at-risk students (Aud et al., 2010) makes it even more imperative that these novice principals are well-trained. Will these principals be equipped with the bevy of skills described by the NAPCS and others?

Despite the sizeable body of literature on educational leadership, researchers have observed a marked disconnect between the rhetoric of how principals should act as school leaders and what they actually do on the job (Louis et al., 2010; Portin et al., 2003). Researchers have attempted to find a relationship between the perceptions of classroom teachers and principals regarding the importance of instructional leadership behaviors (Litchka 2003), only to find significant differences in opinion between principals and teachers as to what constitutes instructional leadership. Because of this, coupled with the increased recognition of the vital importance of gaining the teacher perspective in understanding principal leadership, Kelley et al. (2005), Leithwood and Jantzi (2000), and Oplatka and Tako (2009) called for a closer look into teacher perceptions, at least for charter schools that could serve as the basis for developing criteria to evaluate the effectiveness of charter principal performance. By clearly defining successful charter leadership behaviors, this study could make needed contributions to research, administrator preparation programs, and practice.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to South Carolina Charter School principals and charter school teachers.

This research study did not examine variables of race or ethnicity, as 98% of charter school principals in South Carolina were considered White.

Limitations

This research study was limited by the number of principals and teachers that voluntarily responded to the instrument.

This study was limited by the statistical treatment using a Wilcoxon-Rank Sum Test, in that pairs had to be matched for comparison. This had the potential of limiting the ability to compare groups that could not be matched.

This study was limited by the ability of the respondents to follow survey instructions.

This study was limited by the degree of candor with which each respondent answered each question.

Due to the small number of schools in this study, the research was limited to constraints within a purposeful design using a convenience sample as opposed to a random sample.

Definition of terms

Charter Schools - independent public schools that are allowed the freedom to be more innovative, while being held accountable for improved student achievement (NAPCS).

Leadership - the process of persuasion or example by which an individual or team induces a group to pursue objectives held by the leader and followers (Gardner, 1990).

Perception - an awareness of one's environment through physical sensation; the ability to understand; insight, comprehension.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Instructional leadership has its origins in the effective schools movement of the 1980s, and has since undergone several refinements (Hallinger, 2003; Horng & Loeb, 2010; Lashway, 2002). In its most recent incarnation, the emphasis is on organizational management for the purpose of improving classroom instruction by providing teachers with opportunities for professional growth and development (Horng & Loeb, 2010). Successful educational leaders influence student outcomes via two key channels—supporting and developing effective teachers, and adopting effective organizational processes (Davis et al., 2005). In the business world, transformational leadership grew out of a turbulent climate in which traditional modes of leadership were ineffective for meeting the challenge of ongoing change and the need for organizational redesign (Bass, 1999). In a parallel manner, transformational school leadership arose in a climate of education reform and restructuring (Hallinger, 2003). As Eric Premack’s ironic description of the “perfect” charter school leader indicates, successful charter school principals require a repertoire of leadership and management skills drawn from the private, public, nonprofit, and educational sectors.

Indeed, by the time the K-12 sector began to explore the potential of transformational leadership, there was already a substantial body of research documenting the effectiveness of transformational leadership across organizational sectors (Bass, 1999). Kouzes and Posner’s (2007) *Five Practices of Exemplary*

Leadership came from more than 20 years of extensive and intensive research into the most admired and preferred qualities of a leader. The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), the instrument used for this study, was originally validated in 1988 (Posner & Kouzes, 1988). Kouzes and Posner have continued their research across national, as well as organizational, boundaries. Educational studies are included in the most recent validation of the LPI (Posner, 2010).

In spite of the massive body of leadership research, charter school leaders are working in virtually unmapped terrain. To understand the unique challenges confronting charter school principals, the following section will provide a background on public charter schools in the United States.

Charter Schools

A charter school is defined as a publicly funded school typically run by a group or organization under a charter or legislative contract with the state (Aud et al., 2010). Under the terms of the charter, the school is exempt from certain state and local rules and regulations, but in exchange for autonomy and funding the school is required to meet the accountability standards stipulated by the charter. The charter is reviewed at regular intervals (generally every three-to-five years), and can be revoked if the school has not followed the guidelines for curriculum and management, or fails to meet the specified standards.

As of 2008, 1.3 million students attended 4,400 charter schools operating in 40 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico (Aud et al., 2010). Elementary schools accounted for more than half of the charter schools (54%), with secondary and blended schools representing 27% and 19% of the charter schools, respectively. More than half of

all charter schools (55%) are located in urban communities. Suburban schools comprise the next largest segment of charter schools (22%), followed by rural schools (15%) and schools located in towns (8%). Roughly two-thirds of the charter schools (65%) had less than 300 students in 2008, considerably less than the 77% for the 1999-2000 school year. At the same time, the proportion of charter schools with 300-499 students increased from 9% to 12%, and the proportion with an enrollment of 1,000 students or more increased from 2% to 3%. By 2010, the number of charter schools was approaching 5,000, and an estimated 400 new charter schools open their doors each year (Campbell, 2010).

Due in part to their predominance in urban communities, charter schools serve a disproportionate number of ethnic minority students. In 2008, 32% of charter school students were African American and 39% were White, versus 15% and 55% in the general public school population (Aud et al., 2010). From 2000 to 2008, there was actually some decline in the proportion of both White and African American students in charter schools. However, over the same time period, the proportion of Latino charter school students increased from 20% to 24% and the proportion of Asian/Pacific Islander students, though still small, increased from 3% to 4%. Overall, the charter school population is 52% ethnic minority heritage, 54% economically disadvantaged, and 50% at risk (Allen & Consoletti, 2010). English language learners (ELLs) constitute 19% of charter school students and students with disabilities comprise 14%. Two populations that are overlooked in most educational research; namely, teenage parents and adjudicated youth; represent 8% and close to 14% of charter school students, respectively. The overall portrait is that, "Students who attend charters are largely underserved by the conventional public school environment" (p. 4).

In fact, charter schools attract students by creating innovative programs that appeal to specific groups. Allen and Consoletti (2010) have observed that charter schools attract students at both ends of the educational spectrum, from students at risk for school failure to gifted and talented students who are poorly served by the conventional model. In effect, the curriculum and educational milieu of charter schools are tailored for the target population. More than three-quarters of charter schools have a specific theme or focus. The uniqueness of the charter school environment underscores the importance of having leaders who uphold the school's stated mission. Campbell (2010) noted that, in traditional public schools, principals can be transferred from one school to another fairly easily. In contrast, "finding the right leader to a drop-out recovery school or a college prep high school requires a deep pool of passionate and talented people" (p. 3). While the turnover rate for charter school principals is no higher than the turnover rate for their counterparts in traditional public schools, Campbell pointed out that the loss of a leader can have a potentially greater impact in the charter school sector where a leader who is a wrong fit for the school could have devastating consequences.

Not all charter schools are so vulnerable. In fact, a distinguishing feature of charter schools is their tremendous diversity. Some charter schools are heavily funded and rich in resources (Frumkin, 2003). Most, however, are not. On average, charter schools receive 30% less funding than traditional public schools, despite the fact that they are public schools and therefore should be entitled to equal funding (Allen & Consoletti, 2010). Many charters are still in the start-up phase and are especially vulnerable to leadership transitions. Replacing a leader who is also a founder can be a particularly challenging endeavor. Many charter schools have no succession plans. In research on

leadership planning, Campbell (2010) found that many teachers on charter school leadership teams were shocked by the thought that their principal might be leaving. While this may be positive in the sense that it implies that the school has an excellent charismatic leader, it also implies that the loss of the principal could trigger a crisis. In schools that do have succession plans, the candidate is frequently someone from within the school, often a teacher on the school leadership team.

The term *strategic leadership* is sometimes applied to educational leadership (Leithwood et al., 2004). Perhaps nowhere is strategic leadership needed more than at the helm of charter schools. Frumkin (2003) defined strategic management within the charter school environment as “ultimately about the achievement of fit, alignment, and coherence among the core activities within the school” (p. 6). According to Frumkin, charter school leaders have three major tasks. The first task is securing support and legitimacy from the external authorizing environment. All schools need the support of external stakeholders, including parents, the community, state departments of education, and policymakers. Charter schools, in particular, require the support of the authorizing agencies. The second task for school leaders is effectively mobilizing the operational capacity to provide requisite services. This task is especially challenging for charter schools, which operate in an environment that is more complicated and has fewer resources than that of traditional public schools. The third task is defining the mission of a new charter school or upholding the mission of an established charter.

According to Frumkin (2003), successful charter school entrepreneurs often point to strong relationships with stakeholders as the central facet of their success. This reflects one of the main attractions of charter schools; namely, their personalized

atmosphere and dedication to the communities they serve. There is compelling evidence that charter schools are far superior to conventional public schools in at least one respect: parent involvement. Pragmatically, because charter schools operate on a school choice basis, their survival depends upon their ability to satisfy consumer needs. As Frumkin observed, “The best way to keep parents satisfied is to keep them informed and for their children to thrive” (p. 16). In some charter schools, parents are actively involved in the design and development of the school.

Charter schools also operate in an environment where political support is essential for their success (Frumkin, 2003). Therefore, cultivating and sustaining stakeholder support goes beyond good relationships with school parents. Charter school leaders must be adept at interacting with the local political and regulatory agencies that authorize, oversee, and fund charter schools. Recent trends indicate that increasing numbers of charter schools have multiple authorizers (Allen & Consoletti, 2010). The degree of challenge and importance involved in managing relationships with the various agencies depends upon the state and local policies governing charter schools.

The NAPCS (2008) stated that conventional educational leadership programs fail to cover the unique characteristics, demands, and responsibilities involved in effectively leading a charter schools. The authors noted that there are some highly sophisticated and promising programs tailored to turning out candidates for charter school leadership, but the small number of graduates from these programs is severely inadequate for meeting the demand for leaders in the burgeoning charter school sector. Overall, there has been an increase in the number of K-12 public school principals in two age categories, under the age of 40 and over the age 55 (Aud et al., 2010). In contrast to teacher turnover that

is high for novices, most of the current turnover of charter and traditional public school principals is due to retirement, and it is expected that this will continue to be so. The implication is that veteran leaders are being replaced by novices. For the charter school sector, a key question is whether new principals are equipped with the skills for leading and managing in the dynamic, complex, and uncertain charter school realm. In fact, despite the inherent challenges, charter school principals tend to be less experienced than principals of conventional public schools (Robelen, 2008).

As outlined by the NAPCS (2008), charter school leadership demands “great passion, resourcefulness and resiliency” fused with “an uncommon set of competencies, combining strong instructional leadership with solid business skills and management know-how” (p. 4). From the perspective of contemporary educational leadership, successful charter school leadership requires a synthesis of instructional and transformational leadership and organizational management skills.

Several charter school networks and organizations have delineated the qualities they seek in a leader. For example, the Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP)—a national network of open enrollment in college preparatory schools serving disadvantaged communities—seeks leaders who are student-focused, relentless achievers, people oriented, self-aware, adaptable, critical thinkers and decision makers, strong communicators, organized, inspirational leaders, and instructional leaders (NAPCS, 2008, p. 16). Achievement First, a nonprofit charter school management organization with the goal of establishing a system of high performing charter schools in New York and Connecticut, demarcates a set of core values for their leaders. These are: commitment to mission; focus on excellence, people orientation and interpersonal skills; instructional leadership;

ongoing learning; communication; organization and planning; problem solving; character; vision and inspiration; and management and delegation (p. 17).

Other charter school organizations have similar attributes in their selection criteria for school leaders (NAPCS, 2008). In most cases, there is an explicit reference to instructional leadership. The qualities of transformational leadership based on Bass and Avolio's (1994) model and the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 2007) are both explicit and implicit in the desired leadership attributes. It is also important not to downgrade the components of transactional leadership, which include management and delegation. Bass (1999) emphasized that strong transactional leadership provides the foundation for transformational leadership. There is also evidence that transactional leadership may play a more important role in educational leadership than is generally assumed (Vecchio, Justin & Pearce, 2008). This finding is consistent with the broad conception of instructional leadership that emphasizes organizational management (Grissom & Loeb, 2009; Horng & Loeb, 2010).

Compared to traditional public schools, charter schools have greater freedom in hiring teachers and structuring the school curriculum (Allen & Consoletti, 2010). This endows the schools with the power to tailor the curriculum to reflect the school's mission and hire teachers who espouse innovative teaching practices. In terms of leadership planning, the NAPCS (2008) proposes that one way to expand the pool of potential candidates is to hire teachers who aspire to positions of leadership. Through this practice, schools can cultivate their own leaders from a talent pool already immersed in the school's unique mission and culture. In some states, charter school teachers are allowed to serve on charter school boards of trustees, thereby being placed in the role of

developing school policy. In some charter schools, particularly small charters that are not affiliated with networks or management companies, teachers may assume the role of “lead teacher” or “assistant principal” and engage in performing executive tasks in addition to teaching classes. Many charter schools have extended school days or Saturday classes. Teachers may be in charge of enrichment programs, or serve as liaisons with parents and community members. Team leadership is not unique to charter schools, and indeed is a feature of high-performing schools (Louis et al., 2010). For charter schools, unconventional approaches to organization and leadership “allows even a small charter school to let staff shine” (NAPCS, 2008, p. 24).

In her case study research of five high-performing Massachusetts charter schools, Katherine Merseeth (as cited in Robelin, 2008) discerned several qualities that were common among the school leaders. These qualities include “a singular focus on student outcomes,” an “entrepreneurial mind-set,” and a “nimbleness” of flexibility that enables them to immediately change strategies if they see that a particular strategy is ineffective (p. S9). These principals are driven by the vision of seeing their students succeed and, as a result, “They push the kids, they push the staff, they push the parents....They feel this sense of urgency to serve these kids.” Pushing their constituents does not mean the principals are autocratic. Rather, the five schools favor distributed leadership, cultivating their teachers for future leadership by entrusting them with leadership tasks.

The literature suggests that the most successful charter school principals have the capacity to draw from several models of leadership, synthesizing best practices from the educational, private, and nonprofit sectors into a paradigm that fits the unique situation of charter schools in the educational domain and the unique mission and character of their

schools. In addition to having to navigate the complex dynamics of the charter school environment, charter school principals may have the additional responsibility of serving as excellent role models for teachers who may be assisting them, or succeeding them, in charting the course of the school.

Contemporary Educational Leadership

Instructional leadership began to emerge as a model for educational leadership in the 1970s (Hornig & Loeb, 2010). Spurred by the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk*, the drive for effective schools led by strong instructional leaders gained momentum during the 1980s as schools strove to improve academic achievement (Harris, Ballenger & Leonard, 2004). During the same time period, transformational leadership became a popular leadership mode in the private sector. While the acceptance of transformational leadership in K-12 public schools lagged behind other sectors, by the 1990s, evidence had accrued supporting its effectiveness in the educational realm (Leithwood et al., 2004). Instructional leadership and transformational leadership predominate in the recent educational literature. Instructional leadership in the 21st Century, however, differs in many ways from the instructional leadership of the 1980s.

Instructional Leadership

According to Lashway (2002), the original model of instructional leadership was top-down and principal-centered, often depicting the principal as a heroic figure single-handedly keeping the school on target. Unlike transformational leadership which arose from a theoretical framework, instructional leadership emerged from studies investigating school improvement, school effectiveness, program improvement, and change management (Hallinger, 2003). The common element of these lines of research was that

“the skillful leadership of school principals” was a major factor in the success of each of these endeavors (p. 331). Instructional leadership had critics as well as supporters. Nevertheless, the concept became extremely popular in North America and internationally, and by the early 1990s, instructional leadership was adopted as the “model of choice” by most principal preparation programs in the U.S. (p. 330). Between 1980 and 2000, instructional leadership was the focus of more than 125 research studies.

One critique of instructional leadership is that the lack of a theoretical framework leaves it open to misinterpretation. Leithwood et al. (2006) observed that the terms *instructional leadership* in North America and *learning-centred leadership* in England are frequently used to describe whatever the person regards as “good” leadership with essentially “no reference to models of instructional or learning-centred leadership that have some conceptual coherence and a body of evidence testing their effects on organizations and pupils” (p. 7). Leithwood and his colleagues (2004, 2006) credited Hallinger’s (2003) model with having a sound theoretical and empirical foundation. Indeed, Hallinger’s conception of instructional leadership has extensive acceptance.

Hallinger’s (2003) model of instructional leadership consists of three dimensions: defining the school’s mission, managing the instructional program, and fostering a positive educational climate. Each dimension, in turn, has multiple facets. The two facets of defining the school’s mission are framing and communicating school goals. These entail working with school personnel to assure that the school has clearly defined, quantifiable goals centered on improving the students’ academic performance. The principal is entrusted with the task of conveying these goals to all school stakeholders. Hallinger emphasized that this role does not imply that defining the school’s mission is

the sole province of the principal. Rather, the principal has the responsibility of seeing that the school has a distinct academic mission, and to communicate it to all constituents. This aspect of instructional leadership is especially pertinent to the charter school principalship (Campbell, 2010; Frumkin, 2003).

Managing the instructional program is concentrated on coordinating and directing curriculum and instruction (Hallinger, 2003). Fostering a positive educational climate involves several activities, including preserving instructional time, highlighting professional development, keeping a visible profile, providing incentives for teachers, and providing incentives for learning. Intrinsic to the establishment of a positive climate for learning is the notion that effective schools display an academic focus through “the development of high standards and expectations and culture of continuous improvement” (p. 332). As instructional leader, the principal has the task of ensuring the alignment of the three dimensions.

Hallinger (2003) was aware that there are several competing models of instructional leadership. The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) outlined a model of instructional leadership drawn from six roles reflecting best practices for an educational environment driven by sweeping education reforms and escalating demands for accountability (Lashway, 2002). Lashway characterized this model as more sophisticated than earlier models, and its proponents prefer the term *learning leader* to *instructional leader*. The distinction may seem subtle, but the underlying meaning is that the principal is committed to creating an atmosphere conducive to ongoing learning for children and adults both.

The six key roles delineated by NAESP involve: (1) giving the foremost priority to student and adult learning, (2) setting high performance expectations, (3) aligning content and instruction with standards, (4) forging a culture of continuous learning for adults, (5) drawing from multiple data sources to evaluate learning outcomes, and (6) enlisting community support for school success (Lashway, 2002). According to NAESP's conception, the principal is a leader of a learning community.

Lashway's (2002) vision of instructional leadership represents a marked departure from the top-down, principal-centered model of the 1980s. In Lashway's perspective, leading in an era of standards-driven reforms demands a delicate balance between top-down and collaborative leadership. Principals not only have to develop new skills, but they are also compelled to view their leadership roles and responsibilities from a different perspective. Lashway observed that *vision* is often used to describe the leader's role in creating a structure for standards-based learning. From a practical standpoint, *vision* means ensuring that all constituents are cognizant of the goal for which they are all accountable, and how it aligns with school policies, practices, and resources. As *organizational manager*, the instructional leader builds a coherent framework for teaching and learning directed toward achieving collective educational goals (Grissom & Loeb, 2009; Horng & Loeb, 2010).

Consistent with the trend away from top-down leadership, instructional leaders must learn to be adept in striking a balance between authority and empowerment (Lashway, 2002). The importance of this aspect of leadership is highlighted by the superior results associated with distributed leadership (Louis et al., 2010; Sheppard et al., 2010).). Additionally, research reveals that it is not distributed leadership per se that

generates high performance, but rather the way leadership is distributed among school actors (Leithwood et al., 2007). Lashway (2002) advocated discussion for advancing collective goals, a strategy reflecting the tenets of transformational leadership (Bass, 1999; Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Leithwood et al., 2004).

Another concern for instructional leaders is that they must model learning (Lashway, 2002). At the most basic level, this implies that principals must be knowledgeable about the quality of classroom instruction and assessment and their connection to school standards and goals. Even more important, principals should exemplify the same learning qualities they expect in teachers; such as, openness to new and creative ideas, willingness to adopt a results-driven approach, and perseverance when confronted with obstacles. For principals and teachers in charter schools, these qualities are essential to the success of the school.

Murphy et al. (2007) formulated a model of “leadership for learning,” based on research drawn from higher performing schools and school districts. The model has eight basic dimensions. *Vision for Learning* involves “the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community” (Council of Chief State School Officers, as cited in Murphy et al., 2007, p. 181). *Instructional Program* encompasses being knowledgeable and involved with the school’s educational program, hiring and allocating school staff, supporting school staff, and protecting instructional time. *Curricular Program* entails knowledge and involvement in the school’s curricular program, conveying and upholding high expectations and standards, maximizing learning opportunities for all students, and aligning the curriculum and standards. Knowledge and involvement are also essential to

the *Assessment Program*, which encompasses the modes of assessment used by the school, monitoring of curriculum and instruction, and employing a data-driven approach to academic improvement.

The fifth dimension of the model is commitment to *Communities of Learning*, which involves creating a learning organization by providing and sustaining opportunities for professional development, cultivating communities of professional practice, and developing community anchored schools, meaning schools permeated by a philosophy of community that includes teamwork, distributed leadership, empowerment, and respect for diversity (Murphy et al., 2007). *Resource Acquisition and Use* refers to the acquisition, allocation, and utilization for the purpose of achieving school goals. *Organizational Culture* means dedication to a school culture marked by production emphasis, continuous improvement, a safe and orderly learning environment, and personalization, which is achieved through mechanisms that connect teachers and students. Finally, *Social Advocacy* involves stakeholder engagement, respect for and attention to diversity, environmental context, and ethics.

Although Murphy et al. (2007) developed their model to be applicable to all K-12 schools, it seems especially apt for capturing the complex and multidimensional nature of charter school leadership. Behaviors associated with the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership are explicit and implicit in the model which can be adapted to fit any leadership style.

Transformational Leadership

Instructional leadership and transformational leadership are both associated with positive educational outcomes, primarily by creating a learning environment marked by

high expectations for students and respect and support for teachers' professional knowledge and expertise (Leithwood et al., 2004). The two models each have distinct, and in some ways contrasting, features, but they also share some commonalities.

Transformational leadership in the educational setting has a number of defining features, including vision, collective goals, individualized support, intellectual stimulation, cultural transformation, high expectations, and modeling (Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood et al., 2004). The major difference between instructional and transformational leadership is that instructional leadership is largely a top-down strategy for school improvement, whereas transformational leadership is more of a bottom-up approach (Hallinger, 2003). A second distinction is that instructional leadership is centered on first order (structural) change, while transformational leadership emphasizes second order change (attitudes and beliefs). A third distinction between the two models is that instructional leadership relies on transactional or managerial leadership for guiding interactions between the principal and school personnel, while transformational leadership is based on developing mutual, trusting relationships among all constituents.

Hallinger (2003) acknowledged that, despite the distinctions between instructional and transformational leadership, there are actually more similarities than differences in the two modes of leadership. Both leadership models are committed to: (1) promoting a sense of collective purpose, (2) fostering a climate of high expectations and a culture dedicated to improving teaching and learning, (3) creating a reward system aligned with the goals set for school staff and students, (4) organizing and providing a wide variety of activities designed for the intellectual stimulation and professional development for

school faculty and staff, and (5) being a visible presence within in the school and modeling the values intrinsic to the school culture.

Models of Transformational Leadership

The philosophical principles of transformational leadership are essentially the same, although they are defined somewhat differently by Bass (1999) and Kouzes and Posner (2007). Derived from Burns' (1978) classic work, *Leadership*, Bass and Avolio (1994) developed an operational model for the purpose of evaluating leader behaviors. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) captures the full range of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership, and by extension the LPI, evolved from research conducted by Kouzes and Posner (2007) into the most desired characteristics of an organizational leader. The "Four I's" of transformational leadership assessed by the MLQ and the Five Practices embedded in the LPI both reflect qualities of an excellent leader.

The Full Range Leadership Model

The Four I's, or four dimensions, of transformational leadership are: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1994). *Idealized influence* refers to behaviors that elicit admiration, respect, and trust from followers. Leadership by example is a manifestation of idealized influence. *Inspirational motivation* denotes the ability to convey a compelling vision that motivates action toward achieving individual and collective goals. *Intellectual stimulation* involves seeking ideas, opinions, and input from followers to promote innovation and creativity. The leader creates a milieu where people feel free to

express new ideas and experiment with creative problem solving. In displaying *individualized consideration*, the leader is attuned to each person's needs for growth and recognition, creates opportunities for new learning experiences and encourages followers to aspire to higher levels of self-realization.

The full range leadership model includes three types of transactional leadership: contingent reward, management-by-exception, and *laissez faire* leadership (Avolio et al., 1999). Contingent reward leadership is the most effective form of transformational leadership. Leaders who rely on contingent reward convey clear expectations or directions for performance and specify the rewards that followers receive in return. Management-by-exception is more ambiguous, and can take one of two forms. In active management-by-exception, the leader monitors the follower's performance but only acts if it fails to meet the designated standards. In passive management-by-exception the leader takes no action until a problem arises. *Laissez faire* is the least effective mode of leadership; the leader takes virtually no action at all.

Factor analyses of the MLQ revealed a notable correlation between transactional contingent reward leadership and transformational leadership individualized consideration, leading Avolio et al. (1999) to suggest that, "Transactional contingent reward leadership may be the basis for structuring developmental expectations, as well as building trust, because of a consistent honouring of 'contracts' over time" (p. 458). A criticism of the emphasis on transformational leadership is that it downplays the importance of transactional leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999; Vecchio et al., 2008). The re-conceptualization of instructional leadership as organizational management brings renewed attention to the managerial tasks of the principal that are essential to creating a

school environment for optimizing teaching and learning (Grissom & Loeb, 2009; Hornig & Loeb, 2010).

The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership

In their extensive research into the qualities of an excellent leader, Kouzes and Posner (2007) employed a variety of qualitative and quantitative techniques to investigate leadership practices in a wide spectrum of private and public sector organizations in the U.S. and abroad. *The Leadership Challenge* was originally published in 1987.

Subsequent research has affirmed the primacy of certain leadership attributes which were favored across organizational sectors and international boundaries consistently, and in essentially the same order. Honesty invariably emerged as the paramount quality of an excellent leader. Competence was second. Vision and inspiring were the third and fourth most prized attributes of an organizational leader.

The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership are derived from the most successful and admired leader behaviors and operationalized in the LPI (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). *Modeling the Way* embodies the concept of leadership by example, meaning that the actions of exemplary leaders are congruent with their words. *Inspiring a Shared Vision* refers to imagining hopes and aspirations for the future and engaging others to strive toward mutual goals. *Enabling Others to Act* entails promoting teamwork, collaboration, and empowerment. *Challenging the Process* can be construed as change leadership. Leaders who Challenge look for new opportunities, support and encourage creativity, novel ideas, and innovation, and are not afraid to experiment and take risks. By *Encouraging the Heart*, leaders foster a sense of belonging and involvement by recognizing and rewarding personal contributions and celebrating achievements.

Consistent with the emphasis on teamwork and empowerment in the management and organizational literature, Enabling is the most widely used of the Five Practices (Kouzes & Posner, 2007; Posner, 2010). Leaders use enabling behaviors to develop the leadership talents of their followers, and enabling is especially relevant in light of the positive impact of distributed educational leadership. Enabling behaviors on the part of the leaders foster self-efficacy at the individual level and collective efficacy at the group and organizational levels (Bandura, 1997, 2000; Brinson & Steiner, 2007; Ross & Gray, 2006). Kouzes and Posner (2007) describes it in this way:

For leaders, developing the competence and confidence of their constituents (so that they might be more qualified, more capable, more effective leaders in their own right) is a personal and hands-on affair. Leaders are genuinely interested in those they coach, having empathy for and an understanding of their constituents. (p. 261)

Providing organization members with education and training falls under the heading of Enabling Others to Act (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). A project team manager with a start-up medical device firm described how she pushed her team to success, upon the realization that the successful completion of the project (design of an innovative medical tool) hinged on learning new skills to apply to the task and being confident in performing them:

They needed to extend themselves beyond their current comfortable skills sets. I ensured that the team members were trained to complete each task rather than assuming that previous experience was sufficient. This ended up being very important to the success of the project.... With the additional training and

individual attention, individuals felt like they were part of the team and posed, even eager, to make a contribution. (Gita Barry, as cited in Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 261)

Barry's depiction of her experience invokes the skills required of a successful charter school leader (Robelen, 2008). Enabling leaders recognize that a commitment to ongoing learning is an essential feature of a high performance work environment, and are aware of the vital importance of building the self-confidence of their constituents so they have the capacity to persevere in the face of challenges, obstacles, and uncharted territory (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

The most recent validation studies of the LPI revealed significant associations between the Five Practices and "positive workplace attitude," a construct encompassing team spirit, organizational pride, behavioral commitment, motivation, productivity, clear expectations, trust in management, appreciation, and personal and workplace effectiveness (Posner, 2010). Greater engagement in the Five Practices by leaders is linked with more favorable workplace attitudes on the part of constituents.

In contrast to the extensive use of enabling behaviors, Inspiring a Shared Vision is the most difficult of the five practices (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). Whereas Enabling involves concrete behaviors, Inspiring may depend upon the leader's charisma. The original MLQ was redesigned when it became apparent that there was a substantial degree of overlap between charisma and inspirational motivation (Avolio et al., 1999). The extent to which leaders utilize each of the Five Practices depends upon the situation and the environment but, overall, the more that they are involved in the practices, the

more conducive the organizational environment is to high productivity, motivation, and morale (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Both the LPI and the MLQ have both a self and an observer version. It is not unusual to find discrepancies between the self-appraisals of leaders and the perceptions of their constituents. In the educational setting, there are notable disparities in the way teachers and principals perceive the principal's leadership style (Kelley et al., 2005). Teachers and principals also differ in the precedence they give to certain aspects of educational leadership (Richards, 2003, 2005). Adding to the complexity, principals, teachers, and superintendents have different conceptions of leadership related to their respective positions within the school system (Hsieh & Shen, 1998). Superintendents are most attuned to the knowledge and skills needed to navigate the political realm, which are also requisite for successful charter school leadership (Frumkin, 2003; NAPCS, 2008; Robelen, 2008). The charter school principal's role encompasses many tasks traditionally performed by district superintendents, such as dealing with multiple external stakeholders and securing and allocating human and material resources.

Some demographic differences have been found in the LPI validation studies. In the initial validation study, women were more apt to engage in Encouraging the Heart than their male counterparts (Posner & Kouzes, 1988). In the recent analysis, women scored significantly higher than men on all five leadership practices (Posner, 2010). Women have increasingly become a presence in the public school principalship. At the elementary school level, women comprise a majority of school principals, increasing from 52% in 2000 to 59% in 2008 (Aud et al., 2010). Women still account for less than

one-third of secondary school principals, although the proportion of women has increased from 22% to 29% for the same time period.

Interestingly, but perhaps not surprisingly, the LPI validation studies suggest that leaders in education are not inclined to Challenge the Process to a great extent (Posner, 2010). Leaders who engage in Challenging are ideally suited to the dynamic charter school environment (NACPS, 2008; Robelen, 2008). There is ample anecdotal evidence about charismatic charter school leaders, and virtual consensus that charter school success demands a leader who can Inspire a Shared Vision. However, there is scant empirical research focused on charter school leadership.

Educational Leadership Research

Transformational Leadership

Leithwood and Jantzi's (1999, 2000) research on transformational leadership unfolded over the 1990s and included several replication studies. Their model of transformational leadership arose from their own work, and consists of six "leadership" and four "management" dimensions. The leadership dimensions include *building school vision and goals, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, symbolizing professional practices and values, demonstrating high performance expectations, and developing structures to foster participation in school decisions*. *Staffing, instructional support, monitoring school activities, and community focus* represent the dimensions of management.

The research was based on 1,818 teachers and 6,940 students drawn from 94 elementary schools located in a large Canadian school district serving a mixture of urban, suburban, and rural families (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999). The replication study of

transformational leadership was framed slightly differently than the original and the district had undergone some changes in the interim. Rather than relying on socioeconomic status (SES) to gauge the influence of family background characteristics, both studies used family educational culture, defined as “the assumptions, norms, values, and beliefs held by the family about intellectual work” (p. 460). Both studies found this measure to have considerable influence on student engagement, but the effect was somewhat less in the second study. Another distinction between the two studies was that, in the original study, transformational leadership had a powerful impact on organizational conditions as a whole, but in the replication study it influenced only school conditions. One finding that did not change over time was that transformational leadership exerted a modest, but significant, impact on student engagement. Later, more extensive research by Leithwood et al. (2007) affirmed the positive effect of transformational leadership on student engagement.

Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) also replicated an earlier study on distributed leadership, exploring the effects of principal and teacher leadership. Student engagement was divided into affective and behavioral elements, with increases in identification (affective) strongly related to increased participation representing the behavioral domain. Principal and teacher leadership both had some effects on student engagement, but neither form of leadership was a strong influence. The effects for principal leadership were significant but weak and the effects for teacher leadership fell short of significance.

In their review of research, Leithwood et al. (2004) commented that the idea of teacher leadership is based more on democratic ideals than persuasive empirical evidence. However, they concurred that the leadership of a school is beyond the scope of

one person. In their review of *Seven Strong Claims about Successful School Leadership*, Leithwood et al. (2007) found the least support for the claim that distributed leadership is superior, but nonetheless they described the evidence in its favor as very compelling.

The effects of distributed leadership are quite complex, depending upon the source of the leadership and the specific effect on the school. The researchers use the term “total leadership” to denote leadership from all sources. Total leadership is significantly linked with the three dimensions of staff performance (teachers’ perceived working conditions, teachers’ motivation and commitment, and teachers’ capacity) but in different degrees. The relationship is most pronounced for teachers’ perceived working conditions and weakest for teachers’ motivation and commitment. Teachers’ capacity shows a much stronger association relationship to total leadership than to principal leadership alone.

Lead teachers play an important role in many schools, and can be pivotal to the leadership of small charter schools (NAPCS, 2008). Printy and Marks (2006) viewed teachers and principals as complementary contributors to instructional leadership. In their experience, teachers have maximal impact in schools where the principals are strong in empowering leadership and who cultivate teachers’ leadership skills by working with them “as professionals and full partners” (p. 130). Such principals embody the tenets of *Enabling Others to Act* (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

The U.S. is one of many countries undertaking major education reform initiatives. In England, the National Literacy and Numeracy Strategies (NLNS) were introduced in 1998, beginning with literacy and followed by numeracy the next year (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). The four-year evaluation project represents the most recent empirical research on transformational leadership by Leithwood and his colleagues. Path analyses

were utilized to analyze the results compiled from student achievement data, observational evidence, and the survey responses of 2,290 teachers from 655 primary schools.

The teachers experienced relatively low levels of transformational leadership in support of their endeavor to adopt the Strategies (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). The most evidence of displays of transformational leadership came from the leaders' clarification of the reasons for implementing the Strategies, their conveying high expectations for teaching and learning, and modeling professional practice related to the Strategies. At the same time, they perceived only a minimal degree of individualized support, and there was limited evidence that the principals created school conditions conducive to collaborative decision making related to the Strategies or helped teachers build good working relationships with school parents.

Despite the overall perceptions of low levels of transformational leadership, difference in individual principals' exercise of transformational leadership were robust enough to allow the researchers to detect significant effects of transformational leadership on changes in school conditions and teachers' instructional practices (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Three key findings emerged from the study. First, transformational leadership exerted a powerful direct impact on the teachers' work conditions and motivation with less marked, but still significant, effects on the teachers' capacities. Second, transformational leadership had a moderate significant impact on the teachers' classroom practices. Leadership, combined with teachers' motivation, capacity, and work setting accounted for approximately 25% to 35% of the variations in classroom practices. Although leadership influenced the teachers' classroom practices, there was no

significant relationship between the principals' leadership and the students' achievement in literacy or mathematics (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). Leithwood et al. (2007) acknowledged that the assertion that the influence of principals on students' academic achievement is second only to classroom instruction is a point of controversy. However, they stressed that principal leadership does not directly affect student learning, but instead it acts as a catalyst for activities that have a direct impact on learning. The evidence for this claim comes from five types of empirical research: (1) case studies of outstanding schools, (2) large-scale quantitative analyses of overall leader effects, (3) large-scale quantitative studies of specific leadership practices, (4) studies of student engagement, and (5) studies of the detrimental effects of lack of attention to leadership succession planning. Reinforcing the earlier research review presented by Leithwood et al. (2004), the authors of the later review stated that "there is not a single documented case of a school successfully turning around its pupil achievement trajectory in the absence of talented leadership" (Leithwood et al., 2007, p. 5).

Gurr, Drysdale and Mulford (2006) explored the features of successful principal leadership through case studies of the leadership styles espoused by principals in the Australian states of Victoria and Tasmania. According to Gurr et al., the perspectives of leadership displayed by the principals in the two locales are superficially very different. However, they share many commonalities that are representative of effective school leadership. For example, the Vision/Mission driving school leadership in the Tasmanian model is consistent with the emphasis on high achievement and authentic learning in the Victorian model. In light of the principles of transformational leadership, the most important similarities are the qualities, attitudes, and beliefs of the leaders in the two

states. These include honesty, openness, excellent communication and interpersonal skills, flexibility, commitment, passion, empathy, a sense of “innate goodness,” support for equity and social justice, the belief that all children are important and capable of learning, altruism, high expectations, and commitment to the belief that schools have the power to make a difference. In addition, the principals successfully blended top-down and empowering leadership, reflecting Lashway’s (2002) vision of instructional leadership.

One of the seven claims investigated by Leithwood et al. (2007) is that nearly all successful leaders draw from the same repertoire of basic leadership practices. Synthesizing findings from organizational leadership in education and other sectors, the authors discerned four sets of leadership qualities and practices that distinguish successful leaders across contexts. These are: *building vision and setting directions*, *understanding the developing people*, *redesigning the organization*, and unique to the educational setting, *managing the teaching and learning program*. Embedded in these four basic practices are elements central to transformational and instructional leadership.

In another Australian survey, Barnett (2003) explored the effects of transformational leadership on the school and classroom learning environment in a random sample of 458 teachers recruited from secondary schools across New South Wales. Using the MLQ short form (MLQ-5X), Barnett observed that individualized consideration had a much more powerful impact on the teachers’ satisfaction with principal leadership than “vision” derived from inspirational motivation. Individualized consideration on the part of the principal appears to be a very important dimension in

teachers' relationships to the principals, their teaching colleagues, and indeed to the teaching profession (Li & Hung, 2009; Richards, 2003, 2005; Timmerman, 2008).

An intriguing finding was that factor analysis of the MLQ-5X supported only three transformational leadership components, leading Barnett (2003) to classify individualized consideration as a "hybrid" transformational/transactional leadership construct. Avolio et al. (1999) recognized the intrinsic link between individualized consideration and transactional contingent reward leadership. From an alternative perspective, Vecchio et al. (2008) examined the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership in a study focused only on intellectual stimulation and vision, excluding individualized consideration, idealized influence, and inspirational motivation. The findings from the sample of 179 high school teachers showed that the leader's vision and intellectual stimulation had a greater impact when there was limited use of contingent reward.

Interestingly, transactional leadership not only had a more powerful influence than Vecchio et al. (2008) expected, but its effects surpassed the influence of transformational leadership. Vecchio et al. acknowledged that their study included only a partial model of transformational leadership. Nonetheless, they concluded that the impact of transactional leadership on performance may be underestimated. From a somewhat different perspective, Grissom and Loeb (2009) would probably agree with that claim. The authors cited a 2008 meta-analysis of 22 studies on instructional and transformational leadership performed by Robinson, Lloyd and Rowe. Comparing the results, Robinson and colleagues estimated that the effect of instructional leadership on student outcomes is three-to-four times higher than the effect of transformational

leadership. In their own research, Grissom and Loeb found the principal's organizational management skills to be the overriding factor in successful school outcomes.

Timmerman (2008) focused on the effects of individualized consideration on collegial cohesion for capacity building, in a study of teachers from 26 high-performing North Carolina elementary schools. The results revealed a definite relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the importance of the principals' display of individualized consideration and the importance they attached to a collegial and organized professional climate.

In a study of Taiwan teachers, Li and Hung (2009) explored the effects of school leadership using the MLQ-5X, social identity theory and social exchange theory. The researchers also included leader-member relationships (LMX) and coworker relationships in their exploration of 1,040 teachers from 52 elementary schools. Only individualized consideration and inspirational motivation affected coworker relationships. However, all four dimensions of transformational leadership had a positive impact on LMX. LMX contains elements of both transactional and transformational and transformational leadership (Bass, 1999). LMX begins with transactional leadership and progresses through stages marked by the development of trust, loyalty, and respect, finally culminating in the emergence of transformational leadership.

Chin (2007) conducted a meta-analysis of the effects of transformational leadership in schools in the U.S. and Taiwan. A total of 28 studies, all using the MLQ, met the inclusion criteria. The results affirmed the positive advantages of transformational leadership in both countries. Of the 28 studies, 21 produced an unambiguous measure of the relationship between transformational leadership and

teachers' job satisfaction, 13 between transformational leadership and teachers' perceptions of school effectiveness, and 11 between transformational leadership and students' academic performance.

An intriguing distinction between the two countries was that the effect sizes favoring transformational leadership were larger in the U.S. (Chin, 2007). Chin ascribed this to the relative homogeneity and stability of the Taiwan school system, compared to the diversity and dynamic changes affecting the U.S. educational system. Another interesting finding was that when SES was not controlled for, transformational leadership had a more pronounced influence on teachers' job satisfaction than student achievement. Similarly, Leithwood and Jantzi (1999, 2000) found that the positive advantages of transformational leadership still could not neutralize the influence of the students' sociocultural backgrounds. Dedication to advancing the academic achievement of disadvantaged students is a driving force in the mission of many charter schools (Campbell, 2010; Frumkin, 2003).

Distributed Leadership

Sheppard et al. (2010) used path analysis to create a model of distributed leadership encompassing the interrelationships between the factors of: formal school leaders, teacher collaborative leadership, teachers' professional learning, shared decision making, shared vision, teacher morale, and teacher enthusiasm. The theoretical and empirical work of Bass, Kouzes and Posner, Leithwood and others were used to develop a preliminary theoretical model. The analysis was based on data from 2,029 teachers from 136 schools located in two public school districts in two Canadian provinces. Each

of the variables selected by the researchers was tested to examine its direct and indirect effects: an advantage of path analysis.

In terms of direct effects, the only formal leadership variable to influence *Teacher Morale* and *Teacher Enthusiasm* was *Inclusive Leadership*. Using path analysis, however, Sheppard et al. (2010) found that both *Transformational Leadership* and *Inclusive Leadership* had significant indirect effects on the two teacher outcomes. While the total effect of *Transformational Leadership* was significant but small, the total effect of *Inclusive Leadership* was much more pronounced. *Inclusive Leadership* had an especially strong effect on *Teacher Morale* and a slightly smaller but nonetheless significant effect on *Teacher Enthusiasm*. Overall, the combined positive effects of distributed leadership explained 42% of the variance in *Teacher Morale* and 54% of the variance in *Teacher Enthusiasm*. Invoking the critique Robinson and colleagues expressed toward research on educational leadership claiming that it should focus more directly on *student* outcomes, Sheppard et al. asserted that understanding how leadership dynamics affect the distribution of leadership in schools, and how that affects the teachers who work directly with students, is an essential prerequisite for unraveling the connection between educational leadership and student learning.

Teacher Efficacy and Collective Efficacy

Ross and Gray (2006) examined the role of transformational leadership and collective teacher efficacy in teachers' commitment to organization values (school mission, professional community, and community partnerships). A study of Israeli teachers reported that teachers' sense of personal teaching efficacy was mediated by job satisfaction. Based on their findings, Nir and Kranot (2006) proposed that

transformational leaders are more apt to provide teachers with the professional challenge and work environment that contribute to job satisfaction, thereby indirectly enhancing personal teaching efficacy. Self-efficacy is a powerful motivational force, and self-efficacy theory is widely used in educational research (Bandura, 1997). The behaviors inherent in Enabling Others to Act build self-efficacy, self-confidence, and self-esteem (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Collective efficacy is generally conceived as an aggregate of individual members' appraisals of their abilities to carry out the tasks they perform in the group (Bandura, 2000). Paralleling personal self-efficacy, the higher the group members' expectations for group success, the more determined they are to persevere in pursuit of collective goals. Based on analysis of responses from 2,074 teachers in 218 elementary schools, Ross and Gray (2006) found that collective efficacy partially mediated the effect of transformational leadership on the teachers' commitment to organizational values. Transformational leadership directly influenced the teachers' collective efficacy and had direct and indirect effects on the teachers' commitment to the school mission and professional learning community.

Leadership Practices Inventory

Leech and Fulton (2008) utilized the LPI in an exploration of leadership practices that foster collaborative decision making and team leadership. The sample was composed of 646 secondary school principals (grades 6-12) from 26 schools in a large urban school district. In contrast to the researchers' expectations, there was minimal relationship between the Five Practices and shared decision making. The strongest

association emerged between Challenging the Process and shared decisions in policy development but even this relationship was fairly weak.

Given their finding for the weak effect of leadership practices on shared decision making, Leech and Fulton (2008) proposed that the key to building a collaborative, team-driven culture may lie in targeted training for principals and teachers. The topics they suggest include team building, group processes, leading effective work groups, and facilitating meetings, adding that, in order for training to be effective, the participants need opportunities to apply their new knowledge and skills to different decision-making models. Leech and Fulton viewed instructional leadership as essential but not sufficient for contemporary schools. Calling for transformational leadership as a tool for empowerment, Leech and Fulton declared that the principals of the future must be capable of empowering others by creating a culture that “embraces collaboration and shared governance” (p. 640).

Donaldson, Marnik, Mackenzie and Ackerman (2009) expressed a similar perspective, stating that having good pedagogical knowledge is important, but it is not sufficient for being a successful school leader. To use that knowledge to advantage in working with teachers and parents, principals should hone their skills as consultants. Rather than playing “the expert,” the principal should be helping others “examine and reframe their own challenges and develop strategies for action” (p. 11). Highlighting the vital importance of interpersonal skills, Donaldson et al. envisioned the principal as a consultant, a mediator, and a consensus builder who espouses a philosophy that gives precedence to relationships.

Using the LPI, Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson and Jinks (2007) investigated the leadership practices of principals who were classified as servant leaders. Servant leadership is an extension of transformational leadership driven by the altruistic belief that the interests of followers should take precedence. Servant leaders provide their followers with what they need to perform their roles in pursuit of mutual goals. The sample consisted of 112 principals from 43 elementary, 32 middle and 37 high schools.

The findings revealed a significant relationship between the principals' self-reports of involvement in more behaviors of servant leadership and their teachers' perceptions that they engaged in all of the Five Practices (Taylor et al., 2007). An intriguing finding was that, compared to a sample of business managers, the principals as a group, whether or not they were rated as servant leaders, scored higher on all the leadership practices. Taylor et al. construed that as support for the belief that education is a "nurturing or compassionate profession" (p. 412). In descending order, the principals made the most extensive use of Modeling, Enabling, and Encouraging.

Katz (2004) combined the LPI with qualitative interviews in a study of 148 female superintendents leading school districts in Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Illinois. Many of the superintendents were former teachers or principals, or both. Katz used only the LPI-Self because her research was designed to illuminate how the women perceive their own leadership style and effective leadership practices. District size affected the superintendents' adoption of the Five Practices (Katz, 2004). The women who led the largest districts made greater use of Challenging the Process and Inspiring a Shared Vision. These practices reflect the change agent role and vision that all students are capable of succeeding that would be characteristic of candidates chosen to lead large

urban school districts. In fact, these are the same qualities of a successful charter school principal whose role often spans the boundaries between building principal and community leader.

The qualitative accounts further highlighted differences in the behaviors displayed by superintendents leading large, small, or midsized districts (Katz, 2004). The superintendents of small districts engaged in more personal interactions with students in staff and more direct, hands-on activities. Leaders of both large and small districts worked to involve community stakeholders, but in different ways. Indeed, Katz observed that, while the women were involved in the Five Practices, they each had a unique way of performing them. A common theme among all the superintendents was their belief in high standards of integrity, the foremost attribute of an exemplary leader (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). As a group, the women were risk takers, which is not surprising given the relatively few women in the district superintendent position (Katz, 2004). They also preferred a relational leadership style.

Instructional Leadership

Research exploring leadership in effective economically disadvantaged urban schools began in the 1970s, and emerged as a popular channel of research in the 1980s. Analogous to the situation in American schools, educators in England and Australia were faced with rapidly changing school demographics and demands for accountability for the academic performance of all students (Ylimaki, Jacobson & Drysdale, 2007). In all three countries, the challenges of overcoming deeply entrenched sociodemographic barriers spurred research into the type of leadership needed for high needs schools.

Ylimaki et al. (2007) presented the case studies of instructional leadership in four schools located in urban communities in the U.S. with different profiles of student and teacher demographics, but each having to deal with challenges imposed by poverty. The case studies contrasted the leadership of veteran and inexperienced principals. Two of the principals had the knowledge and expertise needed to bring about second-order change. They possessed strong pedagogical knowledge and practiced shared instructional leadership, producing improvements in academic achievement within a positive school climate. Lacking their pedagogical knowledge base and previous leadership success, the two inexperienced principals managed to increase their students' academic achievement. However, they did so by narrowing the curriculum for the purpose of raising standardized test scores, a strategy that diminishes students' learning opportunities and frequently leads to feelings of disempowerment and dissatisfaction among teachers within the school (Galen, 2005).

The four U.S. schools were included in the international comparison study of successful leadership of high-poverty schools, along with four schools in Australia and five schools in England (Ylimaki et al., 2007). The four core practices of effective leaders delineated by Leithwood et al. (2006)—setting directions, developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing the instructional program—served as the framework for the study.

Across educational settings, the principals were very similar in their approach to setting directions for their schools. School safety and student learning were invariably given top priority precedence in school improvement efforts (Ylimaki et al., 2007). Narratives related to developing people described behaviors linked with individualized

consideration. The principals provided the teachers with opportunities for learning and development, and in turn the teachers applied their new knowledge and expertise to providing their students with high quality learning experiences. Demonstrations of empathy for teachers and students and respect and appreciation for cultural diversity also revealed a commitment to developing people.

Two principals in England, where school leaders enjoy more autonomy than their counterparts in Australia and the U.S., were strongly committed to distributed leadership and decision making (Ylimaki et al., 2007). With respect to managing the instructional program, one U.S. principal “persuaded” poorly performing teachers to transfer to a different school so she could seize the opportunity to hire effective teachers to uphold the school’s mission to improve academic achievement. With more leeway in spite of accountability policies, some of the English principals simply ignored external pressures and adhered to the curriculum and instructional strategies they and their teachers preferred for their students. In the U.S., charter school principals have the advantage of being able to sidestep the policies that restrict teachers’ and principals’ autonomy in conventional public schools.

Under the greatest degree of pressure, the U.S. principals used the external policies as a mechanism for focusing teachers, students, and parents in the direction of raising expectations for higher academic performance (Ylimaki et al., 2007). At the same time, the differences in the actions between the U.S. and English principals seemed more a reflection of entrenched modes of leadership than a response to external pressures. In the U.S., instructional leadership, with its top-down approach to change, dominated principal preparation programs. In contrast, distributed leadership has a long history in

education in England. Studies of transformational and distributed educational leadership in England and Canada predated similar research in the U.S.

Modeling Instructional Leadership

Harris et al. (2004) explored the extent that mentoring principals model standards-based instructional leadership in a study of practicing teachers enrolled in a university principal preparation program in Texas. The prospective principals had just completed a course on the standards. The four standards included in the study were *Competency 4*: instructional leadership through curriculum development; *Competency 5*: “The principal knows how to advocate, nurture, and sustain an educational program and campus culture that are conducive to student learning and staff professional growth”; *Competency 6*: knowing how to implement a system of staff evaluation and staff development; and *Competency 7*: instructional leadership through decision making (Harris et al., 2004, p. 164). The participants were asked how often they observed their mentors modeling each of the four competencies.

Roughly half the participants said their mentors “always” or “usually” modeled instructional leadership through curriculum development; 44.7% reported the same for advocating, nurturing, and sustaining an educational program; and an identical proportion said the same for staff evaluation and staff development. The largest proportion of mentors (59.1%) modeled instructional leadership through decision making always or most of the time (Harris et al., 2004). Interestingly, female principals routinely modeled all four instructional leadership competencies to a greater degree than their male counterparts. Harris et al. noted that women who become principals are often veteran teachers with keen interest in instructional leadership. In an earlier study, female

principals often perceived themselves as “teachers of teachers” (p. 168). Experience was also a major factor. Principals with more administrative experience modeled all four competencies far more often than those with the least experience.

Qualitative Research

Day (2005) explored the leadership attributes of the principals of 10 schools in England where the proportion of students who qualified for free meals ranged from 20% to 62%. Three of the schools had predominately ethnic minority enrollment. Leading schools included one nursery/infant school, five primary schools, and four comprehensive schools, and the principals ranged in experience from 5 to 25 years of experience. Day described the working conditions of the principals as “challenging urban circumstances” (p. 273). The participants included the principals, assistant principals, teachers, and parents. Notably, Day used the British term for principal, *headteacher*, which explicitly recognizes the principal’s instructional leadership role.

Ten themes arose from the interviews: (1) *Performativity and Vision: Managing the Tensions*; (2) *Building and Sustaining an Inclusive Community*; (3) *Narratives of Identity*; (4) *Values, Beliefs and the Ethical Dimension*; (5) *Renewal of Professional Trust*; (6) *Moral Purpose, Agency and the Culture of Courage*; (7) *Expectation and Achievement*; (8) *Leaders Who Learn*; (9) *Building Internal Capital Through Collectivity*; and (10) *The Passion of Commitment*. Day (2005) focused on the first five themes.

The headteachers were driven by a compelling vision and strong ethical beliefs (Day, 2005). A shared opinion among the headteachers was that they were not willing to compromise their commitment to providing their students with enriching learning experiences by narrowing the curriculum for short-term gains. All of the principals had a

powerful belief in the interrelated values of cultural capital and building a sense of community. Overall, the principals and their constituents saw the need for charting a course that would enable them to (1) advance the school forward in relation to a broad vision of moral purposes based on a philosophy of care for the whole child and the community; (2) meet the government demands for measurable student achievement in narrow curriculum areas, while at the same time upholding their own larger perspective of student achievement; (3) maintain their integrity of purpose; (4) ensure that school personnel were treated with respect and trust; and (5) actively involve parents in their children's education.

Portin et al. (2003) included charter school principals in their in-depth exploration of the practices principals carry out to make their schools more effective. The study encompassed principals, vice principals, and teachers drawn from 21 public, private, charter, contract, and magnet schools located in four cities in four states. The series of interviews and school visits and observations produced five key conclusions. The first conclusion arose from the theme of *The Principal as Diagnostician*. That is, the essence of the principal's job is diagnosing the needs of his or her particular schools and deploying the available resources and talent to meet them. For the principals of the charter and private schools, a top priority was attracting and keeping students at their schools. To accomplish this, they scrutinized the school's academic programs, teachers, and facilities to examine whether they accurately reflected the school and its mission. Securing adequate resources is a challenge for most charter schools. Principals of start-up schools, both public and private, were faced with a daunting array of challenges, compared to their counterparts in more established schools. Portin et al. noted that, in

general, the principals of charter and private schools were most likely to cite issues related to basic survival or responding to the expectations of parents or community members as major issues they had to grapple with. Portin et al. described effective principals as *master diagnosticians* who possess the expertise to define and deal with complex issues while at the same time moving their school toward its goals and vision.

The second conclusion reached by Portin et al. (2002) is that, across different school types, all schools need leadership in seven pivotal areas: instructional, cultural, managerial, human resources, strategic, external development, and micropolitical. Portin et al. noted that the comments of the school leaders were replete with references to “mission” and “vision,” which are key to strategic leadership. As a group, the leaders were well-versed in the elements of strategic leadership, as well as instructional, cultural, managerial, and human resources leadership which have been given ample attention in the literature. However, their narratives disclosed the importance of the external and micropolitical dimensions of educational leadership, which are far less prevalent in the literature. Notably, many of the direct references to these last two types of leadership came from the leaders of “entrepreneurial public schools;” that is, charters, magnets, and other publicly funded schools that operate under market conditions. Business is beginning to note these two areas too.

The third conclusion is basically an endorsement for distributed leadership. That is, while principals are entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring that there is leadership in the seven key areas, they do not have to be the ones who provide it. The metaphor used by Portin et al. (2002) is that principals do not have to be a “One-Man Band.” One viable alternative is *The Principal as Jazz Band Leader*, whereby leadership

is distributed among the principal, assistant principal and teachers. A second alternative is *The Principal as Orchestra Leader*. This model is more common in private schools where the principal shares leadership with the heads of upper and lower schools and other teacher leaders. In charter schools, the board members are included among the sources of leadership.

The fourth conclusion is that *Governance Matters*, and the school's governance structure affects the way leadership functions are carried out. Portin et al. (2002) noted that, while the leaders in all the schools reported sharing leadership functions, distributed leadership was much more common in the private and entrepreneurial public schools than in traditional public schools. Among the principals of the private and entrepreneurial public schools, the leadership functions were shared in different degrees, as follows: Instructional (92%), Cultural (67%), Managerial (46%), Strategic (85%), External Development (46%), Micropolitical (77%), and Human Resources (100%). This pattern underscores the importance of the principal's expertise in performing organizational management tasks.

The final conclusion is that principals primarily learn by experience. Regardless of their training and preparation, most of the principals felt they acquired the skills they need on the job (Portin et al., 2002). Principal preparation programs are undergoing changes in order to prepare candidates for the realities they confront on the job. The most effective programs provide prospective principals with mentorships and internships (Davis et al., 2005). However, there are almost no programs that sufficiently prepare principals for leading charter schools. In general, most of the principals felt their preparation programs were inadequate for preparing them for the complex demands of

multiple leadership roles (Portin et al., 2002). Most programs emphasized instructional and managerial leadership, to the exclusion of the other important leadership functions. According to Portin et al., the principals were unanimous in their enthusiasm to serve children, and wanted nothing more than the capacity to be able to do so effectively. Inadequate preparation is one of several constraints that the principals had to grapple with in their dedication to being successful school leaders.

School Climate and Culture

Kelley et al. (2005) examined the relationship between principal leadership and school climate in a study of 155 teachers and their principals from 31 elementary schools. There was a striking discrepancy between the principals' and teachers' assessments of the principals' effectiveness and flexibility. In addition, the teachers' perceptions of school climate showed no relationship to the principals' self-assessments. According to Kelley et al., principals need feedback from their constituents if they are to improve their leadership practices, and to do this they have to establish open multidirectional channels of communication. They proposed that, "If principals are highly skilled, they can develop feelings of trust, open communication, collegiality, and promote effective feedback" (p. 23). Implicitly endorsing the principals of transformational leadership, Kelley et al. added that, "Leaders must be able to correctly envision the needs of their teachers, empower them to share the vision, and enable them to create an effective school climate" (p. 23).

Teachers' Instructional Practices

Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) investigated how teachers experience principal leadership and its effects on their classroom practices in an analysis of data from the

Learning for Leadership Project. The large sample was composed of 4,165 K-12 teachers from schools across the U.S. Consistent with the analytical techniques used throughout the research project, the framework combined various elements of effective schools. Stepwise linear regression was used to assess the relationships among factors.

Principal leadership had relatively minimal effects on the teachers' use of Flexible Grouping Practices and Standard Contemporary Practice, but it exerted a decisive and consistent effect on the use of Focused Instruction (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Trust turned out to be more important to the teachers' perceptions of principal leadership than shared leadership, which has mixed support in empirical research. On the other hand, trust is essential to the successful practice of transformational leadership (Bass, 1999; Kouzes & Posner, 2007). Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) theorized that increasing teachers' trust in the principal might be conducive to a more positive school climate but would only indirectly improve classroom instruction.

Professional community influenced teachers' classroom practices, with the three components of professional community—Reflective Dialogue, Shared Norms and Values, and Collective Sense of Responsibility—each having different effects on the three instructional practices (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). An intriguing pattern emerged, in that the effects of trust in the principal diminished when there was a stronger sense of community, suggesting that a greater degree of collegiality and interdependence among teachers translate into less dependence upon the principal. Principals might have the strongest impact on the quality of classroom instruction by cultivating professional learning communities among faculty.

Commitment and Job Satisfaction

Greenlee and Brown (2009) examined the conditions that enhance the work satisfaction and commitment of teachers in challenging U.S. schools where turnover rates can be unduly high. The sample consisted of 97 teachers enrolled in the educational leadership program at the University of South Florida. Elementary school teachers accounted for the largest segment of participants in the online survey. More than half the teachers were between the ages of 21 and 30, with teachers from 31 to 50 comprising the next largest group. The overwhelming majority (almost 80%) of the participants were female. The sample included both traditionally and alternatively certified teachers.

Financial incentives got high ratings for attracting teachers to high-needs schools or retaining those already employed in those schools (Greenlee & Brown, 2009). At the same time, financial incentives alone were insufficient without support for professional autonomy, resources for curriculum innovations, opportunities for professional development, and involvement in school decisions. Incentives related to autonomy were particularly important to the alternatively certified teachers. The principal played a powerful role in the teachers' accounts of what would induce them to stay at a high-needs school. Creating a positive school culture was the overarching inducement, followed by creating conditions that increase staff commitment. Having integrity and being well-reasoned were far more important to teachers at high-poverty than at low-poverty schools. On the other hand, shared decision making was given moderate importance, regardless of the SES of the school.

One of the factors driving the trend toward transformational leadership in the business world was the realization that transactional leadership alone was insufficient for

producing job satisfaction (Bass, 1999). Respecting professional autonomy, providing challenging work opportunities, and recognizing individual contributions to the organization promote job satisfaction. In turn, job satisfaction enhances commitment, which is especially important given the high turnover rates among teachers. Teachers who work under disempowering conditions are most likely to be dissatisfied and to leave or contemplate leaving (Galen, 2005; Richards, 2003, 2005).

Teachers in their first five years in the profession are most likely to leave (Richards, 2003). Working from the assumption that the principal's leadership might be a major factor in teachers' decisions of whether or not to continue teaching, Richards conducted research with novice teachers and principals from a range of Southern California school districts. All the teachers were K-8 teachers in their second-through-fifth years of teaching and enrolled in master's degree programs at two universities. The mixed methods study began with interviews with 15 teachers who elaborated upon their principals' behaviors related to encouragement and support, the extent of support they received, and influence of support on their decisions to stay or leave the profession, along with information related to job stress, job satisfaction, and commitment in reference to the principal's behaviors.

The interview responses were synthesized into a list of 22 principal behaviors considered important to teachers' job satisfaction and commitment to the profession (Richards, 2003). An additional 100 teachers and 100 principals were given the list and requested to rate the importance of each behavior. The interviews that produced the list of behaviors had seven prominent themes: *The Need for Emotional Support, Love for Students/Making a Difference, Respect for Teachers as Professionals, The Power of*

Praise and Acknowledgement, Support in Matters of Discipline, School

Morale/Colleague Support, and Powerlessness. The need for emotional support was the overriding theme.

Operationalized into the 22 behaviors for the teacher and principal survey, the list of behaviors was refined into four clusters for analysis (Richards, 2003). These were: (1) *Effective Administrative Behaviors*, (2) *Emotional Support Behaviors*, (3) *Valuing Teachers' Judgment Behaviors*, and (4) *Respect and Care for Teachers as Professionals Behaviors*. The principals gave higher priority to the behaviors classified as *Effective Administrative Behaviors* than the teachers did, not unexpectedly. However, the three behaviors ranked by both teachers and principals as among the five most important principal behaviors are consistent with transformational leadership. These are: *respects teachers as professionals; is fair, honest, and trustworthy; and has an open door policy*. Hsieh and Shen (1998) reported similar patterns of differences and similarities between teachers and principals.

Two principal behaviors ranked as the five most important by teachers, but not principals, are unique to the school context (Richards, 2003). These are *is supportive of teachers in matters of discipline* (ranked 2nd by teachers but 8th by principals) and *supports teachers with parents* (ranked 5th by teachers and 15th to principals). The principals gave higher precedence to being a *motivator and team builder who encourages collaboration and gives praise and acknowledgement for a job well done* than teachers did. To preserve the commitment of teachers, Richards suggested that principals reflect upon the extent to which they display the five behaviors most preferred by teachers, with the potential benefits of higher teacher job satisfaction leading to stronger commitment to

stay, higher morale, and more dedication and effort to meeting their students' learning needs.

In a subsequent study, Richards (2005) investigated the perspectives of teachers at various stages of their careers. The study was analogous to the prior study, but included teachers at all stages of experience who were categorized according to 1-5 years of experience, 6-10 years of experience, and veterans with 11 or more years of teaching. The themes that arose from the analysis were *The Power of Caring*, *The Power of Respect*, and *The Power of Praise and Acknowledgment*. The same five behaviors given top priority by the novice teachers in the first study were also ranked at the top of the list by teachers at different career stages.

In response to the question of why teachers leave the profession, most of the teachers felt that colleagues left due to lack of respect, lack of emotional support, or problems with student discipline (Richards, 2005). In effect, teachers leave when the leader does not display the behaviors they seek in a leader. Not unexpectedly, the novice teachers voiced the strongest need for emotional support. The novice teachers also preferred a principal who inspires motivation and promotes collaboration which are behaviors principals value highly as well (Richards, 2003). One of Richards' recommendations is that principals pair novice teachers with more experienced teachers, which conveys both support and the principal's respect for the knowledge and experience of veteran teachers, something given overwhelming significance by the most experienced group (Richards, 2005). The midstage career teachers, however, expressed the strongest interest in mentoring new teachers.

The veteran teachers placed the utmost importance on the principal's fairness and integrity (Richards, 2005). They were less concerned with praise than were novices, but had a strong desire to have their ideas and opinions solicited and respected. They sought opportunities for decision making and respect for their time and individual teaching styles. For midstage career teachers, being respected as professionals was paramount. While it is inevitable that there would be some distinctions based on experience, the three groups of teachers were basically similar in what they preferred in a leader's behavior.

Conclusion

Despite a sizable body of research on educational leadership, few studies focus on the leadership of charter school principals. Yet, in the dynamic and unpredictable charter school landscape, school leaders are faced with challenges beyond the scope of most principals. The school's very survival can be an ongoing issue, and charter school leadership requires dealing with multiple external stakeholders and savvy political skills that are rarely addressed in the literature (Portes et al., 2002). At the same time, the research on transformational leadership shows that transformational leadership behaviors have positive effects across organizational sectors. Especially applicable to the situation of charter school leadership, recent research shows strong support for the advantages of distributed leadership (Louis et al., 2010; Sheppard et al., 2010). Charter school success may be contingent on maximizing resources through distributed and collaborative leadership in pursuit of collective goals. The most successful charter schools have a powerful commitment to the school's mission embodied in a leader with a singular focus on the success of the school and its students (Robelen, 2008).

Instructional leadership is essential to school success, but it is insufficient for advancing the school toward its goals. Organizational management is a more comprehensive form of instructional leadership that has a strong positive impact on teaching and learning (Grissom & Loeb, 2009; Horng & Loeb, 2010). Organizational management is compatible with transformational leadership, and includes elements of transactional leadership that tend to be downgraded in the literature but are nonetheless important for leading a school. The most successful school leaders draw from a repertoire of skills and practices that provide a strong foundation for the exercise of good leadership across organizational settings.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study examined the differences between principal and teacher responses in each of the categories studied, using the Kouzes and Posner Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (2007). This inventory of the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership evolved from more than 20 years of research. Educational studies were included in the most recent validation of the LPI (Posner, 2010). For the purpose of this study, quantitative data was used to gather responses and information to address the research questions. The purpose of the survey was to obtain responses from all charter school principals and a sample of charter school teachers in South Carolina so that differences in scores, whether significant or not, could be identified and used to make inferences if the uniqueness of the charter school environment contributes to teachers' and principals' sharing a leadership vision that runs contrary to research in a typical public schools (Litchka, 2003).

The research proposal for this study was submitted to the International Review Board (IRB) at Seton Hall and approved on September 1, 2011.

Subjects

This study took place in the state of South Carolina, and the population that was projected to be used was all charter school principals and 50% of the charter school teachers from the 44 charter schools in the state of South Carolina.

Because the number of charter schools in South Carolina equaled 44, I obtained a list of all charter school principals in South Carolina from the South Carolina Association of Public Charters (SCAPCS) (2011).

Method

All principals were sent a letter through the U.S. mail requesting their participation in the survey, as well as their permission to sample their faculty. Included in this letter was information concerning my background and the purpose of the study, as well as a statement of confidentiality and a copy of instructions on how to return the completed survey.

Because the number of teachers was predicted to be approximately 500, a random sample of approximately 50% of the charter school teachers at each school was surveyed. The same method was used with teachers as with the principals. Teachers were matched to their principals by schools through a code that was known only to me and kept on a portable jump drive. The coding was necessary to investigate questions of school differences based on gender of the principal or length of tenure of the principal. I obtained a list of employees from each participating principal, upon agreement to participate in the study. From the list, teachers were randomly chosen for participation. Inventories were mailed to both teachers and principals. Data from these inventories were examined, knowing that generalizations from this study would not be appropriate to the total population of charter school principals.

The mission of the South Carolina Association of Public Charter Schools (SCAPCS) (2011) is to advance innovation and excellence in South Carolina's public education through the development and support of public charter schools. The SCAPCS

has charter school members from across the state of South Carolina, and the SCAPCS provided me with names of schools and principals at no charge. This list included principal contact names, as well as enrollment data for the 2010/2011 school year. Using the enrollment data of all charter schools other than my own, I estimated the number of faculty at each. Approximately 50% of the faculty from each school were sent letters using the methodology described above for principals.

In the first part of the study, an examination that compared the perceptions between principals and teachers occurred across charter schools. The second part of the study examined differences in scores between groups of charter school teachers and charter school principals, disaggregating the factors of gender and tenure of the charter school principals to see if there were significant differences between groups. The five practices of the LPI are: *Modeling the Way, Inspiring a Shared Vision, Enabling Others to Act, Challenging the Process, and Encouraging the Heart.*

Instrumentation

The *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) (self) was administered to principals in this study. The LPI was designed to give feedback on five practices of exemplary leadership. According to Kouzes and Posner (2003), these five practices are an accurate description of what leaders do to “get extraordinary things done in organizations.” (p. 16).

The LPI (self) consists of 30 behavioral statements on a 10-point Likert-type scale (1- Almost Never, 2 - Rarely, 3- Seldom, 4- Once in a While, 5- Occasionally, 6- Sometimes, 7 - Fairly Often, 8 - Usually, 9 - Very Frequently, 10 - Almost Always). These 30 items break down into five discreet dimensions of leadership: Model the Way,

Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart. A score in a particular dimension consists of adding the six numerical responses to obtain a total. The lowest score a participant could get on any dimension is a 6 and the highest is a 60. See Appendix A for a detailed description of the five practices of the LPI Leadership Inventory. Appendix B shows which of these 30 items have been assigned to a particular dimension.

Demographic questions were asked; specifically, gender of principal and tenure of principal at his or her charter school. The demographic questions served as a basis for demographic information, in order to answer research questions and to disaggregate the data.

The LPI (observer) was administered to teachers of charter schools in South Carolina. The LPI (observer) was designed to assess the five practices of exemplary leadership behavior from the perspective of the teacher. The LPI (observer) contains the same 30 behavioral statements, using the identical 10-point ranking scale. The only difference between the two instruments is that the prompts for principals are written in the first person, while the prompts for teachers are written in the third person. Teachers are asked, "To what extent does this leader typically engage in the following behaviors?" The response choices are also written in the third person; such as, "Sets a personal example of what he/she expects of others." Demographic questions that included gender and years of experience were asked only of teachers.

The *Leadership Practices Inventory* (Kouzes & Posner, 2003) is an assessment instrument designed to give leaders a 360-degree feedback on their leadership behaviors. According to Kouzes and Posner (2003), "the number one reason leaders succeed in their

roles is the quality of the relationships with their constituents, particularly their self reports.” (p. 5)

The LPI has been used as a research tool in more than 200 academic studies (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). Additionally, as in a data analysis report by the authors (Posner, 2010), which was based on data from over 1.3 million respondents collected online between 2005 and 2009, the reliability and validity data for this current study are shown in Tables 1, 2 and 3. The reliability of the LPI was tested through an analysis of internal reliability, using the Cronbach alpha (see Table 1) for both the self and the observer instruments (Posner, 2010). This was done for each of the five components of leadership. For the purposes of reporting, I used the following abbreviations for the practices: Model the Way (MTW), Inspire a Shared Vision (ISV), Challenge the Process (CTP), Enable Others to Act (EOA), and Encourage the Heart (ETH).

Table 1

Internal Reliability Coefficients (Cronbach alpha)

For the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership

	MTW	ISV	CTP	EOA	ETH
All Respondents N= 1,152,716	.85	.92	.86	.86	.92
All Observers N= 869,849	.85	.92	.87	.87	.92
Self N= 282,867	.84	.91	.86	.86	.91
Direct Reports	.87	.92	.87	.89	.92

N = 276,336					
-------------	--	--	--	--	--

Validity tests between Positive Workplace Attitude and the five components of the LPI were performed. The correlations shown in Table 2 (Posner, 2010) between Positive Workplace Attitude and the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership were all statistically significant ($p < .001$).

Table 2

Correlations of Positive Workplace Attitude with
Five Leadership Practices
[LPI – Observer Responses only]

	Model	Inspire	Challenge	Enable	Encourage
Positive Workplace Attitude	.32	.29	.29	.31	.29

Several norming groups, such as retailing, computers, banking, hospitality, medical, military, publishing, real estate, transportation, and telecommunications were used for this study including education. Responses on the five leadership practices for both self and observer were compared. Scores in the field of education are listed in Table 3 below. A two-tailed *t*-test was used. The results indicated that both teachers and principals were interpreting the measurements of the instruments in the same way.

Table 3

Education Industry Validity Test of LPI

Leadership Practice	Self (Principal)		Observer (Teacher)		t-test
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev	<i>p</i>
Model	48.37	9.26	48.28	9.64	n.s.
Inspire	46.63	10.80	46.86	11.08	n.s.
Challenge	46.81	9.99	46.83	10.22	n.s.
Enable	50.74	8.55	50.71	8.23	n.s.
Encourage	47.76	10.65	47.82	10.96	n.s.

Design and Statistics

Quantitative methods were used to analyze the responses of the participants.

Because the research study involved the analysis of scores between two groups (charter principals and charter teachers), as well as demographic data (gender and age/experience), a Wilcoxon Rank Sum t-test was used. This type of t- test addresses data that are interval and subjects that are not a random subsample of the U.S. charter schools.

This nonparametric test is the most powerful test available to show significance in a nongeneralizable sample. This test is also powerful when working with small numbers of participants. The statistical treatment included if there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups on the overall instrument, as well as each of the five components of the LPI. The two additional factors of gender of principal and years of tenure of principal were also examined to determine if there were statistically significant differences between groups based on those factors.

CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there were significant differences between principals' and teachers' perceptions of effective instructional leadership behaviors in charter school principals. The dependent variables in this study were the principals' self-perceptions on the five dimensions of leadership, as measured by the Kouzes and Posner Leadership Practices Inventory Self and the teachers' reflections of their principals' leadership on the five dimensions of leadership as measured by the Kouzes and Posner Leadership Practices Inventory Observer. The independent variables in this study were gender of principal and years of experience of the principals defined as three years and over, or less than three years.

The following were the hypotheses in this study:

1. Perception scores of charter school principals on themselves and teacher perception scores of their principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership.
2. Perception scores of charter school principals on themselves and teacher perception scores of their principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership according to the gender of the principal.
3. Perception scores of charter school teachers and principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership for principals having three or more years of tenure at their respective charter schools.

4. Perception scores of charter school teachers and principals will differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership for principals having less than three years of tenure at their respective charter schools.

The research questions that will be addressed regarding these hypotheses are:

1. To what extent do principals' perceptions of their leadership differ from their teachers' perceptions of their leadership on the five dimensions as outlined by the LPI?
2. To what extent does gender play a role in differences in perceptions between charter school principals and teachers?
3. To what extent does tenure of principal affect differences in perception scores between charter school teachers and principals on the five dimensions of leadership?
4. To what extent does tenure of principal affect differences in perception scores between teachers in charter schools?

These questions were answered through the analysis of data collected from surveys sent to all charter school principals in the state of South Carolina who responded, and a percentage of the charter school teachers under each principal who responded to the survey instrument.

This chapter presents the data describing the sample, and a summary analysis addressing each of the research questions.

Description of Sample

This section presents demographic descriptors of participants in this study.

This study was limited to charter school principals and charter school teachers in South Carolina. The LPI Self Survey was sent to 44 principals.

Charter School Principals

Thirteen principals responded, giving a response rate of 29.5%. Of the 13 principals, five were female and eight were male, as presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Gender Breakdown of Principal Respondents

Gender	<i>N</i>	%
Female	5	38
Male	8	62

The majority of respondents were principals with three or more years of tenure at their respective charter schools, as presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Tenure of Principal at Charter School

Tenure at Charter School	<i>N</i>	%
≥ 3 years	9	69
< 3 years	4	31

Charter School Teachers

One hundred and seventy-five surveys were sent to a random selection of charter school teachers matched to principals who responded to the survey. Of these, 56 were returned, for a response rate of 32%. Because one of the hypotheses in this study was that gender of principals would not be a significant factor in responses on the LPI observer, the gender breakdown of the principals of the teachers who responded was

reported. The percentage of teachers reporting to male principals was 70%. The percentage of teachers reporting to female principals was 30%, as reported in Table 6.

Table 6

Gender of Principal Teacher Reports to:

Gender of Principal	<i>N</i>	%
Male	39	70
Female	17	30

As to experience, 82% of teachers who responded to the survey worked for principals with three or more years of experience at their respective charter schools, while 18% of teachers responding to the survey worked for principals with less than three years of experience at their respective charter schools, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Tenure of Principal Teacher Reports to:

Tenure of Principal	<i>N</i>	%
≥ 3 years at charter school	46	82
< 3 years at charter school	10	18

Summary of Results

This study was concerned with potential differences or similarities in responses between principals and their teachers. In addition to this, gender and tenure of principal were also examined as possible causes for differences in responses.

Table 8, below, shows the mean and standard deviations for the responses in each dimension/domain for this study. Though there were fewer respondents in the principal category, their standard deviations remained much smaller than that of their teachers, meaning that there was much more consistency across the principals' perceptions. Additionally, the principals rated themselves quite high, as compared to their teachers' ratings. The teachers' ratings of their principals, overall, were moderately high; however, with their standard deviations being over double those of the principals, the variability in the teacher ratings was high.

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of Sample

Participant/Descriptive Statistic	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
Principal <i>M</i>	52.15	53.62	52.38	52.92	51.38
Principal SD	6.97	3.97	5.25	4.96	8.21
Teacher <i>M</i>	44.68	48.93	46.74	46.09	44.94
Teacher SD	14.31	12.31	12.57	14.41	14.73

Analysis of Data

Hypothesis 1: Perception scores of charter school principals on themselves and teacher perception scores of their principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership. In three of the dimensions, Hypothesis 1 was rejected. On two dimensions, Hypothesis 1 was supported.

To determine if there were significant differences between principals and their respective teachers, a Wilcoxon Ranked Sum Test was calculated. To calculate using this statistic, principals must be in matched pairs with their teachers. In order to accomplish this, the median of all scores for each group of teachers under each principal was calculated and the results can be seen in Appendix E.

Appendix C presents the raw data across all five leadership dimensions for the teacher respondents. The variability in teacher scores was much higher than the variability principal scores in each category. This pattern held true for all five leadership practice domains. Appendix D presents the data for all principals across the five domains. There is much less variability in these scores, as compared to the teacher scores.

Table 9 presents data from five tests comparing teacher perception responses to principal self-perception responses on each of the five domains of leadership.

Table 9

Principal's Self-Perception Scores of Leadership as Compared to Their Teacher's Scores

Dimension	Null Hypothesis	Test	Significance	Decision
Model the Way	The median of differences between Model the Way Teacher Scores and Model the Way Principal Scores equals 0	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.025	Reject the null hypothesis
Inspire a Shared Vision	The median of differences between Inspire a Shared Vision Teacher Scores and Inspire a Shared Vision Principal Scores equals 0	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.223	Retain the null hypothesis
Challenge the Process	The median of differences between	Related-Samples		Reject the null

Dimension	Null Hypothesis	Test	Significance	Decision
	Challenge the Process Teacher Scores and Challenge the Process Principal Scores equals 0	Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.027	hypothesis
Enable Others to Act	The median of differences between Enable Others to Act Teacher Scores and Enable Others to Act Principal Scores equals 0	Related- Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.028	Reject the null hypothesis
Encourage the Heart	The median of differences between Encourage the Heart Teacher Scores and Encourage the Heart Principal Scores equals 0	Related- Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.060	Retain the null hypothesis

The significance level is .05.

As Table 9 depicts, for three of the five dimensions, Model the Way, Challenge the Process, and Enable Others to Act, there was a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of their principals and the principals' self-reflections. In each of these dimensions, Hypothesis 1 was rejected. On the two dimensions, Inspire a Shared Vision and Encourage the Heart, the differences in perception were not significant and Hypothesis 1 was retained.

Hypothesis 2: Perception scores of charter school principals on themselves and teacher perception scores of their principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership according to the gender of the principal. Hypothesis 2 was supported on four dimensions, and partially supported on one dimension.

In order to compare the principals to their teachers in this type of matched pairs test, an equal number of scores in both categories were required. Because there were more teachers than principals, as expected, the teachers' scores had to be matched to their

respective principals' scores. This was accomplished by taking the median of each group of teacher scores and pairing that with their respective principal scores. Appendix F depicts these median scores for teachers of female principals. Appendix G depicts teachers' scores of male principals.

Table 10 shows whether there were significant differences in perception based on the gender of the principal. For each dimension, three separate statistical tests were conducted to look for possible significant differences to account for gender of principals and their teachers.

As the table depicts, in 14 of the 15 statistical tests, no significant differences were found, thereby supporting Hypothesis 2. The only significant difference found was in comparing scores of teachers of female principals' with the female principals' scores in the leadership dimension of Challenge the Process.

Table 10

Comparison of Responses Based on Gender of Principal

Dimension	Null Hypothesis	Test	Significance	Decision
Model the Way	The median of differences between scores on Model the Way for female principals and their teachers is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.08	Retain the null hypothesis
Model the Way	The median of differences between scores on Model the Way for male principals and their teachers is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.141	Retain the null hypothesis
Model the Way	The median of differences between scores on Model the Way for teachers reporting to male principals and teachers	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank	.170	Retain the null hypothesis

Dimension	Null Hypothesis	Test	Significance	Decision
	reporting to female principals is 0.	Test		
Inspire a Shared Vision	The median of differences between scores on Inspire a Shared Vision for female principals and their teachers is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.276	Retain the null hypothesis
Inspire a Shared Vision	The median of differences between scores on Inspire a Shared Vision for male principals and their teachers is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.441	Retain the null hypothesis
Inspire a Shared Vision	The median of differences between scores on Inspire a Shared Vision for teachers reporting to male principals and teachers reporting to female principals is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.691	Retain the null hypothesis
Challenge the Process	The median of differences between scores on Challenge the Process for female principals and their teachers is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.042	Reject the null hypothesis
Challenge the Process	The median of differences between scores on Challenge the Process for male principals and their teachers is 0	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.147	Retain the null hypothesis
Challenge the Process	The median of differences between scores on Challenge the Process for teachers reporting to male principals and teachers reporting to female principals is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.074	Retain the null hypothesis
Enable Others to Act	The median of differences between scores on Enable Others to Act for female principals and their teachers is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.068	Retain the null hypothesis
Enable Others to Act	The median of differences between scores on Enable Others to Act for male principals and their teachers is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.161	Retain the null hypothesis

Dimension	Null Hypothesis	Test	Significance	Decision
Enable Others to Act	The median of differences between scores on Enable Others to Act for teachers reporting to male principals and teachers reporting to female principals is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.063	Retain the null hypothesis
Encourage the Heart	The median of differences between scores on Encourage the Heart for female principals and their teachers is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.068	Retain the null hypothesis
Encourage the Heart	The median of differences between scores on Encourage the Heart for male principals and their teachers is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.208	Retain the null hypothesis
Encourage the Heart	The median of differences between scores on Encourage the Heart for teachers reporting to male principals and teachers reporting to female principals is 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.155	Retain the null hypothesis

$p \leq .05$

Hypothesis 3: Perception scores of charter school teachers and principals will not differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership for principals having three or more years of tenure at their respective charter schools. Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Hypothesis 4: Perception scores of charter school teachers and principals will differ significantly on the five dimensions of leadership for principals having less than three years tenure at their respective schools. Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Comparisons were made between two sets of groups over each of the five dimensions of leadership. The comparison groups were teacher scores of principals with less than three years experience at their charter schools compared with the self-scores of principals with less than three years of experience at their charter schools, and teacher

scores of principals with three or more years of experience at their charter schools, compared with the self-scores of principals with three or more years of experience at their charter schools.

The raw scores for the teachers of principals with less than three years of experience across all five domains of leadership can be found in Appendix H. Appendix I displays the raw data for principals with less than three years of experience across all five domains of leadership. As in the previous example of gender, teacher median scores had to be calculated for each principal to perform the matched pair comparison. The adjusted median scores for teachers working under principals with less than three years of experience at their charter schools and three or more years of experience at their charter schools can be found in Appendices J and K, respectively.

Table 11 shows the results of a Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test comparing the scores for principals with less than three years' tenure and their teachers. For principals with less than three years of tenure at their charter school, the results of the tests in the five domains of leadership were not significant; thus, Hypothesis 4 of this study is rejected. There were no significant differences between these two groups.

Table 11

Comparisons of Teacher and Principal Responses for Principals With Less Than Three Years of Experience

Dimension	Null Hypothesis	Test	Significance	Decision
-----------	-----------------	------	--------------	----------

Model the Way	The median of differences between Model the Way scores of principals with less than three years of experience and their teachers equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.144	Retain the null hypothesis
Inspire a Shared Vision	The median of differences between Inspire a Shared Vision scores of principals with less than three years of experience and their teachers equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.465	Retain the null hypothesis
Challenge the Process	The median of differences between Challenge the Process scores of principals with less than three years of experience and their teachers equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.144	Retain the null hypothesis
Enable Others to Act	The median of differences between Enable Others to Act scores of principals with less than three years of experience and their teachers equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.317	Retain the null hypothesis

Encourage the Heart	The median of differences between Encourage the Heart scores of principals with less than three years of experience and their teachers equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.465	Retain the null hypothesis
---------------------	--	---	------	----------------------------

$p \leq .05$

To thoroughly address Hypothesis 3, a comparison of scores between principals with three or more years of experience and their teachers must be examined. The raw data for the teachers of principals with three or more years of experience and the principal scores, respectively, across all five dimensions of leadership practices can be found in Appendices L and M.

Table 12 shows the results of the Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test in comparing perception scores for teachers of principals with three or more years of experience to their respective principals' scores. In three of the five dimensions of leadership practices, no significant differences were found, thus supporting Hypothesis 3. However, in the domains of Model the Way and Encourage the Heart, significant differences were found between principals' perceptions and teachers' perceptions of principals with three or more years of tenure; thus, for these two dimensions, Hypothesis 3 must be rejected.

Combining the results from Table 11 and Table 12 to summarize the effects of principal experience or tenure did not reveal significant differences in scores of principals and their teachers on the five dimensions for principals with less than three years of tenure; however, for principals with three or more years of tenure in this sample

population, there was a significant difference in the domains of Model the Way and Encourage the Heart.

Table 12

Comparisons of Teacher and Principal Responses for Principals With Three or More Years Experience

Dimension	Null Hypothesis	Test	Significance	Decision
Model the Way	The median of differences between Model the Way scores of principals with three or more years of experience and their teachers equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.033	Reject the null hypothesis
Inspire a Shared Vision	The median of differences between Inspire a Shared Vision scores of principals with three or more years of experience and their teachers equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.325	Retain the null hypothesis
Challenge the Process	The median of differences between Challenge the Process scores of principals with three or more years of experience and their teachers equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.065	Retain the null hypothesis

Dimension	Null Hypothesis	Test	Significance	Decision
Enable Others to Act	The median of differences between Enable Others to Act scores of principals with three or more years of experience and their teachers equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.138	Retain the null hypothesis
Encourage the Heart	The median of differences between Encourage the Heart scores of principals with three or more years of experience and their teachers equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.050	Reject the null hypothesis

$p \leq .05$

To answer Research Question 4, scores of teachers working under principals with less than three years of experience were compared with scores of teachers working under principals with three or more years of experience. This research question is slightly different from Research Question 3, in that this question asks if the teachers' responses were significantly different from each other based on the tenure of their principal, while the purpose of Research Question 3 was to determine if teachers and principals in the same category (of principal tenure) were in agreement or disagreement regarding leadership practices of their principals. Appendices M and L display the raw data from

teachers working under principals with less than three years of experience and teachers working under principals with three or more years of experience, respectively.

A Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test of Related Samples was conducted for each of the five domains of leadership comparing the two groups of scores. The null hypothesis was that there were no significant differences between the scores of teachers working under principals with less than three years of experience and scores of teachers working under principals with three or more years of experience. The results are displayed in Table 13. In two of the leadership domains—Inspire a Shared Vision and Enable Others to Act—significant differences were not found, and the null hypothesis was retained. However, for three domains—Model the Way, Challenge the Process, and Encourage the Heart—significant differences were found between the scores of teachers, depending on the tenure of their principal. In these three cases, the null hypothesis was rejected, and it must be noted that principal tenure does indeed affect the perception of leadership practices, as reported by teachers in this sample.

Table 13

Comparisons of Teacher Responses for Principals with Three or More Years of Experience and Teacher responses for Principals with Less Than Three Years of Experience

Dimension	Null Hypothesis	Test	Significance	Decision
Model the Way	The median of differences between scores on Model the Way of teachers under principals with three or more years of experience and scores of teachers under principals with less than three years of experience equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.008	Reject the null hypothesis
Inspire a Shared Vision	The median of differences between scores on Inspire a Shared Vision of teachers under principals with three or more years of experience and scores of teachers under principals with less than three years of experience equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.173	Retain the null hypothesis
Challenge the Process	The median of differences between scores on Challenge the Process of teachers under principals with three or more years of experience and scores of teachers under principals with less than three years of experience equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.005	Reject the null hypothesis

Dimension	Null Hypothesis	Test	Significance	Decision
Enable Others to Act	The median of differences between scores on Enable Others to Act of teachers under principals with three or more years of experience and scores of teachers under principals with less than three years of experience equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.066	Retain the null hypothesis
Encourage the Heart	The median of differences between scores on Encourage the Heart of teachers under principals with three or more years of experience and scores of teachers under principals with less than three years of experience equals 0.	Related-Samples Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test	.008	Reject the null hypothesis

$p \leq .05$

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND FURTHER RESEARCH

Summary

In this research, charter school principals rated themselves on the five dimensions of leadership, as defined by the Kouzes and Posner Leadership Practices Inventory Self (2003). The teachers rated their respective principals on the same five leadership dimensions using the Kouzes and Posner Leadership Practices Inventory Observer instrument (2003).

The data collected from these surveys were analyzed using a Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test. The first analysis concentrated on differences between charter principals' self-perceptions, as matched to their teachers' perceptions. Statistical significance was found on three of the five dimensions of leadership—Model the Way, Challenge the Process and Enable Others to Act. On two dimensions—Inspire a Shared Vision and Encourage the Heart—no significant differences in medians were found. The second analysis also used a Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test of matched pairs, but this time matched on the gender of the principal. Three different tests were run—one examining median differences between female principals and their teachers on the five dimensions, one comparing the median differences of male teachers and their principals on the five dimensions, and one comparing the median differences between teachers reporting to male principals and teachers reporting to female principals on the five dimensions. The only incidence where statistically significant differences in medians were found was in the domain Challenge the Process with female principals and their teachers. In the 14 other Wilcoxon Rank Sum Tests run for this analysis based on gender of principal, no other statistical

significant differences between medians were found. In the third round of analyses conducted in this study, tenure of principals' at their respective charter schools was the matching factor used in the Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test. Three different tests were conducted—one examining the median differences in scores between principals having less than three years' tenure at their charter schools with teachers in these schools on the five dimensions of leadership, one with principals having three or more years' tenure at their charter schools scores with teachers at these schools on the five dimensions of leadership, and one comparing teacher responses for teachers of principals with less than three years of experience at their charter schools to teachers of principals with three or more years of experience at their charter schools across the five dimensions of leadership. In the analysis of data, scores of principals with less than three years of experience in their charter schools were compared to scores of their teachers, and significance was not found on any of the five dimensions of leadership. In the analysis of scores for principals with three or more years of experience in their charter schools, as compared to the scores of teachers in these schools, significance was found on two dimensions, Model the Way and Encourage the Heart. On the three remaining dimensions of leadership—Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, and Enable Others to Act—no significant differences were found. Lastly, in the analysis of scores for teachers serving under principals with less than three years of experience, as compared to the scores of teachers serving under principals with three or more years of experience, statistical significance was found on three leadership domains—Model the Way, Challenge the Process, and Encourage the Heart. No statistical significance was found on the remaining two

dimensions of Inspire a Shared Vision and Enable Others to Act between the two categories of teachers.

Discussion

Charter schools, as a concept, were originated in 1988 by Ray Budde, a professor at the University of Massachusetts Amherst (Budde, 1996). The first charter school laws were enacted in Minnesota and California in 1991 and 1992, respectively (USDOE, 1998). From the enactment of the first charter school laws to the present day, the numbers of charter schools have increased dramatically, and these numbers are expected to continue to increase. The ESEA Reauthorization actively supports charter schools and school choice (USDOE, 2009). However, research on charter schools themselves is conflicting, at best, and generally focuses on overall success measures such as those mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) (2001). Leadership which has been shown to bring about changes in school performance has focused on traditional public schools and not on charter school leadership (Leithwood et al., 2004). In fact, most University preparation programs do not differentiate between the needs of charter school principals and those of principals of traditional public schools, though it has been shown that charter school leadership calls for different qualifications (Frumkin, 2003; NAPCS, 2008).

It can also be said, from *Seven Strong Claims about Successful School Leadership* (Leithwood et al., 2007), that principal leadership is surpassed only by classroom teaching in influencing student learning. However, a study by Litchka (2003) showed that perceptions of critical leadership behaviors of principals varied significantly, depending on whether the respondent was a principal or a teacher. In Litchka's research,

the concentration was on middle-level principals and middle-level teachers in a traditional public school setting. The results from that study found statistically significant differences in 88% of the item responses between principals and their teachers.

If teachers and principals are not in agreement about leadership behaviors, then a school cannot be effective. How can a school, especially a charter school where collaboration of all stakeholders is considered a key role and mission buy-in is crucial, be effective or successful without this agreement?

This research has focused on charter school teachers' and principals' perception scores on five leadership practices deemed critical for success (Kouzes and Posner, 2003)—Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart.

According to a study by Robelin (2008), high-performing charter schools employed distributed leadership by allowing teachers to assume some of the leader's tasks. This strategy of developing leadership from within, and a collaborative leadership to increase collective efficacy, may indeed be the key to a charter school's success (Campbell, 2010; NAPCS, 2008; Robelin, 2008).

The first hypothesis in this study was that there would be no significant differences between charter school principals' leadership perception scores and the leadership perception scores of their teachers. This hypothesis sought to determine if there were significant differences between the perception scores of charter school principals and teachers on the five dimensions of leadership. This data somewhat followed Litchka's, in that for three of the dimensions—Model the Way, Challenge the Process, and Enable Others to Act—there was a significant difference between teachers'

perceptions of their principals and the principals' self-reflections. In each of these domains, the null hypothesis was rejected. However, it is also pertinent to note that, on the dimensions of Inspire a Shared Vision and Encourage the Heart, the differences in perception were not significant and the null hypothesis was retained. This finding lends some support to the differences between traditional public school leadership and public charter school leadership. Because charter schools, though public, are considered schools of choice, leaders of these schools must balance traditional instructional leadership roles with the need to satisfy parents, their primary consumers (Frumkin 2003). Additionally, as reported earlier (Robelin, 2008), teacher buy-in and participation in charter schools are crucial to the success of the charter. The mission of a charter school *is* critical, and Inspiring a Shared Vision and Encouraging the Heart could be two key factors in the differences between leadership in a charter and leadership in a traditional school setting. The interpretation is clear in that, in at least on two domains, there were no significant differences, within this sample, on principal perceptions and teacher perceptions of their principals. Charter teachers and principals, at least in this sample, were in agreement on two critical leadership dimensions. This is in stark contrast to Litchka's research, in which no agreement was found on any dimension in traditional public middle schools (2003).

The second hypothesis and resulting question brought the issue of gender of charter school leader as a possible factor for differences in perception scores. As reported earlier, no significant differences in scores were found on 14 of the 15 Wilcoxon Rank Sum Tests run. There was one area where significance was found, and that was in the differences between female principals' perception scores and their teachers'

perception scores on the leadership domain of Challenge the Process. In this sample, female principals rated themselves much higher than their teachers did on the domain of Challenge the Process. Therefore, in this sample, for some reason there was a disconnect between what the female principals thought they were doing and what the teachers perceived them as doing. According to Kouzes and Posner (2003), in this domain leaders do not accept the status quo and look for opportunities and innovation to grow. Leaders experiment and often engage in out-of-the-box thinking, and also demonstrate the courage to keep going despite setbacks. So, although the female principals in this study felt they were not accepting the status quo, engaging in out-of-the-box thinking and demonstrating the courage to keep going, their teachers did not see this.

The third and fourth hypotheses added the factor of tenure of principals at their respective charter schools into possible causes for differences in teacher and principal perception scores on the five dimensions of leadership. Tenure for principals in this study was defined as “either three or more years at their charter schools, or less than three years at their charter schools”. No significant differences were found between perception scores for principals having less than three years of experience and those of their teachers on any of the five leadership dimensions. This result alone caused a rejection of Null Hypothesis 4. However, for principals having three or more years of experience at their charter, significant differences were found on two dimensions, Model the Way and Encourage the Heart. Null Hypothesis 3 was, therefore, also rejected, as principals with more tenure showed significant differences on these two dimensions. This is not what the research would indicate, because, according to Posner (2010), scores on the LPI for leadership practices by tenure or length of time with the organization do show significant

differences in scores according to years of experience. Principal effectiveness seems to have a steep learning curve over the first few years of principal experience. Studies also show that the longer a principal stays at a school, the more positive his or her effect will be (Clark et al., 2009). For these two dimensions, at least with this population surveyed, more experienced principals scored themselves significantly higher than their teachers did. According to Litchka (2003), principals with more expertise and years of experience do tend to rate themselves higher, often because of more opportunities to have demonstrated leadership skills.

Model the Way, according to Kouzes and Posner (2003), is a matter of leaders' credibility and doing what they say they will do. It consists of two main components, which are "the ability to clarify one's own values" and "setting an example by aligning their values with actions". Perhaps, in the sample surveyed, the less-experienced principals made a concerted effort to clarify their values and align them with their actions. Another explanation could be that the less-experienced charter school leaders rated themselves lower due to a lack of confidence.

Regarding the second dimension of Encourage the Heart, which was found to be significant, Kouzes and Posner (2003) stated that leaders also must be cheerleaders when the going gets tough. This component recognizes the importance of keeping hope and determination alive, and true leaders will recognize the contributions of all and celebrate the victories as a team. (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). Again a possible interpretation is that the less experience a leader has, the more he or she feels that focus must be placed on recognizing the contributions of others and lifting them up as needed. Another possible

interpretation of both of these findings is that perhaps the less-experienced principals in this study rated themselves more accurately than the more-experienced principals did.

In addressing Hypotheses 3 and 4, which both focused on tenure of principal, responses of teachers working under principals with three or more years of experience were compared with responses of teachers working under principals with less than three years of experience at their charter schools, in order to look for possible differences. The results of this comparison showed significant differences in leadership perception scores of teachers depending on the tenure of their principals on three leadership domains—Model the Way, Challenge the Process, and Encourage the Heart. So, reporting to a principal with three or more years of experience or a principal with less than three years of experience can effect, at least in this sample, leadership perception scores on three leadership domains that represent aligning values to action, not accepting the status quo and thinking outside the box, and elevating attitudes from within. It is not surprising that no significance was found with the domains of Inspiring a Shared Vision or Enabling Others to Act, as research cited earlier in this chapter (Campbell, 2010; NAPCS, 2008; Robelin, 2008) demonstrated that the strategy of developing leadership from within, and collaborative leadership to increase collective efficacy, may indeed be the key to a charter school's success. Additionally, charter schools are defined by their mission or central theme.

Implications

The implications of this study are helpful in laying the groundwork for the discussion of instructional leadership abilities and behaviors of charter school principals, as perceived by both principals and teachers at charter schools. Furthermore, it adds to

the literature on differences between the roles and role requirements of traditional public school principals and public charter school principals. In addition, there are implications for administrator preparation programs for charter school principals and evaluation of effective principal behaviors in charter school principals.

Previous research (Litchka, 2003) would suggest significant differences in perceived leadership behaviors between principals and teachers, yet in this research the ratings of perceived leadership behaviors of charter school principals and charter school teachers were significantly different on only three of the five domains of leadership. This would indicate that, at least for this sample of charter school principals and their teachers, on the two dimensions where significant differences were not found, charter school principals and their teachers do not differ and have similar perceptions. The two domains where significance was not found, as earlier stated, were Inspire a Shared Vision and Encourage the Heart. This implies that charter school principals and teachers could differ from traditional public school principals and teachers on these two dimensions. If future studies confirm this and these factors can be linked to school success measures, then perhaps there are implications for training and education programs for both charter school principals and traditional principals.

This study also noted one difference in perception, that of gender of the principal. Research by Litchka (2003) and Posner (2009) indicated that differences should extend into gender on the leadership dimensions. The sole significant finding with gender in this study centered around differences in perception scores of female principals and the perception scores of their teachers on the leadership domain of Challenge the Process. This implies, at least with this sample, that teachers of female charter principals have

significantly different ratings than their principals do on this dimension, whereas no significant differences were found between perceptions of male charter school principals and those of their teachers. To find significance with a sample size this small (with only five female principals) does indicate that this could be an issue that not only needs further research, but perhaps further training of female principals.

Furthermore, on all other dimensions, there were no significant differences found based on gender of the principal. Therefore, for this sample, male and female principals in charter schools are more similar, or more similarly perceived, than their traditional public school counterparts. Future research in this area could determine if this is a charter phenomenon or a result of this subgroup. If this proves to be something unique to charter schools, there are definite implications for leadership preparation programs, especially with regard to females.

Furthermore, this study examined differences in perception scores based on years of tenure of the principal at his or her charter school. Previous research indicated that the more-tenured principals would have a tendency to rate themselves higher (Litchka, 2003), have a more positive effect on their school (Clark 2009), and that their leadership perception scores on the five domains should align more closely with their teachers' (Posner, 2010). The results from this study contradicted these indications, in that no significant differences between principal self-perception scores and teacher-perception scores were found in any of the domains for principals with less than three years of experience. Furthermore, significant differences were found between the self-perception scores of more-tenured principals (three or more years of experience at their charter) and their teachers on the two domains of Model the Way and Encourage the Heart. However,

when comparing teacher-perception scores of tenured principals with teacher-perception scores of less-experienced principals, three areas of differences were found to be significant—Model the Way, Challenge the Process, and Encourage the Heart. This indicates that the teachers themselves were rating principals differently, based on if they reported to a more- or less-experienced principal. Thus, is there a difference in the culture of a school based on principal experience? This study indicated yes on these three domains, which supports the research by Clark (2009).

Litchka's discussion of his research indicated that movement from incongruence to congruence on leadership perception scores between principals and teachers would broaden the concept of leadership and shared purpose (2003), thus improving the middle-level principals as instructional leaders in their schools. This current study implies that some congruence has been established, at least with this population in the charter model. This study also implies that gender is not as much a critical factor in leadership at the charter school level. Thus, with this group of principals, there is more agreement on the leadership dimensions, more congruence, and more of a climate of shared responsibility.

Recommendations for Further Research

In considering this study of the leadership perceptions of charter school principals and their teachers, I suggest the following areas for future investigations:

1. Although this study found many areas where differences and similarities between perceptions of charter school principals and their teachers existed, the results could be applied only to this population and with the nonparametric statistics used. Future research on a much larger population of charter schools that is more representative of the overall population of charters would indicate results that

could be applied to all charters. A larger study would also allow further research to tease out different types of charters such as start-up charters, brick and mortar charters, and virtual charters, for comparison.

2. Although this study did demonstrate some significant differences, it did not provide an opportunity for participants to explain the reasons for their ratings. Future research could combine both quantitative and qualitative procedures to collect data.
3. Further research could also include the factor of school success, and compare current charters with certain success ratings to traditional public schools with similar ratings, to note if differences are due to school success or to some phenomenon with charter schools.
4. Further research could expand the understanding of why differences exist in subgroups used in this study, and could provide more data on gender and role as influences on self-perception scores on the five dimensions of leadership.
5. Future research could also include other subgroups of principals, such as ethnic or religious minorities. This present study was limited in the number of minority principals, and therefore ethnicity could not be studied as a factor in principal leadership perception scores. Future research should include a broader sample to accurately reflect the diversity of society and perhaps examine the impact of demographics and the dynamics of race and religion on leadership perceptions.
6. Future research that correlates increases in congruence between principal perception scores and teacher perception scores, be it charter or traditional, that

could be linked to administrative preparation programs or inform administrative preparation programs could be valuable in preparing future leaders.

7. Further research could be centered around administrator evaluation instruments and their effectiveness, as compared to leadership perception scores of principals, their teachers and their students.

References

- Allen, J., & Consoletti, A. (2010). *Annual survey of America's charter schools*. Washington, DC: Center for Education Reform. Retrieved from http://www.edreform.com/download/CER_Charter_Survey_2010.pdf.
- Aud, S., Hussar, W., Planty, M., Snyder, T., Bianco, K., Fox, M., Frohlich, L., Kemp, J., & Drake, L. (2010). *The Condition of Education 2010* (NCES 2010-028). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov>
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441-462.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of human agency through collective efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(3), 75-78.
- Barnett, A. M. (2003). *The impact of transformational leadership style of the school principal on school learning environments and selected teacher outcomes: A preliminary report*. Paper presented at NZARE AARE, Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/03pap/bar03777.pdf>.
- Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9-32.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Brinson, D., & Steiner, L. (2007, October). Building collective efficacy: How leaders inspire teachers to achieve. *Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement Issue Brief*. Retrieved from www.centerforsri.org.
- Budde, Ray (September 1996). The evolution of the charter concept. *Phi Delta Kappan* 78(1): 72–73. Archived from the original on June 12, 2007. http://web.archive.org/web/20070612034640/http://eric.uoregon.edu/search_find/ericd/b/detail.php?AC=EJ530653.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Campbell, C. (2010). *You're leaving? Succession and sustainability in charter schools*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Center on Reinventing Public Education. National Charter School Research Project. Retrieved from http://www.crpe.org/cs/crpe/download/csr_files/pub_ICS_Succession_Nov10_web.pdf.
- Chin, J. M. C. (2007). Meta-analysis of transformational leadership effects on school outcomes in Taiwan and the USA. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 8, 166-177.
- Clark, D., Martorell, P., & Rockoff, J. (2009). "School Principals and School Performance." CALDER Working Paper 38. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *School leadership study: Developing successful principals* (Review of Research). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute. Retrieved from

<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/SiteCollectionDocuments/WF/Knowledge%20Center/Attachments/PDF/DevelopingSuccessfulPrincipals.pdf>.

- Day, C. (2005). Principals who sustain success: Making a difference in schools in challenging circumstances. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 8, 273-290. doi:10.1080/1363120500330485.
- Donaldson, G., Marnik, G., Mackenzie, S., & Ackerman, R. (2009, October). What makes or breaks a principal. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 8-14.
- Frumkin, P. (2003). *The strategic management of charter schools*. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.aecf.org/upload/publicationfiles/ed3622h329.pdf>.
- Galen, H. (2005, Spring). Restoring teacher empowerment: A possible antidote for current educational challenges. *Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, pp. 31-36.
- Gates, S. M., Ringel, J. S., Santibanez, L., Chung, C. H., & Ross, K. E. (2003). *Who is Leading our Schools? An Overview of School Administrators and Their Careers*. Santa Monica, Ca.: RAND Corporation, MR-1679-EDU, 2003. As retrieved April 14, 2011 from: http://www.rand.org/pubs/monograph_reports/MR1679.
- Greenlee, B., & Brown, J. J. (2009). Retaining teachers in challenging schools. *Education*, 130, 96-109.
- Grissom, J., & Loeb, S. (2009, December). *Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills* (Working Paper 35). National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.

- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2006). Models of successful principal leadership. *School Leadership and Management, 20*, 415-434.
doi:10.1080/13632430020003210.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*, 329-351. doi:10.1080/13632430600886921.
- Harris, S., Ballenger, J., & Leonard, J. (2004). Aspiring principal perceptions: Are mentor principals modeling standard-based leadership? *Mentoring & Tutoring, 12*, 155-172. doi:10.1080/1361126042000239910.
- Hornig, E. & Loeb, S. (2010). New thinking about instructional leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 92*(3), 66-69.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*, 425-446.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools. In W. K. Hoy & C. Miskel (Eds.). *Studies in leading and organizing schools (pp. 181-207)*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishers.
- Hsieh, C-L. & Shen, J. (1998). Teachers' principals' and superintendents' conceptions of leadership. *School Leadership and Management, 18*, 107-121.
- Katz, S. (2004). *Women school superintendents: Perceptions of best practices for leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/>.

- Kelley, R. C., Thornton, B., & Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education, 126*, 17-25.
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Leadership practices inventory*(3rd ed.). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Leadership practices inventory facilitator's guide*(3rd ed.). San Francisco: Pfeiffer
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leech, D. & Fulton, C. R. (2008). Faculty perceptions of shared decision making and the principal's leadership behaviors in secondary schools in a large urban district. *Education, 128*, 630-644.
- Lashway, L. (2002, July). Developing instructional leaders. *ERIC Digest* (ED466023). Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/>.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2006). *Successful school leadership: What it is and how it influences pupil learning*. Research Report No. 800. Retrieved from <http://elan.wallacefoundation.org/SiteCollectionDocuments/WF/ELAN/RR800.pdf>
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2007). *Seven strong claims about successful school leadership*. England: National College for School Leadership. Retrieved from <http://www.npbs.ca/2007-elements/pdfs/seven-strong%20claims.pdf>.

- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10*, 451-479.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). Principal and teacher leadership effects: A replication. *School Leadership and Management, 20*, 415-434.
doi:10.1080/13632430020003210.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*, 201-227.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K.S., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.cehd.umn.edu/carei/Leadership/ReviewofResearch.pdf>.
- Li, C. K., & Hung, C. H. (2009). The influence of transformational leadership on workplace relationships and job performance. *Social Behavior and Personality, 37*, 1129-1142. doi:10.2224/sbp.2009.37.8.1129
- Litchka, P. (2003) *The importance of instructional leadership behaviors of principals as perceived by middle school teachers and principals*, (Doctoral dissertation, Seton Hall University, 2003). Seton Hall Library call number LB2831.962 .L5 2003.
Retrieved from
[http://domapp01.shu.edu/depts/uc/apps/libraryrepository.nsf/resourceid/E8217477B919B83985256E1A006CF15E/\\$File/Litchka-Peter_Doctorate.pdf?Open](http://domapp01.shu.edu/depts/uc/apps/libraryrepository.nsf/resourceid/E8217477B919B83985256E1A006CF15E/$File/Litchka-Peter_Doctorate.pdf?Open).
- Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning: Final report of research findings*. Wallace Foundation, Learning from Leadership Project. Retrieved from

<http://www.wallacefoundation.org/KnowledgeCenter/KnowledgeTopics/CurrentAreasofFocus/EducationLeadership/Documents/Learning-from-Leadership-Investigating-Links-Final-Report.pdf>.

- Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., Goldring, E., & Porter, A. C. (2007). Leadership for learning: A research-based model and taxonomy of behaviors. *School Leadership and Management, 27*, 179-201. doi:10.1080/13632430701237420.
- National Alliance for Public Charter Schools. (2008). *Charter school executives: Toward a new generation of leadership*. Retrieved from http://www.publiccharters.org/files/publications/2008_Toward%20a%20New%20Generation%20of%20Leadership.pdf.
- Nir, A.E., & Kranot, N. (2006). School principal's leadership style and teachers' self-efficacy. *Planning and Changing, 37*, 205-218.
- Oplatka, I. & Tako, E. (2009). Schoolteachers' constructions of desirable educational leadership: A career-stage perspective. *School Leadership and Management, 29*, 425-444. doi:10.1080/13632430903152286.
- Portin, B., Schneider, P., DeArmond, M., & Gundlach, L. (2003). *Making sense of leading schools: A study of the school principalship*. (Report No. EA032811). Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Center on Reinventing Public Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED481977).
- Posner, B. Z. (2010, September). *Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) data analysis*. Retrieved from <http://media.wiley.com/assets/2260/07/LPIDataAnalysisSept2010.pdf>.

- Posner, P. Z. & Kouzes, J. M. (1988). Development and validation of the Leadership Practices Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48*, 483-496.
- Printy, S. M., & Marks, H. M. (2006). Shared leadership for teacher and student learning. *Theory Into Practice, 45*, 125-132.
- Richards, J. (2003). *Principal behaviors that encourage teachers to stay in the profession: Perceptions of K-8 teachers in their second to fifth year of teaching.* (Report No. SP041596). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED477523).
- Richards, J. (2005). *Principal behaviors that encourage teachers at three career stages.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Robelin, E. W. (2008, September 10). Wanted: The perfect person. *Education Week*, pp. S3, S9.
- Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*, 179-199.
doi:10.1080/09243450600565795.
- Sheppard, B., Hurley, N., & Dibbon, D. (2010). *Distributed leadership, teacher morale, and teacher enthusiasm: Unravelling the leadership pathways to school success.* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Denver CO.
- South Carolina Association of Public Charter Schools (2011). Retrieved April 22, 2001 from <http://www.sccharterschools.org/>.

- Taylor, T., Martin, B. N., Hutchinson, S., & Jinks, M. (2007). Examination of leadership practices of principals identified as servant leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 10*, 401-419. doi:10.1080/1360312701408262.
- Timmerman, A. (2008). Examining the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the importance of the transformational individual consideration behaviors of school leadership and teachers' perceptions of the importance of the peer cohesion of school staff. *Dissertations Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 69*, 1249.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1998). *A national study of charter schools*. Retrieved on November 12, 2011 from <http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/ResearchToday/98-3037.html>.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2009). *A blueprint for reform: The reauthorization of the elementary and secondary education act*. Retrieved on July 23, 2011 from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/publicationtoc.html>.
- Vecchio, R. P., Justin, J. E., & Pearce, C. L. (2008). The utility of transactional and transformational leadership for predicting performance and satisfaction within a path-goal theory. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 81*, 71-82. doi:10.1348/096317907X202482.
- Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*, 458-495. doi:10.11177/0013191x08321502.
- Witte, R., & Witte, J. (2007). *Statistics (8th ed)*. New York: Wiley.

Ylimaki, R. M. (2007). Instructional leadership in challenging US schools. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 35(3), 11-19.

Ylimaki, R. M., Jacobson, S. L., & Drysdale, L. (2007). Making a difference in challenging, high-poverty schools in the USA, England, and Australia. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 18, 361-381.

doi:10.1080/09243450701712486.

*Appendix A**Five Dimensions of the LPI*

The five practices that the LPI measures are:

1. **Model the Way** - This is a matter of leaders' credibility and their doing what they say they will do. It consists of two main components, the ability to clarify one's own values and setting an example by aligning their values with actions (Kouzes & Posner, 2003)
2. **Inspire a Shared Vision** - This component involves, not only the leader as a visionary in to future possibilities, but it also engages his or her ability to enlist others in their dreams through a common vision (Kouzes & Posner, 2003)
3. **Challenge the Process** - Leaders do not accept the status quo and look for opportunities and innovation to grow. Leaders experiment and often engage in out-of-the-box thinking. This component also includes leaders' demonstrating the courage to keep going despite setbacks (Kouzes & Posner, 2003)
4. **Enable Others to Act** - Leaders must foster collaboration and teamwork, with an attitude that together the group can accomplish whatever needs to be done (Kouzes & Posner, 2003)
5. **Encourage the Heart** - Leaders also must be cheerleaders when the going gets tough. This component recognizes the importance of keeping hope and determination alive, and true leaders will recognize the contributions of all and celebrate the victories as a team (Kouzes & Posner, 2003)

Appendix B

Questions on the LPI and the Five Dimensions They Represent

The Five Dimensions and their corresponding questions on the LPI

Model the Way

- Question 1. Sets a personal example of what is expected in others
- Question 6. Makes certain that people adhere to agreed-upon standards and principles
- Question 11. Follows through on promises and commitments made
- Question 16. Asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect people's performance
- Question 21. Builds consensus around a common set of organization's values
- Question 26. Is clear about his/her philosophy of leadership

Inspire a Shared Vision

- Question 2. Talks about future trends influencing how work will get done
- Question 7. Describes a compelling image of what the future could be like
- Question 12. Appeals to others to share exciting dream of the future
- Question 17. Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision
- Question 22. Paints a big picture of group aspirations
- Question 27. Speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning of work

Challenge the Process

- Question 3. Seeks challenging opportunities to test self-skills and abilities
- Question 8. Challenges people to try out innovative approaches to their work
- Question 13. Searches outside boundaries of organization for innovative ways to improve
- Question 18. Asks, "what can we learn" when things do not as expected
- Question 23. Makes certain that achievable goals, plans, and milestones are set
- Question 28. Experiments and takes risks in the face of failure

Enable Others to Act

- Question 4. Develops cooperative relationships with coworkers
- Question 9. Actively listens to diverse points of view
- Question 14. Treats others with dignity and respect
- Question 19. Supports decisions that others make on their own
- Question 24. Gives people the opportunity to decide how to do their work
- Question 29. Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing himself or herself

Encourage the Heart

- Question 5. Praises people for a job well done
- Question 10. Lets people know he/she is confident in their abilities
- Question 15. Ensures that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions
- Question 20. Publicly recognizes people for their commitment to shared values
- Question 25. Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments
- Question 30. Gives team members appreciation and support for their contributions

Appendix C

*Teacher Responses on Perceptions of Their Principals Across the Five Leadership
Domains*

Teacher Responses on Perceptions of Their Principals Across the Five Leadership Domains

Teacher	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
1	54	55	54
2	60	58	59
3	54	60	58
4	58	59	60
5	54	60	58
6	54	60	56
7	48	51	46
8	48	45	47
9	60	43	60
10	57	59	59
11	59	60	60
12	55	60	58
13	59	49	59
14	51	59	46
15	59	49	58
16	47	60	51
17	31	46	50
18	34	41	31
19	60	60	60

Teacher	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
20	37	57	50
21	52	58	57
22	54	57	50
23	38	46	44
24	22	24	23
25	46	48	42
26	13	32	19
27	47	49	46
28	39	23	18
29	45	42	48
30	27	28	24
31	21	35	25
32	36	49	41
33	41	42	33
34	53	55	56
35	45	55	52
36	57	58	56
37	40	41	48
38	41	49	46
39	56	60	60
40	50	48	50

Teacher	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
41	47	56	48
42	60	47	50
43	59	56	55
44	44	51	46
45	12	20	27
46	33	37	40
47	10	19	23
48	8	13	21
49	53	54	54
50	57	58	60
51	30	44	33
52	36	59	41
53	36	59	41
54	53	54	54
55	47	60	51
56	57	58	56
N = 56			

Table continued for Domains “Enable Others to Act” and “Encourage the Heart”

Teacher	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
1	54	57
2	56	59
3	53	57
4	47	60
5	52	30
6	57	59
7	53	51
8	52	55
9	53	56
10	57	56
11	57	55
12	60	56
13	59	54
14	52	48
15	60	57
16	49	48
17	42	30
18	17	10
19	60	60

Teacher	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
20	48	43
21	55	46
22	47	48
23	49	49
24	42	20
25	17	46
26	60	18
27	48	49
28	55	21
29	47	48
30	49	26
31	42	23
32	53	36
33	50	51
34	60	55
35	55	46
36	55	60
37	41	34
38	36	37
39	59	60
40	52	49

Teacher	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
41	52	50
42	58	58
43	59	60
44	54	55
45	8	12
46	42	46
47	12	12
48	13	19
49	57	56
50	59	58
51	43	40
52	36	41
53	36	41
54	57	56
55	49	48
56	55	60
N = 56		

Appendix D

Principal Self-Perceptions Across the Five Leadership Domains

Principal Self-Perceptions Across the Five Leadership Domains

Principal	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
1	57	55	57
2	57	58	54
3	55	57	53
4	56	50	59
5	47	51	49
6	48	57	51
7	59	51	58
8	44	50	46
9	54	56	51
10	51	53	52
11	57	45	51
12	35	58	41
13	58	56	59
N = 13			

Table continued for Domains “enable Others to Act” and Encourage the Heart”

Principal	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
1	56	57
2	55	55

Principal	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
3	57	55
4	58	57
5	51	48
6	46	42
7	58	58
8	41	40
9	53	49
10	50	59
11	53	54
12	54	34
13	56	60
N = 13		

Appendix E

Teacher Median Scores for Each Corresponding Principal

Teacher Median Scores for Each Corresponding Principal

Teachers Median Score for each Principal	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
1	55	59	58
2	47	57	50
3	38	35	25
4	43	52	47
5	41	49	48
6	50	56	50
7	59	51	50
8	22	29	34
9	9	16	22
10	55	56	57
11	33	52	37
12	45	57	48
13	52	59	54
N = 13			

Table continued on next page for last two domains of “Enable Others to Act” and “Encourage the Heart”

Teachers Median Score for each Principal	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
1	54	56
2	48	48
3	47	26
4	54	49
5	41	37
6	52	50
7	58	58
8	25	29
9	13	16
10	58	57
11	40	41
12	47	49
13	52	54
N = 13		

Appendix F

*Female Principal Scores with the Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for
Matched-Pair Comparison*

*Female Principal Scores with the Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for
Matched-Pair Comparison*

Model the Way		Inspire a Shared Vision		Challenge the Process	
Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median
57	47	58	57	54	50
47	41	50	49	49	48
57	59	53	51	51	50
58	33	58	51.5	59	37
59	52	57	59	58	53.5

Enable Others to Act		Encourage the Heart	
Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median
55	48	55	46
51	41	48	37
58	58	58	58
53	39.5	54	40.5
56	52	60	54

Data in Appendix F and G depict the median of the teacher scores paired with their respective principals for each of the five dimensions of leadership.

Appendix G

*Male Principal Scores with the Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for
Matched-Pair Comparison*

Male Principal Scores with the Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for

Matched-Pair Comparison

Model the Way		Inspire a Shared Vision		Challenge the Process	
Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median
57	55	55	59	57	58
55	38	57	35	53	25
56	43	56	52	59	46.5
48	50	51	56	51	50
44	21.5	51	28.5	46	33.5
54	9	50	16	51	22
35	55	45	56	41	57
51	44.5	56	56.5	52	47.5

Enable Others to Act		Encourage the Heart	
Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median
56	54	57	56
57	32	55	26
58	54	57	48.5
46	52	42	50
41	25	40	29
53	12.5	49	15.5
50	58	59	56
54	46.5	34	48.5

Appendix H

Raw Scores for Teachers of Principals with Less than Three Years of Experience

Raw Scores for Teachers of Principals with Less than Three Years of Experience

Teachers of principals with less than three years of experience	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
1	36.0	49.0	41.0
2	41.0	42.0	33.0
3	53.0	55.0	56.0
4	10.0	19.0	52.0
5	8.0	13.0	23.0
6	30.0	44.0	21.0
7	36.0	59.0	33.0
8	36.0	59.0	41.0
9	53.0	54.0	41.0
10	45.0	56.0	54.0
N = 10			

Teachers of principals with less than three years of experience	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
1	53.0	36.0
2	50.0	51.0
3	60.0	55.0

Teachers of principals with less than three years of experience	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
4	55.0	46.0
5	12.0	12.0
6	13.0	19.0
7	43.0	40.0
8	36.0	41.0
9	36.0	41.0
10	57.0	56.0
N = 10		

Appendix I

Raw Scores for Principals with Less than Three Years of Experience

Raw Scores for Principals with Less than Three Years of Experience

Principals with less than three years of experience	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
1	56.0	56.0	59.0
2	54.0	50.0	51.0
3	57.0	53.0	51.0
4	35.0	45.0	41.0
N = 4			

Principals with less than three years of experience	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
1	58.0	57.0
2	53.0	49.0
3	53.0	54.0
4	54.0	34.0
N = 4		

Appendix J

*Scores of Principals Having Less than Three Years of Experience, with the
Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for Matched-Pair Comparison*

Scores of Principals Having Less than Three Years of Experience, with the Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for Matched-Pair Comparison

Model the Way		Inspire a Shared Vision		Challenge the Process	
Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median
56	38.5	56	45.5	59	46.5
54	11	50	28.5	51	22
57	36	53	59	51	37
35	49	45	55	41	47.5

Enable Others to Act		Encourage the Heart	
Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median
58	54	57	48.5
53	12.5	49	15.5
53	39.5	54	40.5
54	46.5	34	48.5

Appendix K

*Scores of Principals Having Three or More Years of Experience, with the Corresponding
Median Score of their Teachers for Matched-Pair Comparison*

*Scores of Principals Having Three or More Years of Experience, with the
Corresponding Median Score of their Teachers for Matched-Pair Comparison*

Model the Way		Inspire a Shared Vision		Challenge the Process	
Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median
57	55	55	59	57	58
57	47	58	57	54	50
55	38	57	35	53	25
47	41	50	49	49	48
48	50	51	56	51	50
59	39	57	51	58	50
44	22.5	51	28.5	46	33.5
51	55	56	56	52	57
58	52	58	59	59	53.5

This table is continued on the next page

Enable Others to Act		Encourage the Heart	
Principal Score	Teacher Median	Principal Score	Teacher Median
56	54	57	56
55	48	55	46
57	32	55	26
51	41	48	37
46	58	42	50
58	42	58	58
41	25	40	29
50	58	59	57
56	52	60	54

Appendix L

Raw Scores for Teachers of Principals with Three or More Years of Experience

Raw Scores for Teachers of Principals with Three or More Years of Experience

Teachers of principals with three or more years of experience	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
1	57.00	58.00	54.00
2	59.00	60.00	59.00
3	55.00	59.00	58.00
4	48.00	60.00	60.00
5	46.00	60.00	58.00
6	18.00	51.00	56.00
7	23.00	45.00	46.00
8	49.00	43.00	47.00
9	12.00	59.00	60.00
10	60.00	53.00	59.00
11	57.00	59.00	60.00
12	59.00	60.00	58.00
13	55.00	60.00	59.00
14	48.00	49.00	46.00
15	46.00	59.00	58.00
16	18.00	60.00	51.00
17	23.00	46.00	50.00
18	49.00	41.00	31.00
19	12.00	60.00	60.00

Teachers of principals with three or more years of experience	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
20	60.00	57.00	50.00
21	57.00	58.00	57.00
22	59.00	57.00	50.00
23	55.00	46.00	44.00
24	48.00	24.00	23.00
25	46.00	48.00	42.00
26	18.00	32.00	19.00
27	23.00	49.00	46.00
28	49.00	23.00	18.00
29	12.00	42.00	48.00
30	60.00	28.00	24.00
31	57.00	35.00	25.00
32	59.00	58.00	56.00
33	55.00	41.00	48.00
34	48.00	49.00	46.00
35	46.00	60.00	60.00
36	18.00	48.00	50.00
37	23.00	56.00	48.00
38	49.00	47.00	50.00
39	12.00	56.00	55.00

Teachers of principals with three or more years of experience	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
40	60.00	51.00	46.00
41	57.00	20.00	27.00
42	59.00	37.00	40.00
43	55.00	54.00	54.00
44	48.00	58.00	60.00
45	46.00	60.00	51.00
46	18.00	58.00	56.00
N = 46			

Table continued for Enable Others to Act and Encourage the Heart

Teachers of principals with three or more years of experience	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
1	54.00	57.00
2	56.00	59.00
3	53.00	57.00
4	47.00	60.00
5	52.00	30.00
6	57.00	59.00
7	53.00	51.00

Teachers of principals with three or more years of experience	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
8	52.00	55.00
9	53.00	56.00
10	57.00	56.00
11	57.00	55.00
12	60.00	56.00
13	59.00	54.00
14	52.00	48.00
15	60.00	57.00
16	49.00	48.00
17	42.00	30.00
18	17.00	10.00
19	60.00	60.00
20	48.00	43.00
21	55.00	46.00
22	47.00	48.00
23	49.00	49.00
24	19.00	20.00
25	50.00	46.00
26	18.00	18.00
27	47.00	49.00

Teachers of principals with three or more years of experience	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
28	20.00	21.00
29	48.00	48.00
30	32.00	26.00
31	21.00	23.00
32	55.00	60.00
33	41.00	34.00
34	36.00	37.00
35	59.00	60.00
36	52.00	49.00
37	52.00	50.00
38	49.00	58.00
39	59.00	60.00
40	54.00	55.00
41	8.00	12.00
42	42.00	46.00
43	57.00	56.00
44	59.00	58.00
45	49.00	48.00
46	55.00	60.00
N = 46		

Appendix M

Raw Scores for Principals with Three or More Years of Experience

Raw Scores for Principals with Three or More Years of Experience

Principals with three or more years of experience	Model the Way	Inspire a Shared Vision	Challenge the Process
1	57.0	55.0	57.0
2	57.0	58.0	54.0
3	55.0	57.0	53.0
4	47.0	50.0	49.0
5	48.0	51.0	51.0
6	59.0	57.0	58.0
7	44.0	51.0	46.0
8	51.0	56.0	52.0
9	58.0	58.0	59.0
N = 9			

Principals with three or more years of experience	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
1	56.0	57.0
2	55.0	55.0
3	57.0	55.0
4	51.0	48.0
5	46.0	42.0

Principals with three or more years of experience	Enable Others to Act	Encourage the Heart
6	58.0	58.0
7	41.0	40.0
8	50.0	59.0
9	56.0	60.0
N = 9		

*Appendix N**Permission to use instrument*

KOUZES POSNER INTERNATIONAL
 1548 Camino Monde
 San Jose, California 95125
 FAX: (408) 554-4553

February 18, 2011

Tamara Kirshtein
 15 Rebellion Road
 Charleston, SC 29407

Email: tkirshtein@charlestonmathscience.org

Dear Ms. Kirshtein:

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

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

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you indicate so by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it to us. Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,



Ellen Peterson
 Permissions Editor
 epeterson@scu.edu

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed)  Date: 3-1-11

Expected Date of Completion is: 5-1-12