**SCHOOL *of*
GRADUATE STUDIES**
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

**East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University**

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

12-2005

Principal Leadership, Teacher Morale, and Student Achievement in Seven Schools in Mitchell County, North Carolina.

Morgen A. Houchard
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.etsu.edu/etd

Part of the Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons

Principal Leadership, Teacher Morale, and Student Achievement in Seven Schools
in Mitchell County, North Carolina

_____

A dissertation
presented to
the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Education

_____

by
Morgen A. Houchard
December 2005

_____

Dr. Terry Tollefson, Chair
Dr. Cecil Blankenship
Dr. James Lampley
Dr. Louise MacKay

ABSTRACT

Principal Leadership, Teacher Morale, and Student Achievement in Five Schools
in Mitchell County, North Carolina

by

Morgen A. Houchard

The purpose of this study was to understand and measure principal leadership practices and teacher morale as it relates to student achievement in Mitchell County at two elementary schools, four middle schools, and one high school. First, a review of the related literature attempted to define teacher morale as much as possible given that it is an ever-changing individual characteristic. Second, the researcher tried to understand teacher morale and distinguish between high and low elements and characteristics of teacher morale. Third, the researcher examined the difficult task of measuring the morale of teachers in public education today. Fourth, an attempt was made to understand what role school leaders play in the development of teacher morale and how their specific behavior affects the morale of teachers. Lastly, student achievement was reviewed using the North Carolina End-Of-Grade tests. All of these variables were examined to determine if there was a connection or pattern to high or low student achievement based on teacher morale.

This quantitative study was conducted using a survey-design method. The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* was used to measure factors contributing to teacher morale. The *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) was chosen to measure leadership practices that best supports great accomplishments in organizations. The North Carolina End-Of-Grade/End-Of-Course tests were used to measure student achievement.

Overall results for Mitchell County Schools showed that there was a moderately high level of teacher morale. Satisfaction with teaching led the way in contributing to higher morale whereas the issue of teacher salary was found to lower morale. School leaders in Mitchell County proved to inspire a common vision as well as encourage teaching from the heart more so than found in existing research. Teachers from two of the seven schools rated their principals higher in leadership practices than the principals themselves; this is contrary to presented research. Many significant relationships existed between perceived leadership practices and teacher morale factors. All factors of teacher morale as measured by the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* had a positive correlation with the End-Of-Grade/End-Of-Course test scores.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my dear wife Tamara. Her love, patience, and understanding have made this work possible. She enriches my life on a daily basis and is indeed my best friend. I love you, Tamara!

I also dedicate this work to my three sons: David, Taylor, and Stewart and to my daughter Josefina Elisabeth. On many occasions, they have graciously given up time with their poppa in the effort to complete this endeavor. You are truly my life's work. I love all of you.

Finally, I dedicate this work to my parents Marcia and Nick. They have shown trust, patience, and love for me my entire life. They are my heroes. I love you both.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"The way to improve education is through a healthy environment at each school"

(John Goodlad, speaking in Denver, Colorado, on January 17, 1986).

Schools, teachers, and principals are often blamed for much of what is wrong with education in the United States. *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) reported to the American people:

> While we can take justifiable pride in what our schools and colleges have historically accomplished and contributed to the United States and well being of its people, the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a nation and a people. (p. 5)

This report, along with many other educational reports from the last two decades, emphasized altering the outward structure of school in some form or another (Maeroff, 1988). Many suggestions were offered such as a initiating a longer school day, a longer school year, more subject specific class offerings, and tighter controls of curriculum. Although these changes hold promise and can be important, the teacher ultimately is going to make the most difference. The teacher is the basis of schooling, and the morale of that teacher has an effect on every aspect of the educational process. There is little to no mention of teacher morale in any of the reports since the release of *A Nation at Risk*. Whitaker, Whitaker, and Lumpa (2000) found it surprising that books on teacher morale were almost nonexistent given that high staff morale applies to and is so critical to every school. Simply put, morale has not been thought of as a recommendation for improving education.

Teacher morale has not been a significant part of school improvement in the past because of the unclear definition or understanding of morale. Smith (1976) pointed out that the use of the term morale had often been avoided in research in order to eliminate the problems of defining it. Redefer (1959) also stated that morale was a complex and complicated area for investigation because it lacked a succinct definition. Williams (1986) added that attempting to define and

measure morale in the literature was an impossible task to complete. Finally, Rempel and

Bentley (1970) agreed that the phenomenon of morale was recognized as a powerful force and

was greatly discussed but little understood and difficult to define in unequivocal terms. Most of

the research shared the concept that there was a general agreement that morale is a vital

ingredient in the success of any human enterprise.

Statement of the Problem

Low morale, job related stress, teachers leaving the vocation, and recruitment problems

have continued to grow over the last few decades and have collectively been identified as

symptoms of demoralization of the educational profession (Andain, 1990; Blackbourne, 1990;

Garner, 1985; Gold, 1990; Hofkins, 1990; Raferty & Dore, 1993). Determining the leadership

traits and factors of effective principals that lead to higher teacher morale is imperative to any

school system or successful leader. If student achievement is tied into the equation, the interest

level rises two-fold.

The purpose of this study was to understand and measure principal leadership practices

and teacher morale in Mitchell County Schools as they relate to student achievement. A study of

this kind could possibly uncover valuable information to aid instructional leaders in improving

the morale of their teachers as well as enhance the school's climate and student achievement.

This researcher first attempted to identify a clear and understandable definition of teacher

morale. Then, an attempt was made to measure teacher morale in seven schools in Mitchell

County. Finally, leadership behaviors were identified and examined at each school. By

examining data collected, a determination was made as to the relationship of high and low

teacher morale with student achievement. Because of the lack of a comprehensible definition of

teacher morale, most research dealing with improving student achievement completely ignores

this aspect of school climate for improved schools.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of teacher morale exhibited by teachers in this study?

2. What is the level of teacher morale exhibited at each school in this study?

3. To what extent is there a difference between the self-reported leadership practices of principals in the current study and the Kauzes-Posners norms for these leadership practices?

4. Is there a difference between the perceptions of leadership by the leaders themselves (LPI-Self) and their teachers (LPI-observer)?

5. Is there a difference in the mean teacher morale score (PTO) and specific leadership behaviors as perceived by teachers (LPI-observer)?

6. Is there a relationship between teacher morale (PTO) and student achievement on the End-Of-Grade/End-Of-Course Tests?

Significance of the Study

Over the last 20 years, almost all research and recommendations for improving schools and student achievement have overlooked teacher morale. Very few proposals for effective leadership even mention the idea of understanding and supporting high teacher morale. The last few decades have had their share of "educational emergences" with each having produced its "American wake-up call" or "warning" about the downfall of our educational system. The late 1950s began with the launching of Sputnik and America's "rise to face the Russians." The nation awoke in the early 1980s only to learn that our system of education was being taken over by a rising tide that would soon devour all that was important to our nation. Now, at the turn of the century, we are reminded once again how far behind we have left some students with the federal legislation in the *No Child Left Behind* Act. There have been hundreds of suggestions for educational improvement over the years. Unfortunately, most have only looked to the external

workings of a school and ignored the internal mechanism of the institutions and individuals that we call school.

In the last half century, public educators have not enjoyed highly revered positions in American society; this is evident in the lack of public commitment and little confidence in our educational system and with its educators in general (Barth, 1990). A recent national survey conducted by the National Educational Association revealed that fewer than half of all teachers wanted their sons and daughters to enter public teaching careers (Elam, 1989). Elam reported that when asked, teachers simply "[saw] their own services as more valuable than those of all 11 other occupations that they rated including medicine, the clergy, and the bench" (p. 785). Elam added:

> At the same time, teachers place their prestige at the bottom of the totem pole. Below even funeral directors, realtors, and advertising practitioners. The gap that teachers perceive between the value of their services and their prestige is three times as great as the similar gap for physicians, members of the clergy, and public school principals. (p. 785)

A study of this kind might uncover valuable information to aid systems and building administrators in improving the lives of their teachers, enhancing the school climate, and increasing student achievement. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1993) contended that one of the major reasons to measure morale was to answer the question, "What does the worker want from his job?" (p. 79). Evans (1998) took the rational for studying morale a step further by stating that the intent should be to study and understand what influenced people's feelings about their work so positive job-related attitudes could be cultivated and prevail. In this day and age of accountability and high stakes testing, leaders and future leaders could use helpful insight into improvement. Finally, this study is significant because it directly deals with improving the working conditions and lives of a school community.

Delimitations

1. The research was limited to seven schools in Mitchell County, North Carolina.

2. The research was limited to the teachers of the Western mountain region of North Carolina.

3. The data collected were limited to the winter/spring semester of the public school calendar with the knowledge that morale shifts from season to season as well as from year to year.

4. The measurement of teacher morale was limited to the variable measured by the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.* It required the teachers and administrators to respond honestly and openly to the questions and surveys.

5. For the purpose of this study, student achievement was measured using only the North Carolina End-Of-Grade/End-Of-Course Tests that are administered on three days in the last two weeks of school in late spring.

6. Results of this study might not be generalized to other populations.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made in this study:

1. All of the statistical procedures used in the research were appropriate for analyzing the data.

2. The questionnaires and surveys were valid and met the purpose of this study.

3. The End-Of-Grade test scores were adequate indicators of student achievement.

Definitions of Terms

1. *Leader Behavior*: The behavior of those who are leading a school or educational organization. Usually this incorporates leading a group of people towards a common goal or vision. It is the "nuts and bolts" of leadership.

2. *Leadership*: Represents the interpreter for the group or the "voice." Leadership denotes the ability to guide, inspire, direct, and manage those in an organization or group.

3. *Morale*: The quality of lives within a community that involves "being known and appreciated, having professional knowledge valued, and being given the freedom to act" (Koerner, 1990, p. 3). *Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary* defined morale as, (a) the mental and emotional condition (as of enthusiasm, confidence, or loyalty) of an individual or group with regard to the function or tasks at hand; (b) a sense of common purpose with respect to a group; (c) the level of individual psychological well-being based on such factors as a sense of purpose and confidence in the future.

4. *Principal*: The person (or persons) who is the administrative head of the faculty and staff of a school. This position is usually in care of the overall well-being and production of the school.

5. *School Organizational Climate*: An average perception that a person holds about their work environment. It is a set of traits or factors that gives "personality" to an organization.

6. *Teacher:* A person employed to guide and direct the learning experiences of students in an official educational setting. This person has successfully completed a professional curriculum from an accredited teaching institution and holds a teaching certificate from the state of North Carolina.

Organization of the Study

This study contains five chapters. The first chapter includes an introduction to the study, statement of the problem, research questions, significance of the study, the limitations of the study, assumptions of the study, and the important definitions for clearer understanding. Chapter 2 contains a review of the related literature and is divided into five sections: (a) defining teacher

18

morale, (b) high and low teacher morale, (c) measuring teacher morale, (d) leadership behaviors and morale, and (e) student achievement. Chapter 3 introduces the procedures and methods used to collect, analyze, and report the data. The fourth chapter will present the results of the data and analyze the findings. The last chapter contains a summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Society today is as complex and fast paced as it has ever been. The problems and

obstacles that plague society are simply channeled into our schools. As Dinham (1994) relayed:

> With the unresolved social problems of unemployment, family breakdown, crime,
> poverty, and poor health for many, schools have been looked to for solutions, with the
> results that they have in many respects, become the 'wastebaskets of society', being
> expected to solve the problems that society appears unwilling or unable to deal with. (p.
> 2)

Teachers are being asked to accomplish more in schools today than ever before.

Expectations that are being placed on them seem to be expanding exponentially (Lumsden,

1998). Not only are teachers expected to teach specific content for high-stakes testing and

mentor students in the love of learning, but they must also function as frontline social workers

(Lumsden). Coupled with this broad range of social problems that find their way into our

schools, many other pressures affect our teachers and their classrooms. Parks (1983) was

compelled to ask:

> How does one compensate professionals for inadequate books and supplies, large classes,
> disruptive students, public criticism, limited assistance, increased duties, and the lowest
> salaries paid to highly educated personnel in the nation? How does one lead a group in
> which morale is so low that over 40% of survey respondents would not again select
> teaching as a profession and 57% are definitely planning to leave, will leave if something
> better comes along, or are undecided about staying? (p. 11)

It is no wonder that in a typical year, 6% of teachers leave the field while another 7.2%

transfer schools (Graves, 2001). Results from surveys given by the United States Department of

Education indicated that of those leaving the profession, 27% retired while a surprising 49% left

because of job dissatisfaction or a desire to pursue other careers (Graves). Simply put, it is

difficult for individuals to derive job fulfillment or high morale for any activity, task, or

component of their work to which they afford little value (Evans, 1998). It does not matter what

the morale level is of educators, they consistently describe one of their needs as "having higher morale" (Whitaker et al., 2000).

Chapter 2 consists of a review of the related literature in the areas of principal leadership and teacher morale. The chapter is divided into several relevant sections: (a) defining teacher morale, (b) high and low teacher morale, (c) measuring teacher morale, (d) leadership behaviors and morale, and (e) student achievement.

Definitions of Teacher Morale

Morale is a difficult concept to define and even harder to measure. During idle discussions between teachers and administrators they are quick to tell you they know what the term and concept of morale means but become confused when asked to clearly define it (Washington & Watson, 1976). Moreover, within the research and academic communities, "Those who take conceptual analysis and definition seriously accept that morale is a very nebulous, ill-defined concept whose meaning is generally inadequately explored" (Evans, 1998, p. 21). Because of these difficulties in definition, many researchers who begin to study morale in schools find it necessary, if they strive for conceptual rigor, to rely mainly on what seems to be dated material. Evans (1997) contended that the research might indeed be dated, but enduring because of the de-contextualized nature that provides valuable information that is useful and applicable.

Morale is defined by *Webster's New World Dictionary* as the morale of mental condition with respect to courage, discipline, confidence, enthusiasm, willingness to endure hardship, etc. with a group, in relation to a group, or within an individual. It also included the idea or willingness to endure hardship. Much of the research leads to a definition of morale as a feeling or state of mind that involves a mental and emotional attitude (Mendel, 1987). Washington and Watson (1976) referred to morale as the feeling a worker had about his or her job in relationship to the importance of that job to the organization as a whole working unit. Further, they

contended that the organization must also meet the workers' own expectations and needs. Evans (1997) defined morale as a state of mind that is derived by individuals' anticipation of satisfaction for those needs that they perceive as important factors affecting their work environment. Bentley and Rempel (1980) recognized that morale occupied many manifestations but considered it the enthusiasm and interest that an individual held towards goals and professional ambition either as a group or individually. Clough (1989), as well, stated it should be thought of as a shared purpose that was forward-looking and confident. Koerner (1990) offered more of a holistic approach when he referred to staff morale as the quality of lives within a community that involved "being known and appreciated, having professional knowledge valued, and being given the freedom to act" (p. 3). Moreover, the author stated it involved learning, growing, making mistakes, reflecting on them, and moving on.

Getzel and Guba (1957) offered a theoretical model that asserted morale was composed of three different factors: belongingness, rationality, and identification. Belongingness encompasses the ability of the teacher to achieve satisfaction within the working group of the school. Rationality deals with the feeling of job appropriateness wherein the teachers' expectation of their role is in line with the goals they are required to achieve for the school. Identification refers to the ability of the teacher to combine his or her needs and values with those of the school so that they are somewhat alike. Lipham, Rankin, and Hoeh (1985) echoed Getzels and Guba's theory but referred to the responsible factors with different terms. They contended that morale was comprised of the existence of and interaction between effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction. To be effective, the individual's behavior must be fitting for the expectations that exist for the job. Efficiency refers to the extent to which the group's social behavior is in-line with that of the individual's behavior. In other words, does the individual "fit in" with the group? Finally, satisfaction refers to the matching up of the institutional role expectations and the individual's need dispositions.

22

Evans (1998) was quick to point out that morale essentially related to the individual and was an individual phenomenon. Keeler and Andrews (1963) found that the degree to which organizational dimensions correlated with the morale and job satisfaction of the teachers depended on the personal attitudes and dimensions of the teachers. Many of the environmental aspects that related to job satisfaction were not necessarily the same for all subgroups of teachers. What may cause the dissatisfaction or low morale with one person may not affect the morale of another.

High and Low Teacher Morale

Work can be one of the most absorbing activities humanity can think and talk about and it tends to fill the greater part of the waking day for most. For those more auspicious, it is the source of great satisfactions; unfortunately, for others it can be the cause of grief and unhappiness (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1993). Maslow (1970), in his hierarchy of needs theory, offered a great basis to begin to understand the foundations or building blocks of teacher morale. According to Lunenburg and Ornstein (1996), Maslow established five basic needs of humans that emerge in a hierarchy of importance that addresses physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-actualization needs of humans. The following needs that are arranged from lowest to highest are contended to be the basic needs of humans and are a determining factor when looking at the morale of an individual person:

1. Physiological needs include the basics of food, water, sleep, oxygen, and the like.

2. Safety and security needs include the need for physical safety, avoidance of anxiety, order, structure, and job and financial security.

3. Social needs include the need for belonging to groups, friendship, and acceptance by others.

4. Esteem needs include the need for self-respect, appreciation, and recognition from others.

5. Self-actualization needs include the desire for maximizing your own potential, autonomy, and creativity (Whitaker et al., 2000, p. 5).

Parks (1983) contended that people needed certain things from life in order to maintain higher levels of morale. These needs are grounded in motivational psychology and involve: (a) feeling good about oneself, (b) being free from economic worry, (c) living a life and in an environment that is free from both hazards to physical and mental health, (d) having the ability to exhibit one's own creations, and (e) having the freedom and opportunity to love and be loved. Once the needs that are basic to all humans are met, job satisfaction and higher morale can begin to exist. Evans (1998), with her exhaustive study and research with teacher morale, specifically concluded with several key points of interest. To begin with, she said that school specific rather than centrally imposed factors were the most significant determinants of teachers' attitudes about their work. Factors that affect morale will vary from individual to individual. A major factor in influencing the levels of morale among teachers is that of professional orientated. Relative perspective of the teacher influences the respective levels of morale as well as the realistic expectations that are held.

To fully understand what high teacher morale is one must first look at low teacher morale. Koerner (1990) suggested that low staff morale resulted from "professional lives that have little meaning; from frustration and the inability to change what is happening; from muddled goals and demands that stretch resources--both human and material--to the breaking point" (p. 3). Brodinsky (1984) analyzed questionnaires from superintendents who said teacher morale in their districts was poor. The results showed the following reasons for low teacher morale: (a) a reduction in force, (b) adversarial contacts with principals that were simply unproductive, (c) unhealthy public respect towards teachers that seems to continually grow, (d) low pay, (e) facilities and resources that were inadequate, and (f) administrative supervision that was insufficient because of the lack of time and resources. Strickland, in his 1962 dissertation work, identified 10 factors that tended to lower morale:

1. A lack of relief from student contact during the school day,

2. overwhelming clerical duties,

3. lack of support and cooperation from administration,

4. inadequate school facilities,

5. lack of cooperation with the faculty and staff,

6. teaching loads that were excessive,

7. low salary,

8. declining parent interest and cooperation,

9. student discipline problems, and

10. lack of working equipment and proper supplies. (p. 49)

Mendel (cited in Lumsden, 1998) contended that a low level of teacher satisfaction or morale could possibly lead to a decrease in productivity by the teacher, a loss of concern for the subject or the students, alienation from colleagues, depression, increased rate of sickness with missed work days, general fatigue, and burnout. Furthermore, Clough (1989) stated that low morale could be attributed to factors such as frustration, alienation, and a feeling of powerlessness. Research from the United Kingdom (Evans, 1997) revealed there were many perennial factors that attributed to low teacher morale. Evans (1997) found that a perception of low status, low pay, and a lack of professional autonomy were the three leading factors. Finally, Dinham (1994) found that low staff morale was affected by extrinsic factors such as changes to educational policies and procedures, schools having to deal with social problems, a declining status of teachers in society, poor supervision, and, increased administrative workloads. Relatively all the research reviewed indicated that low teacher morale was fostered by extrinsic factors.

In his attempt to improve schools from within, Barth (1990) examined how teachers felt and attempted to pinpoint those areas of the teaching environment that deterred from promoting a higher level of morale. He found that teachers said they felt unappreciated, overworked, and not

25

respected as professionals. They also tended not to trust the administration, public, or even themselves for the most part. Many of the teachers reported that they were separated from one another or compartmentalized too often and were held powerless to effect change in most cases. Many were frustrated at the non-teaching demands placed upon them by administrators and the public (Barth). Levine (1986) noted that the teaching profession in the United States has recently hit an all-time low and convincingly shared one of her paradoxes of teaching, "…that an occupation that is based on nurturing, developmental knowledge, motivation, reinforcement, incentives, and rewards should itself be so deprived of those characteristics in the organizational setting in which it functions" (p. 173). Rosenholtz (1985) contended that it was hard enough to recruit new teachers as well as retain those already in the profession because the rewards purely did not outweigh the frustrations. This was multiplied in schools that were characterized as having low teacher morale.

When school environments are healthy and teacher morale is high, not only do teachers feel good about themselves and others but they also possess a sense of accomplishment from their jobs (Hoy & Miskel, 1987). High teacher morale is coupled with many good attributes with and of an individual teacher as well as the "whole" school, administration, and community. In his research on teacher morale, Napier (1966) found that high teacher morale was associated with:

1. the teacher being appreciated as an individual by the administration;
2. confidence from the administration in teachers' competence;
3. administrative support when dealing with student discipline problems;
4. teacher participation in the development of school policies;
5. adequate equipment, teaching supplies, and facilities;
6. appropriate teaching loads and assignments;
7. equitable distribution of extracurricular duties;
8. worthwhile in-service training and staff developments; and

9. job security.

Clough (1989) wrote that high staff morale was associated with feelings of belongingness, togetherness, achievement, and self- and group-esteem. Dinham (1994) credited high teacher morale with rewards that were intrinsic such as pupil achievement, teacher achievement, changing pupil attitudes and behaviors in a positive way, recognition from others, mastery and self-growth, and positive relationships. According to Washington and Watson (1976), positive teacher morale was exemplified by teachers who:

1. looked forward to going to work in the morning and were not in a hurry to leave in the evening;

2. exhibited concern for the direction in which the school and the programs were moving;

3. actively participated in school functions, committees, and organizations;

4. willingly performed various school tasks that were above and beyond their stated duties;

5. derived satisfaction from being a member of the school, system, and teaching profession;

6. were supportive of the school, its goals, and philosophy; and

7. were actively engaged in improving school-community relations. (p. 4)

Ellenburg (1972) summed it up well by proclaiming that usually the teacher possessing high morale tends to be that teacher who relates well with the parents and students. Schools with high staff morale have very distinctive features. School members feel good about the school and what is happening and are more willing to perform assigned tasks and tend to be more confident, cheerful, and self-disciplined (Whitaker et al., 2000). There is a sense of community--one in which people care about each other and work together so that every one involved can succeed and learn. Teachers and students have input into the decision-making

process and they have ownership and pride in their school. As well, teachers and students must have the chance to be creative, to take risks, and to make mistakes. The school climate must be one where open communication is constant among all, conflicts are dealt with, differences are appreciated, and individual voices are fostered and developed. Leadership and ownership needs to be encouraged by all (Koerner, 1990). Ellenburg encompassed the importance of morale by affirming that:

> Morale affects more than just productivity or student achievement. It assists in establishing the character of a school. It is one of the factors which may determine whether a school functions at its best, demanding and receiving the utmost from its students, or whether the school plods along happy just to see the passing of another day. (p. 37)

Although morale is something easy to overlook, one must never forget that it can and for the most part does make a school stand ahead of the rest (Von Burg, 1963).

Measuring Teacher Morale

Most teachers and administrators agree that high teacher morale is advantageous to everyone involved in the educational process (Stedt & Fraser, 1984). Most of the researchers on teacher morale agree to a few set conditions. First, morale itself is an intangible element that is difficult to define or describe. Secondly, morale is onerous to measure and is in a constant state of fluctuation. Finally, morale manifests itself in a number of different factors with no single factor always being present (Bess, 1997; Evans, 1997; Kottkamp, Provenzo, & Cohn 1986; Reyes, 1990). Regarding supervision, Anderson (1985) put it best when he stated that it was difficult to name a paradigm that fully describes human and organizational factors that influence morale. It is even more difficult to find a paradigm that links the morale of staff to specific supervisory practices.

Although there have been consistent problems in defining and measuring morale, several attempts have been made to devise instruments to record and measure teacher morale. With any

attempt to measure teacher morale, one must always take into account the complexities and challenges that extra- and intra-organizational processes with schooling has on humans when seeking relationships (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982). There are many ways school leaders can measure teacher morale either individually or as a group. An inventory of morale may serve as a good starting point. Inventories can start with inquiries as simple as paper surveys, interviews, or group discussions (Koerner, 1990). In addition, there are dozens of more formal inventories such as the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire*, the NASSP School Climate Survey, and the Behavioral Morale Checklist. Educational leaders can design and implement a school profile, form a staff morale committee, or hire outside consultants to measure teacher morale. Stedt and Fraser (1984) contended that one of the most useful and dependable methods for measuring teacher morale was that of the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* developed by Bentley and Rempel (1968). The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* is a standardized instrument that asks teachers to respond to 100 questions such as "I love to teach," or "I am well satisfied with my present teaching position" (Stedt & Fraser). The test is set up as a Likert-type scale that scores and indicates how the respondents feel about certain questions or issues and investigates 10 factors of morale that include: teacher rapport with the principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher salary, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support, school facilities and services, and community pressures. The end product is a subset of scores that helps to determine an overall morale score or measurement.

Leadership Behaviors and Morale

A 1997 report on job satisfaction by the National Center for Education Statistics revealed many factors that contributed to higher teacher job satisfaction. Among them were the involvement of a supportive administrative staff, leadership, better student behavior, more teacher autonomy, and a safer, supportive school that promotes a positive atmosphere. It seems likely that school and district-level leadership styles can significantly affect teacher morale.

Recent research continued to emphasize the importance of the principal as the key to improved learning and teaching environments (Cotton, 2003). Although morale is ultimately something one provides for one's self, it can be enhanced and nurtured by school leaders. Adams (1992) reinforced this perception by relaying the concept that those principals who positively reinforce their teaching staff as well as handle the many contingencies in the work environment are behind improving the morale and self-esteem of their teachers. Research has clearly shown that the effectiveness of leadership is the single most important factor in staff morale (Clough, 1989). Barth (1990) found that "No characteristic of a good school is more pervasive than a healthy teacher-principal relationship--and no characteristic of a troubled school more common than a troubled, embattled administrator-teacher relationship" (p. 19).

Clifford Campbell's study of leadership behaviors (as cited in Clough, 1989) that contributed to high teacher morale included: showing interest in teachers' work and offering assistance, supporting the actions and decisions of staff members, allowing self-direction in work and showing confidence in the ability of teachers, and allowing the staff to participate in the decision-making process. A simple factor that aids the principal in supporting high teacher morale is to develop and ensure an orderly educational program with all who participate and are involved (Wood, Nicholson, & Findley, 1985). Koerner (1990) recognized 13 essential factors of leadership that determined high morale:

1. allow teachers to have input into decision-making that directly affects curriculum, instruction, and school climate;
2. recognize and appreciate teacher and student achievement;
3. promote a school climate that reflects a feeling of unity, pride, cooperation, acceptance of differences, and security;
4. maintain good communication;
5. promote opportunities for meaningful, professional growth;
6. encourage clear, shared goals;

7. endorse strong, supportive leadership;

8. provide quality time for collegial interaction--planning, educational dialogue, decision-making, problem-solving;

9. provide a well maintained physical environment;

10. encourage good human relations, both within school and between school community;

11. Encourage and reward risk-taking, innovation, and good teaching;

12. give attention to professional needs such as salary and benefits and

13. give attention to personal needs such as stress management, good health, and social interaction (p. 2).

School leaders need to have a conscious awareness that they directly affect teacher morale. Washington and Watson (1976) reinforced this thought by stating that principals must realize that promoting high teacher morale does not just happen in the course of daily events. Morale must be cultivated, developed, and nurtured by creative, receptive principals. It requires much time, effort, and planning. In addition, administrators must understand the existence and importance of the dynamics and relationships that exist in a working environment and that they are essential elements to improvement and morale (Whitaker et al., 2000). Administrators must clearly know that they play a pivotal role in the success of the school and the morale of the individual members. Hood (1965) found that the teachers' relationship with the principal was much more important in determining their morale level than that of their relationship with other teachers. Coulson (1988) found that leadership was not about procedures and rules only but also depended largely on the personality of the principals and the relationships they cultivated with their teachers. This greatly involves leading by example as well as holding and promoting key values. If principals are going to be effective in developing and maintaining high teacher morale, they must possess high morale themselves (Washington & Watson). Clough (1989) offered 10 keys to developing good supervisory relations with the staff:

1. treat your teachers as individuals, get to know them as people;

2. give your teachers as much opportunity for growth and change as possible;

3. refrain from getting involved in their personal lives;

4. compliment them frequently and thank them for their good work;

5. organize their work and make certain they have all the information they need to do a good job;

6. allow them to express their creativity;

7. establish a relaxing atmosphere by using your sense of humor;

8. give them work they are capable of completing, make reasonable goals;

9. allow them to work; and

10. remain available for them. (p. 6)

It is no mystery that people who feel empowered with the work they do will generally possess higher morale. When people are more personally invested in their work and work place, they genuinely have control over what happens to them. In return, their work has a higher meaning and they tend to serve a higher purpose (Maehr, Midgley, & Urdan, 1993). Thus, individuals are motivated to participate in activities that appear to be oriented towards job satisfaction and increased job satisfaction leads to higher morale (Evans, 1998). School leaders can also enhance teacher morale by simply standing behind teachers and supporting them. Many researchers have found that the morale of teachers was affected simply by the teachers' opinion of whether the administrator understood and appreciated them (Ellenburg, 1972; Napier, 1966).

According to Blasé and Kirby (1992), effective principals are servants to the teachers; they serve as guardians of instructional time, help teachers with discipline matters, empower the teachers to develop discipline procedures and codes, and then support teachers as they enforce the policies they developed. Herzberg's et al. (1993) research and data supported that recognition, achievement, responsibility, interesting work, and advancement all lead to a more positive attitude toward a job. A simple increase in recognition can be one of the greatest motivators available and will often lead to higher staff morale (Scarnati, 1994). When teachers

were asked about the one thing that would improve their "working health," they overwhelmingly responded to the need of more positive reinforcement and recognition from both their principals and the communities for which they worked (Elam, 1989). Furthermore, recognition received from administrators, supervisors, and the community had a strong positive relationship to career status, work ethic, and longevity (Chapman, 1982). The single important factor for principals in cultivating positive morale might be acknowledging and reinforcing the many positive things that occur in their schools every day (Whitaker et al., 2000). If school leaders want to establish and enhance the morale of those who work in the school, a consistent and positive approach to all endeavors is paramount. According to Parks (1983), the educational leader sets and establishes the tone for the entire organization. The school leader can make the school either a pleasant, attractive place to work or only a place for which time is exchanged for income.

Finally, principals need to remember the "little things" that create effective schools and helps teacher morale. Responding to daily human needs is imperative for the principal or supervisor. Koerner (1990) suggested:

1. saying hello to teachers and using their names;
2. sending a note or word of congratulations for a job well done, achievement on an excellent job, a birthday;
3. asking others for their opinions and listening;
4. scheduling time for regular visits to the classroom;
5. letting teachers know what is going on;
6. following through on teachers' requests;
7. asking for help when you need it; and
8. dropping by teachers' rooms for lunch. (p. 3)

Teachers who were given positive feedback on their work by those who administer and supervise continually reported higher levels of job satisfaction, morale, and motivation than those who did not (Evans, 1998).

It is imperative that school administrators lead for high teacher morale. They must frequently check and monitor the morale of teachers, students, and the school community. As well, they must know that each school has needs that are unique to that school at that time. The conditions of schools and the needs of teachers and students constantly change from year to year and even month to month (Klopf, Scheldon, & Brennan, 1982). Teachers can definitely take steps to help their own morale both personally and professionally but it also must be nurtured, supported, and valued by all involved in the educational process (Lumsden, 1998). Lumsden acknowledged it best by stating the importance of teachers being provided with whatever they required to remain enthusiastic and inspired about teaching and learning. In the end, both teachers and students will be the beneficiaries. Teachers, like all humans, need to feel and know how important and appreciated they are. Morale will no doubt suffer if they believe that an administrator is unconcerned about their welfare (Cook, 1979). When teachers are convinced that their principal honestly takes their needs seriously and genuinely cares about their success as a professional and a person, discontent will not likely prevail.

Teacher Morale and Student Achievement

The linking of teacher morale and student achievement by school leaders reportedly has been overlooked in the last two decades in public education. According to Miller (1981):

> External and internal pressures to improve pupil social behavior and academic performance continue. Our major response has been to increase discipline and remediation, but the results have not been encouraging. Largely ignored is the considerable research that indicated another, perhaps more productive, route to facilitating student growth. There is evidence that the social climate of the school and the morale of the staff can have a positive effect on pupil attitudes and learning. Improving the climate and morale also makes teaching more pleasant. (p. 483)

Because of the changing trend of accountability and high-stakes testing, school and district leaders are now beginning to investigate other "non-traditional" factors in schools that might affect achievement. Educational leaders are constantly attempting to analyze all factors of an educational environment in order to improve student achievement and test scores. As Cook

(1979) stated over two decades ago, "Undeniably, teacher morale is recognized by school administrators as one of the key ingredients in the development of a successful educational organization" (p. 356). An effective educational environment is characterized by a positive school climate where the teachers and students feel good about teaching and learning and cooperate to foster a caring attitude (Bartell, 1990). To be able to approach work each day with a positive state of mind is critical to being successful with the students and their achievement (Whitaker et al., 2000).

School leaders influence and exercise a measurable effect on student achievement by an indirect process through the influence they have on teachers (Gurr, 1997; Hallinger & Heck, 1998). Lumpa (1997) found that a strong predicator of student satisfaction and success was the level of teacher satisfaction in the school. By simply involving teachers in developing a collaborative school climate, a statistical relationship between higher teacher morale and higher student's achievement becomes evident (Thomas, 1997). When schools have teachers with high morale, they also have a good chance of having students with high morale; this has a direct impact on student achievement (Keeler & Andrews, 1963; Whitaker et al., 2000). Adams and Bailey (1989) followed a simple idea that when teachers felt good themselves and what they were doing in the classroom they became more inspired to teach thus delivering instruction at a much higher level. When teachers' morale is energized and productive, good things tend to happen in the classroom. When good things happen in the classroom, the future for each student in that classroom is brighter (Whitaker et al.).

When schools possess high teacher morale, they not only make teaching much more enjoyable for teachers, but learning becomes more pleasant for students as well according to Miller (1981). Ellenberg (1972) also found that when a school's employees demonstrated high morale, it showed an increase in student achievement. Miller pointed out that high teacher morale could have a positive effect on students' attitudes and learning thereby improving achievement. Ellenburg compared student achievement with the morale of teachers in 12

secondary public schools in Dearborn, Michigan, and found that student achievement increased under teachers with high morale and decreased under teachers with low morale. High morale simply helped create a more conducive, inviting, and stable learning environment. In short, the morale of teachers has far-reaching implications for student learning, the overall health of the school, and definitely the health of the teacher (Mendel, 1987).

Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003), in their work entitled *Balanced Leadership: What 30 Years of Research Tell us About the Effect of Leadership on Student Achievement,* gave explanation and detail to the 21 leadership responsibilities significantly correlated with student achievement. Those responsibilities, listed below, clearly demonstrate the importance of maintaining high morale:

1. culture--fosters shared beliefs, sense of community, and cooperation;

2. order--establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines;

3. discipline--protects teachers from issues;

4. resources--provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs;

5. curriculum, instruction, assessment--is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices;

6. focus--establishes clear goals;

7. knowledge of curriculum, instruction assessment--is knowledgeable about current curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices;

8. visibility--has quality contact and interactions;

9. contingent rewards--recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments;

10. communication--establishes strong lines of communications;

11. outreach--is an advocate or spokesperson for the school and faculty;

12. input--involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies;

13. affirmation--recognizes and celebrates school accomplishments;

14. relationship--demonstrates an awareness of the personal aspects of teachers and staff;

15. change agent--is willing to and actively challenges the status quo;

16. optimizer--inspires and leads new and challenging innovations;

17. ideal/beliefs--communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling;

18. monitors/evaluates--monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning;

19. flexibility--adapts leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent;

20. situational awareness--is aware of the details and undercurrents of the running of a school; and

21. intellectual stimulation--ensures that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices. (p. 4)

Through these 21 responsibilities, school leadership reportedly increases teacher morale, improves the working and learning conditions at schools, and ultimately increases student achievement. Interestingly enough, these recommendations for school improvement take little money but a lot of caring for the students, teachers, staff, and overall success of the school.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to better understand the associations among principal leadership, teacher morale, and student achievement in seven public schools in Mitchell County, North Carolina. This chapter describes in detail the methods and procedures that were used to conduct the study. The sample and population is identified in this chapter along with the design of the study. The instruments used to collect the data are identified and presented.

Research Design

This study is a quantitative study that was conducted using a survey-design method. The purpose of the study was to make generalizations about morale using 10 factors and student achievement by analyzing the End of Grade (EOG) and End-Of-Course Test scores. Results from the sample allowed the researcher to make inferences concerning effective behaviors in a population (Babbie, 1990). A survey design was chosen because of the economy of the design and the rapid turnaround in data collection (Creswell, 2003). The survey design also allowed for more confidentiality with those being surveyed. Those being surveyed were asked specific questions and details about their superiors, teaching in general, curriculum issues, and questions dealing with the school community. The survey was cross-sectional with the data being collected during a window of time. The surveys were designed to be self-administered and were sent out in paper form. The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* (see Appendix F) was chosen to measure the factors contributing to teacher morale. This instrument used a Likert-type scale to collect and measure each variable of the research. The *Leadership Practices Inventory* (see Appendix G) measures five leadership practices that best support great accomplishments in

organizations. This study was approved by the International Review Board at East Tennessee State University.

Population

Mitchell County Schools include eight schools spread throughout the county. There is one high school with approximately 699 students, 3 administrators, and 42 teachers. There are two "true" middle schools: one enrolling 208 students, 16 teachers, and one and one half administrators; the other has 335 students, 22 teachers, and one and one half administrators. There are two kindergarten through eighth-grade schools; one has 95 students, 9 teachers, and 1 administrator and the other has 108 students, 13 teachers, and 1 administrator. One elementary school houses kindergarten through fourth grade with 247 students, 13 teachers, and 1 administrator. One houses third through fifth grade with 307 students, 20 teachers, and 1 administrator. One contains kindergarten through second grade with 302 students, 21 teachers, and 1 administrator. Overall, there are over 2,302 students enrolled, 156 certified teachers, and 11 administrators in Mitchell County Schools (Mitchell County Schools Website, 2005).

Instruments

The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* (see Appendix F) was used to measure the morale of the teachers of middle and high schools in Mitchell County, North Carolina. The instrument breaks down morale into 10 specific dimensions for more meaningful discoveries and is designed to estimate individual, school, and system morale. The following is a brief description by Bentley and Rempel (1980) of the 10 factors included in the opinionaire:

1. Teacher rapport With Principal deals with the teacher's feelings about the principal, his professional competency, his interest in teachers and their work, his ability to communicate, and his skill in human relations.

2. Satisfaction With Teaching pertains to teacher relationships with students and feelings and satisfaction with teaching. According to this factor, the high morale

teacher loves to teach, feels competent in his job, enjoys his students, and believes in the future of teaching as an occupation.

3. Rapport Among Teachers focuses on a teacher's relationship with other teachers. The items here solicit the teacher's opinion regarding the cooperation. Preparation, ethics, influence, interests, and competency of his peers.

4. Teacher Salary pertains primarily to the teacher's feelings about salaries and salary policies. Are salaries based on teacher competency? Do they compare favorably with salaries in other school systems? Are salary policies administered fairly and justly, and do teachers participate in the development of these policies?

5. Teacher Load deals with such matters as record-keeping, clerical work, "red tape," community demands on teacher time, extra-curricular load, and keeping up to date professionally.

6. Curriculum Issues solicits teacher reactions to the adequacy of the school program in meeting student needs, in providing for individual differences, and in preparing students for effective citizenships.

7. Teacher Status samples feelings about the prestige, security, and benefits afforded by teaching. Several of the items refer to the extent to which the teacher feels he is an accepted member of the community.

8. Community Support of Education deals with the extent to which understands and is willing to support a sound educational program.

9. School Facilities and Services have to do with the adequacy of facilities, supplies and equipment, and the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services.

10. Community Pressures gives special attention to community expectations with respect to the teacher' personal standards, his participation in outside-school activities, and his freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom. (p. 4)

Each of the 100 items of the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* uses a four-point Likert-type scale that measures the degree of agreement with the statement: (1) disagree, (2) probably disagree, (3) probably agree, and (4) agree. For the purpose of this study, item numbers in which disagreement represents a high degree of teacher morale have been reverse coded so that a 1 represents low morale and a 4 represents high morale for all 100 questions. By adding the numeric responses of all items for a given factor, it was possible to create scores for each of the 10 dimensions.

The 100 questions of the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* are divided into each of the 10 teacher morale factors as shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Purdue Teacher Opinionaire Division of 10 Teacher Morale Factors

Factor #	Description	Items
1	Teacher Rapport with Principal	2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 61, 62, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 92, 93, 95
2	Satisfaction with Teaching	19, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 46, 47, 50, 51, 56, 58, 60, 76, 78, 82, 83, 86, 89, 100
3	Rapport Among Teachers	18, 22, 23, 28, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55, 77, 80, 84, 87, 90
4	Teacher Salary	4, 9, 32, 36, 39, 65, 75
5	Teacher Load	1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 31, 34, 40, 42, 45
6	Curriculum Issues	17, 20, 25, 79, 88
7	Teacher Status	13, 15, 35, 37, 63, 64, 68, 71
8	Community Support of Education	66, 67, 94, 96, 97
9	School Facilities and Services	16, 21, 49, 57, 59
10	Community Pressures	81, 85, 91, 98, 99

Bentley and Rempel (1968) reported that the test-retest correlation for the total score was .87 with the correlations for the 10 subscales ranging from .62 to .88. However, 9 of the 10 subscales had test-retest correlations greater than .75 with the weakest correlation of .62 for the Community Pressure subscale. Information from Purdue University relayed that permission was no longer needed to use the PTO because the copyright protection had expired (see Appendix I).

To measure five leadership practices, the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) was used with six items measuring each of the five categories that were created by Kouzes and Posner as a result of their quantitative and qualitative research in 1998. The five practices are: "challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart" (p. 310). The use of the LPI for this study was obtained through payment.

The statements in the LPI were scored on a 10-point scale based on these responses: (1) Almost never do what is described in the statement; (2) Rarely; (3) Seldom; (4) Once in a while; (5) Occasionally; (6) Sometimes; (7) Fairly often; (8) Usually; (9) Very frequently; and (10) Almost always do what is described in the statement (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). As shown in Table 2, the scale score for the five practices is summed by the numeric responses of the following statements (self-form begins questions with "I" observer form does not).

Table 2

Leadership Practices Inventory

Leadership Practice	Item #	Statement
Model the Way:	1	I set a personal example of what I expect of others.
	6	I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.
	11	I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.
	16	I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people's performance.
	21	I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.
Model the Way:	26	I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.
	2	I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.
	7	I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.

Table 2 (continued)

Leadership Practice	Item #	Statement
Inspire a Shared Vision:	12	I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.
	17	I show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting a common vision.
	22	I paint the "big picture" of what we aspire to accomplish.
	27	I speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.
Challenge the Process:	3	I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.
	8	I challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.
	13	I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.
	18	I ask, "What can we learn?" when things don't go as expected.
	23	I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.
	28	I experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.
Enable Others to Act:	4	I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.
	9	I actively listen to diverse points of view.
	14	I treat others with dignity and respect.
	19	I support the decisions that people make on their own.
	24	I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.
	29	I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.
Encouraging the Heart:	5	I praise people for a job well done.
	10	I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities.

Table 2 (continued)

Leadership Practice	Item #	Statement
Encouraging the Heart	15	I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.
	20	I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.
	25	I find ways to celebrate accomplishments.
	30	I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.

The North Carolina End-Of-Grade Tests were used as instruments to measure student achievement. During the 1992-1993 school year, North Carolina changed its form of testing from a nationally-normed achievement test to a state-developed test that closely aligned itself with the North Carolina Standard Course of Study. These tests have a strong emphasis on higher-order thinking skills that are taken from the North Carolina curriculum that, in turn, are aligned with the national curriculum standards (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1999). In an assessment brief, the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction defined the primary purpose of these statewide tests to measure:

1. individual student skills and knowledge specified in the North Carolina *Standard Course of Study;* and

2. the knowledge and skills attained by groups or students for school, school system, and state for the ABC's Accountability Program. (p. 1)

These scores serve as only one indicator of student achievement with the value of the test being that they cannot be influenced by local differences in achievement and expectations: According to the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction:

The tests provide yardsticks that can be used to compare the achievement of students, schools, school systems, and the state. The assessment yardstick can be used to measure

gains (or losses) in performance across time to see if educational improvement efforts at the state and local level are working. (p. 1)

Data Collection

A permission letter, cover letter, informed consent documents, and copies of all survey instruments were given to the Director of Schools for Mitchell County (see appendices A-H). With permission from the director of schools and the principals from each school, the researcher attended after school faculty meetings at all seven schools over a span of two weeks. In earlier correspondences, the school principals were asked not to be present at the meeting. A cover letter was given to all in attendance at the meetings that informed them of their role in the study. All in attendance were informed by both cover letter and announcement that their contribution and responses would be and would remain anonymous and that participation was strictly on a voluntary basis. All teachers were given the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* to complete as well as the *Leadership Practices Inventory (Observer)*. At a different location, the principals were asked to complete the self-form of the *Leadership Practices Inventory (Self)*.

To protect the confidentiality of all participants, access to all surveys was restricted to the researcher only. Individual surveys results were never used, only schools' results as a collective, thus further ensuring respondents' confidentiality. Individual schools were never referred to by name to protect each from identification. The informed consent documents were purposefully not given to survey respondents' as requested by the IRB board that determined that the use of the documents could link the survey results to particular participants. The director of schools was given the option to receive an executive summary of the results upon completion of the study. All statistical analyses were presented in summary form with no one person or school being identified.

Data Analysis

Research Question #1: What is the level of teacher morale exhibited by teachers in this study?

To analyze this research question, the mean and standard deviation for each of the 10 subscales of the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* was presented.

Research Question #2: What is the level of teacher morale exhibited at each school in this study?

To analyze this research question, the means and standard deviations for each of the 10 subscales for each school of the Purdue Teacher Questionnaire were presented.

Research Question #3: Is there a difference between the self-reported leadership practices of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner Norms for these leadership practices? This research question will be answered using a single-sample *t* test. This research question has five parts, one for each of five LPI categories: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others, and encouraging the heart.

$Ho3_1$: There is no difference between the mean of modeling the way on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

$Ho3_2$: There is no difference between the mean of inspiring a shared vision on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

$Ho3_3$: There is no difference between the mean of challenging the process on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

$Ho3_4$: There is no difference between the mean of enabling others to act on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

Ho3$_5$:   There is no difference between the mean of encouraging the heart on the self-

reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-

Posner norms.

Research Question #4: Is there a difference between the perceptions of leadership by the

leaders themselves (LPI-Self) and their teachers (LPI-observer)?

Ho4:   There is no difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers'

LPI-observer mean.

To analyze this, a single sample *t* test was conducted to compare each school's LPI-

observer means to the principal's LPI-self scores. For each of the seven schools there were five

t-test comparisons one for each of the five leadership practices or 35 *t* tests.

Research Question #5: Is there a difference in the mean teacher morale score (PTO) and

specific leadership behaviors as perceived by teachers (LPI-observer)?

To analyze this research question, 12 one-way ANOVA was used.

Research Question #6: Is there a relationship between teacher morale (PTO) and student

achievement on the End-Of-Grade / End-Of-Course Tests?

To analyze this research question, descriptive statistics was used.

Summary

This chapter included a description of the study, research design, population,

instrumentation, data collection procedures, and analysis of the data. This was a quantitative

study designed to investigate the relationships between leadership behaviors, teacher morale, and

student achievement. Chapter 4 presents in detail the results of the data, analysis of the data, and

relevant findings.

CHAPTER 4

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to understand and measure principal leadership practices and teacher morale in Mitchell County Schools as they relate to student achievement. A study of this kind could possibly uncover valuable information to aid instructional leaders in improving the morale of their teachers as well as enhance the school's climate and student achievement. Data were gathered from teachers and principals during regularly scheduled faculty meetings. The data were analyzed through the use of means, standard deviation, median, independent sample *t* tests, Pearson's correlations, and Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients.

This study's population consisted of all the principals and teachers of seven out of eight schools in Mitchell County School System. The schools are identified as school number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. The overall response rate for teachers participating in the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* was 84.3%. Table 3 presents the number of teachers at each school as well as the number who participated in the study with the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire*.

Table 3

Teacher Population and Percentage of Those Who Responded by School--Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

School	Teacher Population N	Teacher Participants N	Response Rate %
1	13	13	100.0
2	9	9	100.0
3	16	9	56.3
4	16	13	81.3
5	18	12	66.7
6	20	18	90.0
7	42	39	92.9
Total	134	113	84.3

The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* is an instrument that is designed to help break down teacher morale into 10 specific dimensions for more meaningful discoveries and is designed to estimate individual, school, and system-wide morale. The instrument is composed of 100 questions that can be divided up into 10 different dimensions. The dimensions of teacher morale included teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher salary, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, school facilities and services, and community pressures. Table 4 shows the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire*. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient is a measure of a scale's internal consistency. The closer the coefficient is to 1.0, the higher the reliability.

Table 4

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients for the 10 Purdue Teacher Opinionaire Factors

Factor	Cronbach's Alpha
1 Teacher Rapport with Principal	.96
2 Satisfaction with Teaching	.88
3 Rapport Among Teachers	.94
4 Teacher Salary	.74
5 Teacher Load	.79
6 Curriculum Issues	.73
7 Teacher Status	.82
8 Community Support of Education	.78
9 School Facilities and Services	.69
10 Community Pressures	.55

The *Leadership Practices Inventory* was used to measure leadership practices and divided 30 questions into 5 different practices. The instrument was created by Kouzes and Posner as a result of their quantitative and qualitative research in 1998. The *Leadership Practices Inventory* has two forms: the self form that the administrator of the school completes, as well as the observer form that is completed by those who observe or work for the administrator. The five practices included challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, modeling the way, and encouraging the heart. The overall response rate for the *Leadership Practices Inventory* observer was 83.6%. Table 5 presents the number of teachers at each school as well as the number who participated in the study with the *Leadership Practices Inventory* observer.

Table 5

Teacher Population and Percentage of Those Who Responded by School--Leadership Practices Inventory Observer

School	Teacher Population N	Teacher Participants N	Response Rate %
1	13	12	92.3
2	9	9	100.0
3	16	9	56.3
4	16	13	81.3
5	18	12	66.7
6	20	17	85.0
7	42	40	95.2
Total	134	112	83.6

The overall response rate for the *Leadership Practices Inventory* self was 100%. Each principal from each school completed the inventory.

The reliability coefficients ranged from .82 to .96 using Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients. Table 6 shows the reliability coefficients for observers (teachers) and for those that were self-reported (principals). As consistent with previous research, observer-reported (teachers) results were higher than those that were self-reported (principals).

Table 6

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients for LPI by Principals and Teachers

Leadership Practice	Principals	Teachers
Model	.82	.94
Inspire	.83	.93
Challenge	.85	.93
Enable	.90	.93
Encourage	.90	.96

Analysis of the Research Questions

Data for this study were compiled from the results of the survey instruments and various statistical methods were used to analyze the data. The organization of this chapter follows the order of the research questions as written in Chapter 1.

Research Question #1

What is the level of teacher morale exhibited by teachers in this study?

To better understand and compare each aspect of teacher morale as measured by the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire*, each factor was created by summing the items that make up the factor and dividing by the number of items in the factor. This calculation results in each factor having a potential range of 1 to 4. Table 7 shows that a low score represents low morale whereas a high score represents high morale.

Table 7

Guidelines for Understanding the Means of Teacher Morale Factors

Mean Score of Teacher Morale	Teacher Morale Definition
1.00 – 1.25	Very Low Teacher Morale
1.26 – 1.99	Moderately Low Teacher Morale
2.00 – 2.75	Moderate Teacher Morale
2.76 – 3.49	Moderately High Teacher Morale
3.50 – 4.00	High Teacher Morale

The total teacher morale score, as shown in Table 8, was 3.05 with a standard deviation of .38 that indicates a moderately high degree of teacher morale overall. It is important to note that only teachers who answered all 100 questions, 84 in all, were used to calculate total teacher morale. The analysis of all 10 factors revealed that the means ranged from 2.44 with regard to teacher salary to as high as 3.38 with satisfaction with teaching. When comparing the means from Table 8 with the established guideline from Table 7, the means for teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, and community pressures fell within the range of moderately high teacher morale, whereas teacher salary and school facilities and services fell

within moderate teacher morale. None of the 10 factors measured very low, moderately low, or high teacher morale.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for the 10 Teacher Morale Factors as Indicated on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

Teacher Morale Factor	*N*	*Mdn*	*M*	*SD*
Teacher Rapport with Principal	105	3.15	3.08	.64
Satisfaction with Teaching	103	3.50	3.38	.41
Rapport Among Teachers	111	3.14	3.20	.62
Teacher Salary	107	2.57	2.44	.61
Teacher Load	107	3.00	2.97	.51
Curriculum Issues	112	3.20	3.13	.55
Teacher Status	104	2.88	2.89	.58
Community Support of Education	113	3.00	2.96	.59
School Facilities and Services	113	2.80	2.75	.66
Community Pressures	109	3.20	3.12	.46
Total PTO	84	3.05	3.07	.38

Research Question #2

What is the level of teacher morale exhibited at each school in this study?

This research question has seven parts, one for each school. The 10 moral factors, as addressed in the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire*, are analyzed for each of the schools in the study.

There is a total teacher morale score and only includes those respondents who answered all of the questions on the survey, and a total standard deviation.

Table 9 shows the total teacher morale score for School 1 as 3.50 with a total standard deviation of .23 that indicates a high level of teacher morale. The analysis of all 10 moral factors showed that the means ranged from a low of 2.85 with teacher salary to a high of 3.84 with rapport among teachers. Teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, and curriculum issues were within the high teacher morale range. Teacher salary, teacher load, teacher status, community support of education, school facilities and services, and community pressures fell within the moderately high teacher morale. None of the 10 factors fell below moderately high teacher morale.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for School 1 on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

School 1	N	Mdn	M	SD
Teacher Rapport with Principal	13	3.65	3.63	.28
Satisfaction with Teaching	12	3.55	3.57	.22
Rapport Among Teachers	13	3.92	3.84	.19
Teacher Salary	12	2.85	2.85	.47
Teacher Load	12	3.40	3.35	.39
Curriculum Issues	13	3.60	3.60	.32
Teacher Status	13	3.25	3.41	.33
Community Support of Education	13	3.40	3.47	.33
School Facilities and Services	13	3.20	3.20	.46
Community Pressures	12	3.50	3.36	.37
Total PTO Score	10	3.55	3.50	.23

Table 10 shows the total teacher morale score for School 2 as 2.92 with a total standard deviation of .32 that indicates a moderately high level of teacher morale. The analysis of all 10 moral factors showed that the means ranged from a low of 2.19 with teacher salary to a high of 3.50 with satisfaction with teaching. Satisfaction with teaching was the only factor that fell in the range of high teacher morale. Teacher rapport with principal, rapport among teachers, teacher load, curriculum issues, and community pressures were within the moderately high teacher morale range. Teacher salary, teacher status, community support of education, and school facilities and services fell within the moderate teacher morale category. None of the 10 factors fell on or below the moderately low teacher morale group.

Table 10

Descriptive Statistics for School 2 on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

School 2	N	Mdn	Mean	SD
Teacher Rapport with Principal	9	3.65	2.90	.55
Satisfaction with Teaching	9	3.55	3.50	.34
Rapport Among Teachers	9	3.92	3.45	.42
Teacher Salary	8	2.85	2.19	.37
Teacher Load	9	3.40	3.28	.46
Curriculum Issues	9	3.60	3.15	.46
Teacher Status	8	3.25	2.70	.48
Community Support of Education	9	3.40	2.44	.44
School Facilities and Services	9	3.20	2.40	.76
Community Pressures	8	3.50	2.80	.45
Total PTO Score	7	2.80	2.92	.32

The total teacher morale score for School 3 was 2.96 with a total standard deviation of .22 as shown in table 11. This indicates a moderately high level of teacher morale. The analysis of all 10 moral factors showed that the means ranged from a low of 2.41 with teacher salary to a high of 3.35 with satisfaction with teaching. Teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, teacher load, curriculum issues, school facilities and services, and community pressures fell within the moderately high teacher morale range. Rapport among teachers, teacher salary, teacher status, and community support of education were within the moderate teacher morale category. None of the 10 factors fell on or below the moderately low teacher morale group.

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for School 3 on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

School 3	N	Mdn	M	SD
Teacher Rapport with Principal	6	2.80	3.07	.61
Satisfaction with Teaching	8	3.27	3.35	.33
Rapport Among Teachers	8	2.57	2.64	.31
Teacher Salary	9	2.57	2.41	.58
Teacher Load	9	2.90	2.92	.44
Curriculum Issues	9	3.00	3.08	.52
Teacher Status	9	2.62	2.55	.47
Community Support of Education	9	2.80	2.73	.52
School Facilities and Services	9	2.80	2.82	.67
Community Pressures	7	2.80	2.97	.39
Total PTO Score	6	2.89	2.96	.22

Table 12 shows the total teacher morale score for School 4 as 2.88 with a total standard deviation of .28 that indicates a moderately high level of teacher morale. After analysis of all 10 moral factors, the means ranged from a low of 2.30 with teacher rapport with principal to a high of 3.45 with satisfaction with teaching. Satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, and community pressures were within the moderately high teacher morale range. Teacher rapport with principal, teacher salary, and school facilities and services fell within the moderate teacher morale category. None of the 10 factors fell on or below the moderately low teacher morale group.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for School 4 on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

School 4	N	Mdn	M	SD
Teacher Rapport with Principal	12	2.30	2.30	.57
Satisfaction with Teaching	12	3.50	3.45	.36
Rapport Among Teachers	13	3.21	3.31	.41
Teacher Salary	13	2.57	2.42	.56
Teacher Load	11	3.18	2.99	.60
Curriculum Issues	13	3.00	3.06	.34
Teacher Status	12	2.93	2.93	.41
Community Support of Education	13	3.00	3.06	.37
School Facilities and Services	13	2.60	2.33	.70
Community Pressures	13	3.20	3.27	.26
Total PTO Score	10	2.79	2.88	.28

The total teacher morale score for School 5 was 3.00 with a total standard deviation of .32 as revealed in table 13. This indicates a moderately high level of teacher morale. The analysis of all 10 moral factors showed that the means ranged from a low of 2.33 with teacher salary to a high of 3.40 with satisfaction with teaching. Teacher rapport with Principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher load, curriculum issues, community support of education, school facilities and services, and community pressures fell within the moderately high teacher morale range. Teacher salary and teacher status were within the moderate teacher morale category. None of the 10 factors fell on or below the moderately low teacher morale group.

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for School 5 on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

School 5	N	Mdn	M	SD
Teacher Rapport with Principal	10	3.15	3.20	.43
Satisfaction with Teaching	11	3.50	3.40	.32
Rapport Among Teachers	11	2.92	3.07	.80
Teacher Salary	12	2.35	2.33	.61
Teacher Load	12	2.86	2.78	.32
Curriculum Issues	12	3.20	3.23	.53
Teacher Status	9	2.75	2.69	.50
Community Support of Education	12	3.00	3.01	.64
School Facilities and Services	12	2.90	2.90	.56
Community Pressures	12	3.30	3.25	.46
Total PTO Score	7	2.93	3.00	.32

Table 14 shows the total teacher morale score for School 6 as 3.26 with a total standard deviation of .31 that indicates a moderately high level of teacher morale. After analysis of all 10 moral factors, the means ranged from a low of 2.69 with teacher salary to a high of 3.61 with rapport among teachers. Rapport among teachers was the only factor that was in the high teacher morale range. Teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, school facilities and services, and community pressures were within the moderately high teacher morale range. Only one of the factors fell in the moderate teacher morale category, teacher salary, and none were in or below the moderately low teacher morale group.

Table 14

Descriptive Statistics for School 6 on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

School 6	N	Mdn	M	SD
Teacher Rapport with Principal	17	3.35	3.36	.52
Satisfaction with Teaching	14	3.47	3.44	.36
Rapport Among Teachers	18	3.78	3.61	.38
Teacher Salary	16	2.71	2.69	.35
Teacher Load	17	3.00	3.03	.46
Curriculum Issues	18	3.60	3.47	.45
Teacher Status	17	2.87	2.94	.61
Community Support of Education	18	3.30	3.25	.50
School Facilities and Services	18	3.20	3.14	.51
Community Pressures	18	3.20	3.16	.39
Total PTO Score	13	3.20	3.26	.31

As shown in Table 15, the total teacher morale score for School 7 was 2.97 with a total standard deviation of .40. This indicates a moderately high level of teacher morale. The analysis of all 10 moral factors showed that the means ranged from a low of 2.29 with teacher salary to a high of 3.24 with satisfaction with teaching. Teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, and community pressures fell within the moderately high teacher morale range. Teacher salary, and school facilities and services were within the moderate teacher morale category. None of the 10 factors fell on or below the moderately low teacher morale group.

Table 15

Descriptive Statistics for School 7 on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

School 7	N	Mdn	M	SD
Teacher Rapport with Principal	38	3.07	3.01	.63
Satisfaction with Teaching	37	3.35	3.24	.51
Rapport Among Teachers	39	2.92	2.85	.56
Teacher Salary	37	2.42	2.29	.71
Teacher Load	37	2.63	2.78	.52
Curriculum Issues	38	2.80	2.80	.53
Teacher Status	36	2.87	2.83	.64
Community Support of Education	39	3.00	2.78	.61
School Facilities and Services	39	2.60	2.56	.58
Community Pressures	39	3.00	3.02	.51
Total PTO Score	31	2.93	2.97	.40

A comparison of all seven schools showed that the leading factor in low teacher moral was that of teacher salary with six of the seven schools rating it the lowest factor. One school did reveal that rapport with principal was the lowest factor relating to high teacher morale. Interestingly, five of seven schools indicated that satisfaction with teaching was the highest factor contributing to high teacher morale with the other two rating rapport among teachers as the highest contributor to high teacher morale.

Research Question #3

Is there a difference between the self-reported leadership practices of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms for these leadership practices? This research question will be answered using a single-sample *t* test. This research question has five parts, one for each of five LPI categories: modeling the way, inspiring a shared vision, challenging the process, enabling others, and encouraging the heart.

Modeling the Way

Ho3_1: There is no difference between the mean of modeling the way on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principals' mean for modeling the way to the Kouzes-Posner norm. The *t* test was not significant, $t(6) = 1.99$, $p = .09$. The principals' mean on modeling the way ($M = 51.57$, $SD = 6.05$) was only somewhat higher than the Kouzes-Posner norm ($M = 47.02$, $SD = 7.10$) a mean difference of 4.55. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -1.04 to 10.15. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was medium ($d = .75$). Principals in the study were not significantly different from the mean score in the Kouzes-Posner.

Inspiring a Shared Vision

> $Ho3_2$: There is no difference between the mean of inspiring a shared vision on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

Results from the single-sample *t* test for the difference between principals' mean and the Kouzes-Posner norm for inspiring a shared vision was significant, $t(6) = 2.64$, $p = .04$. The mean for principals ($M = 51.00$, $SD = 6.69$) was higher than the Kouzes-Posner norm ($M = 44.34$, $SD = 8.79$), a mean difference of 6.66. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was .47 to 12.84. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large ($d = .99$). Principals mean score for inspiring a shared vision was significantly higher than the mean on the Kouzes-Posner.

Challenging the Process

> $Ho3_3$: There is no difference between the mean of challenging the process on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principals' mean for challenging the process to the Kouzes-Posner norm. The *t* test was not significant, $t(6) = .79$, $p = .46$. The principals' mean on challenging the process ($M = 48.57$, $SD = 8.28$) was only slightly higher than the Kouzes-Posner norm ($M = 46.12$, $SD = 7.22$), a mean difference of 2.45. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -5.20 to 10.12. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was medium ($d = .30$). Principals in the study were not significantly different from mean score in the Kouzes-Posner.

Enabling Others to Act

Ho3$_4$: There is no difference between the mean of enabling others to act on the self-

reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-

Posner norms.

To compare principals' mean for enabling others to act to the Kouzes-Posner norm, a single-sample *t* test was used. The *t* test was not significant, $t(6) = .98$, $p = .36$. The principals' mean on enabling others to act ($M = 52.29$, $SD = 7.78$) was only somewhat higher than the Kouzes-Posner norm ($M = 49.40$, $SD = 6.42$), a mean difference of 2.89. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was -4.31 to 10.09. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was medium ($d = .37$). Principals in the study were not significantly different from the mean score in the Kouzes-Posner.

Encouraging the Heart

Ho3$_5$: There is no difference between the mean of encouraging the heart on the self-

reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-

Posner norms.

Results from the single-sample *t* test for the difference between principals' mean and the Kouzes-Posner norm for encouraging the heart was significant, $t(6) = 3.36$, $p = .02$. The mean for principals ($M = 53.71$, $SD = 5.25$) was higher than the Kouzes-Posner norm ($M = 47.06$, $SD = 8.20$), a mean difference of 6.65. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means was 1.80 to 11.52. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large ($d = 1.27$). The principals mean score for encouraging the heart was significantly higher than the mean on the Kouzes-Posner.

Comparisons of principals' self-reported leadership practices and the Kouzes-Posner norms are shown in Table 16

Table 16

Single-Sample t-Test Mean Comparisons of Principals' Self-Reported Leadership Practices and the Kouzes-Posner Norms

Leadership Practice		*N*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Model the Way	Principals	7	51.57	6.05	1.99	6	.09
	Norm	1256	47.02	7.10			
Inspire a Shared Vision	Principals	7	51.00	6.68	2.64	6	.04*
	Norm	1252	44.34	8.79			
Challenge the Process	Principals	7	48.57	8.28	.79	6	.46
	Norm	1257	46.12	7.22			
Enable Others to Act	Principals	7	52.29	7.78	.98	6	.36
	Norm	1256	49.40	6.42			
Encourage the Heart	Principals	7	53.71	5.25	3.36	6	.02*
	Norm	1255	47.06	8.20			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Research Question #4

Is there a difference between the perceptions of leadership by the leaders themselves (LPI-self) and their teachers (LPI-observer)?

For this analysis single-sample *t* tests were conducted to compare each school's LPI-observer means to the principal's LPI-self scores. For each of the seven schools there were five *t*-test comparisons, one for each of the five leadership practices, for a total of 35 *t* tests. The null hypothesis tested in each *t* test was:

Ho4:   There is no difference between the principal's LPI-self score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean.

School 1--Modeling the Way

  The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI-self score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean on modeling the way for School 1 was significant, *t* (11) = 8.48, *p*<.01. The principal's score (42) was lower than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 52.92, *SD* = 4.46) with a mean difference of 10.92. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 8.08 to 13.75. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 2.45).

School 1--Inspiring a Shared Vision

  A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 1 on inspiring a shared vision. The *t* test was significant, *t* (11) = 5.51, *p*<.01. The principal's score (38) was lower than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 48.08, *SD* = 6.35) with a mean difference of 10.08. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 6.05 to 14.12. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 1.59).

School 1--Challenging the Process

  The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean on challenging the process for School 1 was significant, *t* (11) = *6.49, p*<.01. The principal's score (36) was lower than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 48.17, *SD* = 6.49) with a mean difference of 12.17. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 8.04 to 16.29. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 1.88).

School 1--Enabling Others to Act

  A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 1 on enabling others to act. The *t* test was significant, *t* (11) = 6.86, *p*<.01. The principal's score (38) was lower than the teachers' LPI-observer mean

(*M* = 52.00, *SD* = 7.07) with a mean difference of 14.00. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 9.51 to 18.49. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 1.98).

School 1--Encouraging the Heart

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean on encouraging the heart for School 1 was significant, *t* (11) = 5.48, *p*<.01. The principal's score (50) was lower than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 55.50, *SD* = 3.48) with a mean difference of 5.50. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 3.29 to 7.71. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 1.58).

School 2--Modeling the Way

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean on modeling the way for School 2 was significant, *t* (8) = 5.22, *p*<.01. The principal's score (51) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 45.56, *SD* = 3.13) with a mean difference of 5.44. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 7.85 to 3.04. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 1.74).

School 2--Inspiring a Shared Vision

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 2 on inspiring a shared vision. The *t* test was significant, *t* (8) = 9.49, *p*<.01. The principal's score (54) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 41.78, *SD* = 3.87) with a mean difference of 12.22. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 15.19 to 9.25. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 3.16).

School 2--Challenging the Process

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean on challenging the process for School 2 was significant, $t(8) = 9.62$, *p*<.01. The principal's score (51) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 39.67, *SD* = 3.54), with a mean difference of 11.33. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 14.05 to 8.62. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 3.21).

School 2--Enabling Others to Act

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 2 on enabling others to act. The *t* test was significant, *t* (8) = 7.70, *p*<.01. The principal's score (54) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 45.22, *SD* = 3.42) with a mean difference of 8.78. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 11.41 to 6.15. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 2.57).

School 2--Encouraging the Heart

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean on encouraging the heart for School 2 was significant, *t* (8) = 10.76, *p*<.01. The principal's score (53) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 44.89, *SD* = 2.26) with a mean difference of 8.11. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 9.85 to 6.37. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 3.59).

School 3--Modeling the Way

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean on modeling the way for School 3 was significant, *t* (8) = 3.42, *p*<.01. The principal's score (56) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 50.00, *SD* = 5.27)

with a mean difference of 6.00. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 10.05 to 1.95. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 1.14).

School 3--Inspiring a Shared Vision

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 3 on inspiring a shared vision. The *t* test was significant, *t* (8) = 5.41, *p*<.01. The principal's score (58) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 51.56, *SD* = 3.58) with a mean difference of 6.44. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 9.19 to 3.70. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 1.80).

School 3--Challenging the Process

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on challenging the process for School 3 was significant, *t* (8) = 2.86, *p* = 02. The principal's score (58) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 53.00, *SD* = 5.24) with a mean difference of 5.00. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 9.03 to 0.97. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = .95).

School 3--Enabling Others to Act

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 3 on enabling others to act. The *t* test was significant, *t*(8) = 4.63, *p*<.01. The principal's score (59) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 51.56, *SD* = 4.83) with a mean difference of 7.44. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 11.15 to 3.74. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 1.54).

School 3--Encouraging the Heart

The t test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on encouraging the heart for School 3 was significant, $t(8) = 5.44$, $p<.01$. The principal's score (60) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean ($M = 53.33$, $SD = 3.67$) with a mean difference of 6.67. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 9.49 to 3.84. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d*, was large ($d = 1.81$).

School 4--Modeling the Way

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on modeling the way for School 4 was significant, $t(12) = 12.32$, $p<.01$. The principal's score (54) was significantly higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean ($M = 25.00$, $SD = 8.49$) with a mean difference of 29.00. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 34.13 to 23.87. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d*, was large ($d = 3.41$).

School 4--Inspiring a Shared Vision

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 4 on inspiring a shared vision. The t test was significant, $t(12) = 8.20$, $p<.01$. The principal's score (50) was significantly higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean ($M = 29.38$, $SD = 9.06$) with a mean difference of 20.62. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 26.09 to 15.14. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d*, was large ($d = 2.27$).

School 4--Challenging the Process

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on challenging the process for School 4 was significant, $t(12) = 5.66$, $p<.01$. The

principal's score (42) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean ($M = 29.15$, $SD = 8.18$) with a mean difference of 12.85. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 17.79 to 7.90. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's d, was large ($d = 1.57$).

School 4--Enabling Others to Act

A single-sample t test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 4 on enabling others to act. The t test was significant, t (12) = 13.04, $p<.01$. The principal's score (57) was significantly higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean ($M = 27.31$, $SD = 8.21$) with a mean difference of 29.69. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 34.65 to 24.73. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's d, was large ($d = 3.61$).

School 4--Encouraging the Heart

The t test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on encouraging the heart for School 4 was significant, t (12) = 11.34, $p<.01$. The principal's score (56) was significantly higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean ($M = 23.38$, $SD = 10.37$) with a mean difference of 32.62. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 38.88 to 26.35. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's d, was large ($d = 3.14$).

School 5--Modeling the Way

The t test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on modeling the way for school 5 was significant, t (11) = 4.62, $p<.01$. The principal's score (52) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean ($M = 45.58$, $SD = 4.81$) with a mean difference of 6.42. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 9.48 to 3.36. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's d, was large ($d = 1.34$).

70

School 5--Inspiring a Shared Vision

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 5 on inspiring a shared vision. The *t* test was significant, *t* (11) = 4.80, *p*<.01. The principal's score (51) was slightly higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 46.17, *SD* = 3.49) with a mean difference of 4.83. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 7.05 to 2.62. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 1.39).

School 5--Challenging the Process

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on challenging the process for School 5 was significant, *t* (11) = 3.31, *p*<.01. The principal's score (48) was slightly higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 43.25, *SD* = 4.98) with a mean difference of 4.75. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 7.91 to 1.59. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = .96).

School 5--Enabling Others to Act

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 5 on enabling others to act. The *t* test was significant, *t* (11) = 2.67, *p* = .02. The principal's score (51) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 43.83, *SD* = 9.31) with a mean difference of 7.17. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 13.08 to 1.25. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was moderate (*d* = .77).

School 5--Encouraging the Heart

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on encouraging the heart for School 5 was not significant, *t* (11) = 11.34, *p*<.01.

The principal's score (51) was slightly higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 47.50, *SD* = 7.26) with a mean difference of 3.50. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 8.11 to 1.11. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was small (*d* = .48).

School 6--Modeling the Way

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on modeling the way for School 6 was significant, *t* (16) = 9.71, *p*<.01. The principal's score (60) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 48.29, *SD* = 4.97) with a mean difference of 11.71. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 14.26 to 9.15. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 2.36).

School 6--Inspiring a Shared Vision

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 6 on inspiring a shared vision. The *t* test was significant, *t* (16) = 10.24, *p*<.01. The principal's score (57) was higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 46.53, *SD* = 4.22) with a mean difference of 10.47. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 12.64 to 8.30. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 2.49).

School 6--Challenging the Process

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on challenging the process for School 6 was significant, *t* (16) = 14.48, *p*<.01. The principal's score (59) was much higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 46.29, *SD* = 3.62) with a mean difference of 12.71. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in

score and mean was 14.57 to 10.85. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 3.51).

School 6--Enabling Others to Act

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 6 on enabling others to act. The *t* test was significant, *t* (16) = 9.22, *p*<.01. The principal's score (60) was much higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 49.76, *SD* = 4.58) with a mean difference of 10.24. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 12.59 to 7.88. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 2.24).

School 6--Encouraging the Heart

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on encouraging the heart for School 6 was significant, *t* (16) = 13.25, *p*<.01. The principal's score (60) was much higher than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 48.41, *SD* = 3.61) with a mean difference of 11.59. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 13.44 to 9.73. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 3.22).

School 7--Modeling the Way

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on modeling the way for School 7 was significant, *t* (39) = 35.48, *p*<.01. The principal's score (46) was lower than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 57.43, *SD* = 2.04) with a mean difference of 11.42. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 10.77 to 12.08. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 5.61).

School 7--Inspiring a Shared Vision

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 7 on inspiring a shared vision. The *t* test was significant, *t* (39) = 12.96, *p*<.01. The principal's score (49) was lower than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 55.15, *SD* = 3.00) with a mean difference of 6.15. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 5.19 to 7.11. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 2.05).

School 7--Challenging the Process

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on challenging the process for School 7 was significant, *t* (39) = 23.21, *p*<.01. The principal's score (46) was lower than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 55.70, *SD* = 2.64) with a mean difference of 9.70. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 8.85 to 10.55. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 3.67).

School 7--Enabling Others to Act

A single-sample *t* test was conducted to compare the principal's LPI-self-score and the teachers' LPI-observer mean for School 7 on enabling others to act. The *t* test was significant, *t* (39) = 26.36, *p*<.01. The principal's score (47) was lower than the teachers' LPI-observer mean (*M* = 57.63, *SD* = 2.55) with a mean difference of 10.63. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 9.81 to 11.44. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's *d,* was large (*d* = 4.17).

School 7--Encouraging the Heart

The *t* test for the difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean on encouraging the heart for School 7 was significant, *t* (39) = 34.49, *p*<.01. The

principal's score (46) was lower than the teachers' LPI-observer mean ($M = 57.18$, $SD = 2.05$) with a mean difference of 11.17. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in score and mean was 10.52 to 11.83. The effect size, as measured by Cohen's d, was large ($d = 5.46$).

Research Question #5

Is there a difference in the mean teacher morale score (PTO) and specific leadership behaviors as perceived by their teachers (LPI-observer)?

Twelve one-way ANOVAs were used to analyze this research question. Specifically, five principal-controlled teacher morale factors were the dependent variables: rapport with principal; satisfaction with teaching; rapport among teachers; teacher load; and school facilities and services. The independent variable for a given teacher morale factor was a specific LPI-observer leadership practice. Table 17 shows LPI-observer independent variables and the dependent teacher morale variables used in the 12 one-way ANOVA models conducted to address this research question.

Table 17

LPI Observer Independent Variables as Matched With the Dependent Teacher Morale Variables

Independent Variable: LPI Observer	Dependent Variable: Teacher Morale Factor
Enable Others to Act Encourage the Heart	Rapport with Principal
Inspire a Shared Vision Enable Others to Act Encourage the Heart	Satisfaction with Teaching
Model the Way Enable Others to Act Encourage the Heart	Rapport among Teachers
Inspire a Shared Vision Enable Others to Act	Teacher Load
Inspire a Shared Vision Enable Others to Act	School Facilities and Services

Each of the independent LPI observer independent variables was collapsed into three categories representing low, moderate, and high scores of teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership practices. The classification of a school's mean for a given LPI observer scale was based on the range of scores included in the Kouzes-Posner percentile rankings for each scale. Scores below the 30th percentile were defined as low; scores between the 30th and 69th percentiles were defined as moderate; and scores between the 70th to 100th percentiles were defined as high. Using the percentile rankings of the LPI scales from Kouzes-Posner, the three levels for each LPI scale are modeling the way: 1 = low (43 and below), 2 = moderate (44 – 50), and 3 = high (51 – 60); inspire a shared Vision: (1 = low (39 and below), 2 = moderate (40 – 49), and 3 = high (50 – 60); enable others to act: (1 = low (46 and below), 2 = moderate (47 – 52),

76

and 3 = high (53 – 60); encouraging the heart: 1 = low (42 and below), 2 = moderate (43 – 51), and 3 = high (52 – 60).

The null hypothesis analyzed with each one-way analysis of variance was:

Ho5: There is no difference among the levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership practice and teacher morale.

Rapport With Principal

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the differences in the rapport with principal teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' enabling others to act leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was significant, $F(2, 102) = 10.22$, $p = <.01$, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The strength of the relationship as measured by η^2 was large (.17). The means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the rapport with principal teacher morale factor by levels of enabling others to act are shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Summary Statistics for Rapport With Principal Means and Standard Deviations by Level of Enabling Others to Act

Enable Others to Act	n	M	SD	df	F	η^2	p
Low	31	2.77	.64	2, 102	10.22	.167	<.01*
Moderate	36	3.41	.49				
High	38	3.02	.64				

*Significant at the .001 level

Because the overall *F* test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the groups. A Tukey procedure was

selected for the pariwise comparisons because equal variances were assumed (F (2,102) = 1.21, p=.30). There was a significant difference in the means between the low group and the moderate group (p<.01). The mean of the low group (M = 2.77, SD = .64) was lower than the mean of the moderate group (M = 3.41, SD = .49), a difference of .64. There was not a significant difference in the means between the low group and the high group (p=.20). The difference between the low group mean (M = 2.77, SD = .64) and the high group mean (M = 3.02, SD = .64) is .24. There was a significant difference between the means of the moderate group and the high group (p=.01). The moderate group had a higher mean (M = 3.41, SD = .49) than the high group (M = 3.02, SD = .64) with a difference of .39.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the differences in the rapport with principal teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' encouraging the heart leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was significant, $F(2, 102) = 11.77$, $p = <.01$; therefore, the null was rejected. The strength of the relationship as measured by η^2 was large (.19). The means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the rapport with Principal teacher morale factor by levels of encouraging the heart are shown in Table 19.

Table 19

Summary Statistics for Rapport With Principal Means and Standard Deviations by Level of Encouraging the Heart

Encourage the Heart	n	M	SD	df	F	η^2	p
Low	12	2.31	.57	2, 102	11.78	.188	<.01*
Moderate	36	3.20	.53				
High	57	3.16	.62				

*Significant at the .001 level

The overall F test was significant; therefore, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the pariwise comparisons because equal variances were assumed (F (2,102) = .94, p=.39). There was a significant difference in the means between the low group and the moderate group (p<.01). The mean of the low group (M = 2.31, SD = .57) was lower than the mean of the moderate group (M = 3.20, SD = .53), a difference of -.89. There was a significant difference in the means between the low group and the high group (p<.01). The difference between the low group mean (M = 2.31, SD = .57) and the high group mean (M = 3.16, SD = .62) was -.85. There was not a significant difference in the means between the moderate group and the high group (p=.94). The moderate group had a higher mean (M = 3.20, SD = .53) than the high group (M = 3.16, SD = .62) with a difference of .04.

Satisfaction With Teaching

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the differences in the satisfaction with teaching teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' inspiring a shared vision leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was significant, $F(2, 100) = 3.553$, p = .03, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The strength of the relationship as measured by η^2 was moderate (.07). The means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the satisfaction with teaching teacher morale factor by levels of inspiring a shared vision are shown in Table 20.

Table 20

Summary Statistics for Satisfaction with Teaching Means and Standard Deviations by Level of

Inspiring a Shared Vision

Inspire Shared Vision	N	M	SD	Df	F	η^2	p
Low	12	3.46	.36	2, 100	3.55	.066	.03*
Moderate	46	3.48	.31				
High	45	3.26	.48				

*Significant at the .05 level

The overall *F* test was significant; therefore, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the groups. The Tamhane procedure, which does not assume equal variances, was chosen because the variances were not equal (F (2,100) = 3.68, p=.02). There was not a significant difference between the means of the low and moderate group (p=.99). The mean of the low group (*M* = 3.46, *SD* = .36) was slightly lower than the mean of the moderate group (*M* = 3.48, *SD* = .31), a difference of .02. There was not a significant difference between the means of the low group and the high group (p=.35). The difference between the low group mean (*M* = 3.46, *SD* = .36) and the high group mean (*M* = 3.26, *SD* = .48) is .20. There was a significant difference between the means of the moderate and high group (p=0.4). The moderate group had a higher mean (*M* = 3.48, *SD* = .31) than the high group (*M* = 3.26, *SD* = .48) with a difference of .22.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to calculate the differences in the satisfaction with teaching teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' enabling others to act leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was significant, *F*(2, 100) = 3.448, *p* = .04; therefore the null hypothesis was rejected. The strength of the relationship as measured by

80

η^2 was moderate (.07). The means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the satisfaction with teaching teacher morale factor by levels of enabling others to act are shown in Table 21.

Table 21

Summary Statistics for Satisfaction with Teaching Means and Standard Deviations by Level of Enabling Others to Act

Enable Others to Act	n	M	SD	df	F	η^2	p
Low	32	3.45	.33	2,100	3.45	.065	.04*
Moderate	34	3.47	.31				
High	37	3.24	.51				

*Significant at the .05 level

The overall F test was not significant; therefore, post hoc multiple comparisons were not conducted. The mean of the low group ($M = 3.45$, $SD = .33$) was slightly lower than the mean of the moderate group ($M = 3.47$, $SD = .31$), a difference of .02. The low group mean was higher ($M = 3.45$, $SD = .33$) than the high group mean ($M = 3.24$, $SD = .51$) with a difference of .21. The moderate group had a higher mean ($M = 3.47$, $SD = .31$) than the high group ($M = 3.24$, $SD = .51$) with a difference of .22.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine the differences in the satisfaction with teaching teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' encouraging the heart leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was not significant, $F(2, 100) = 1.129$, $p = .33$; thus, the null hypothesis was retained. The strength of the relationship as measured by η^2

was low (.02). Table 22 shows the means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics

for the satisfaction with teaching teacher morale factor by levels of encouraging the heart.

Table 22

Summary Statistics for Satisfaction With Teaching Means and Standard Deviations by Level of

Encouraging the Heart

Encourage the Heart	n	M	SD	df	F	η^2	p
Low	12	3.46	.36	2, 100	1.13	.022	.33
Moderate	34	3.45	.34				
High	57	3.33	.46				

The overall F test was not significant; therefore, post hoc multiple comparisons were not

conducted. The mean of the low group (M = 3.46, SD = .35) was slightly higher than the mean

of the moderate group (M = 3.45, SD = .34), a difference of .01. The low group mean was higher

(M = 3.46, SD = .36) than the high group mean (M = 3.33, SD = .46) with a difference of .13.

The moderate group had a higher mean (M = 3.45, SD = .34) than the high group (M = 3.33, SD

= .46) with a difference of .12.

Rapport Among Teachers

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to ascertain the differences in the rapport among

teachers teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' model the

way leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was not significant, $F(2, 108)$ = 1.383, p = .26;

therefore, the null hypothesis was retained. The strength of the relationship as measured by η^2 was low (.02). Table 23 shows the means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the rapport among teachers teacher morale factor by levels of modeling the way.

Table 23

Summary Statistics for Rapport Among Teachers Means and Standard Deviations by Level of Modeling the Way

Model the Way	n	M	SD	df	F	η^2	p
Low	13	3.31	.42	2, 108	1.36	.025	.26
Moderate	46	3.28	.61				
High	52	3.10	.66				

The overall *F* test was not significant; therefore, post hoc multiple comparisons were not conducted. The low group mean (*M* = 3.31, *SD* = .42) was higher than the mean of the moderate group (*M* = 3.28, *SD* = .61), a difference of .03. The low group mean was higher (*M* = 3.31, *SD* = .42) than the high group mean (*M* = 3.10, *SD* = .66) with a difference of .21. The moderate group had a higher mean (*M* = 3.28, *SD* = .61) than the high group (*M* = 3.10, *SD* = .66) with a difference of .18.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine the differences in the rapport among teachers teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' enabling others to act leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was significant, *F*(2, 108) = 13.059, *p*< .01; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. The strength of the relationship as measured by η^2

was large (.19). The means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the rapport among teachers teacher morale factor by levels of enabling others to act is shown in Table 24.

Table 24

Summary Statistics for Rapport Among Teachers Means and Standard Deviations by Level of Enabling Others to Act

Enable Others to Act	n	M	SD	df	F	η^2	p
Low	33	3.27	.58	2, 108	13.06	.195	<.01*
Moderate	39	3.49	.54				
High	39	2.85	.56				

*Significant at the .001 level

Because the overall *F* test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the pariwise comparisons because equal variances were assumed (F (2,108) = .5, p=.94). There was not a significant difference in the means between the low group and the moderate group (p=.23). The low group mean (*M* = 3.27, *SD* = .58) was lower than the mean of the moderate group (*M* = 3.49, *SD* = .54), a difference of.22. There was a significant difference between means of the low and high group (p<0.1). The low group mean (*M* = 3.28, *SD* = .58) was higher than the high group mean (*M* = 2.85, *SD* = .56) with a difference of .43. There was a significant difference in the means between the moderate group and the high group (p<.01). The moderate group mean (*M* = 3.49, *SD* = .54) was much higher than the high group (*M* = 2.85, *SD* = .56) with a difference of .64.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to establish the differences in the rapport among teachers teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' encouraging the heart leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was significant $F(2, 108) = 5.020$, $p= .01$; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The strength of the relationship as measured by η^2 was moderate (.09). Table 25 shows the means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the rapport among teachers teacher morale factor by levels of encouraging the heart.

Table 25

Summary Statistics for Rapport Among Teachers Means and Standard Deviations by Level of Encouraging the Heart

Encourage the Heart	n	M	SD	df	F	η^2	p
Low	13	3.31	.42	2, 108	5.02	.085	.01*
Moderate	38	3.42	.58				
High	60	3.04	.64				

*Significant at the .01 level

The overall F test was significant; therefore, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the pariwise comparisons because equal variances were assumed (F (2,108) = 1.25, p=.28). There was not a significant difference in the means between the low group and the moderate group (p=.84). The low group mean ($M = 3.31$, $SD = .42$) was lower than the mean of the moderate group ($M = 3.42$, $SD = .58$), a difference of .11. There was not a significant difference between the means of the low and high group (p=.29). The low group mean ($M = 3.31$, $SD = .42$) was higher than the high group mean ($M = 3.04$, $SD = .64$) with a difference of

.27. There was a significant difference between the means of the moderate group and the high

group (p,.01). The moderate group mean ($M = 3.42$, $SD = .58$) was much higher than the high

group ($M = 3.04$, $SD = .64$) with a difference of .38.

Teacher Load

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the differences in the teacher load teacher

morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' inspiring a shared vision

leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was significant, $F(2, 104) = 3.886$, $p = .02$ and the

null hypothesis was rejected. The strength of the relationship as measured by η^2 was moderate

(.07). The means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the teacher load

teacher morale factor by levels of inspiring a shared vision are shown in Table 26.

Table 26

Summary Statistics for Teacher Load Means and Standard Deviations by Level of Inspiring a

Shared Vision

Inspire Shared Vision	n	M	SD	df	F	η^2	p
Low	11	2.99	.60	2, 104	3.89	.070	.02*
Moderate	50	3.10	.46				
High	46	2.82	.50				

*Significant at the .05 level

Because the overall *F* test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted

to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the groups. A Tukey procedure was

selected for the pariwise comparisons because equal variances were assumed (F (2,104) = .83,

p=.43). There was not a significant difference in the means between the low group and the moderate group (p=.79). The mean of the low group (M = 2.99, SD = .60) was lower than the mean of the moderate group (M = 3.10, SD = .46), a difference of .11. There was not a significant difference between the means of the low and high group (p=.54). The difference between the low group mean (M = 2.99, SD = .60) and the high group mean (M = 2.82, SD = .50) was .17. There was a significant difference between the means of the moderate group and the high group (p=.01). The moderate group had a higher mean (M = 3.10, SD = .46) than the high group (M = 2.82, SD = .50) with a difference of .28.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to calculate the differences in the teacher load teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' enabling others to act leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was significant, $F(2, 104)$ =4.096, p = .02; thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. The strength of the relationship as measured by η^2 was moderate (.07). Table 27 shows the means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the teacher load teacher morale factor by levels of enabling others to act.

Table 27

Summary Statistics for Teacher Load Means and Standard Deviations by Level of Enabling Others to Act

Enable Others to Act	n	M	SD	Df	F	η^2	p
Low	32	3.00	.50	2, 104	4.10	.073	.02*
Moderate	38	3.11	.46				
High	37	2.79	.52				

*Significant at the .05 level

The overall *F* test was significant; therefore, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the pariwise comparisons because equal variances were assumed (F (2,104) = .35, p=.70). There was not a significant difference in the means between the low group and the moderate group (p=.59). The low group mean (*M* = 3.00, *SD* = .50) was lower than the mean of the moderate group (*M* = 3.11, *SD* = .46), a difference of .11. There was not a significant difference in the means of the low and high group (p=.19). The low group mean (*M* = 3.00, *SD* = .50) was higher than the high group mean (*M* = 2.79, *SD* = .52) with a difference of .21. There was a significant difference between the means of the low group and the high group (p=.01). The moderate group had a higher mean (*M* = 3.11, *SD* = .46) than the high group (*M* = 2.79, *SD* = .52) with a difference of .32.

School Facilities and Services

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine the differences in the school facilities and services teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' inspiring a shared vision leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was significant, $F(2, 110) = 7.363$, $p < .01$; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The strength of the relationship as measured by η^2 was moderate (.11). The means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the school facilities and services teacher morale factor by levels of inspiring a shared vision is shown in Table 28.

Table 28

Summary Statistics for School Facilities and Services Means and Standard Deviations by Level of Inspiring a Shared Vision

Inspire Shared Vision	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*df*	*F*	η^2	*p*
Low	13	2.34	.70	2, 110	7.36	.118	<.01*
Moderate	52	2.97	.62				
High	48	2.61	.60				

*Significant at the .01 level

Because the overall *F* test was significant, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the pariwise comparisons because equal variances were assumed (F (2,110) = .60, p=.55). There was a significant difference in the means between the low group and the moderate group (p<.01). The low group mean (*M* = 2.34, *SD* = .70) was significantly lower than the mean of the moderate group (*M* = 2.97, *SD* = .62), a difference of .63. There was not a significant difference in the means of the low group and the high group (p=.34). The low group mean (*M* = 2.34, *SD* = .70) was lower than the high group mean (*M* = 2.61, *SD* = .60) with a difference of .27. There was a significant difference in the means of the moderate and high group (p=.01). The moderate group mean (*M* = 2.97, *SD* = .62) was higher than the high group (*M* = 2.61, *SD* = .60) with a difference of .36.

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine the differences in the school facilities and services teacher morale factor by levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' enabling others to act leadership practice. The one-way ANOVA was significant, *F*(2, 110) = 9.792, *p*< .01; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The strength of the relationship as measured by

η^2 was moderate (.15). Table 29 shows the means, standard deviations, and summary ANOVA statistics for the school facilities and services teacher morale factor by levels of enabling others to act.

Table 29

Summary Statistics for School Facilities and Services Means and Standard Deviations by Level of Enabling Others to Act

Enable Others to Act	n	M	SD	df	F	η^2	p
Low	34	2.55	.70	2, 110	9.79	.151	<.01*
Moderate	40	3.09	.54				
High	39	2.56	.59				

*Significant at the .001 level

The overall *F* test was significant; therefore, post hoc multiple comparisons were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means of the groups. A Tukey procedure was selected for the pariwise comparisons because equal variances were assumed (F (2,110) = 1.23, p=.29). There was a significant difference in the means between the low group and the moderate group (p<.01). The low group mean (*M* = 2.55, *SD* = .70) was significantly lower than the mean of the moderate group (*M* = 3.09, *SD* = .54), a difference of .54. There was not a significant difference between the mean of the low group and that of the high group (p=.99). The low group mean (*M* = 2.55, *SD* = .70) was slightly lower than the high group mean (*M* = 2.56, *SD* = .59) with a difference of .01. There was a significant difference between the mean of the moderate group and the high group (p,.01). The moderate group mean (*M* = 3.09, *SD* = .54) was much higher than the high group (*M* = 2.56, *SD* = .59) with a difference of .53.

Research Question #6

Is there a relationship between teacher morale (PTO) and student achievement on the End-Of-Grade / End-Of-Course Tests? For this question, Pearson's correlation was used to indicate whether a there was a relationship between teacher morale factors and the End-Of-Grade / End-Of-Course Test scores. Each of the correlations between the 11 teacher morale factors and the End-Of-Grade / End-Of-Course (EOG / EOC) Tests had a positive relationship.

The morale factor of teacher rapport with principal had a definite but weak relationship (r = .19) with the EOG / EOC test scores. The effect size as measured by r^2 was small (r^2 = .04). The EOG / EOC test scores accounted for almost 4% of the variance for by teacher rapport with principal.

Satisfaction with teaching had a positive relationship that was moderately strong (r = .67) with the EOG / EOC test scores. It accounted for 45% of the variance with the EOG /EOC scores and was the third largest. The effect size as measured by r^2 was significantly large (r^2 = .45).

Rapport among teachers had a moderate correlation (r = .42) with the EOG / EOC test scores. The effect size as measured by r^2 was large (r^2 = .18). Almost 18% of variance in EOG / EOC test scores was accounted for by rapport among teachers.

The morale factor of teacher salary had a moderately strong relationship (r = .67) with the EOG / EOC test scores. The effect size as measured by r^2 was quite large (r^2 = .45). It was the second highest in variance in the EOG / EOC with a little more than 45% accounting for teacher salary.

Teacher load had a moderate relationship (r = .41) with the EOG / EOC test scores. The effect size as measured by r^2 was large (r^2 = .17). It accounted for almost 17% of variance in EOG / EOC test scores.

Curriculum issues had a strong correlation (r = .73) with the EOG / EOC test scores. The effect size as measured by r^2 was notably large (r^2 = .53). It had the biggest correlation between

all of the 11 factors with more than 53% of the variance in EOG / EOC tests directly related to curriculum issues.

The morale factor of teacher status had a moderate correlation (r = .37) with the EOG / EOC test scores. The effect size as measured by r^2 was moderate (r^2 = .14). Almost 14% of the variance in EOG / EOC test scores was accounted for by teacher status.

Community support of education was the fourth largest correlation (r = .61) with the EOG / EOC test scores. The effect size as measured by r^2 was large (r^2 = .37). Support of education by the community was 37% of the variance in EOG / EOC test scores.

The morale factor of school facilities and services had a moderate (r = .49) correlation between facilities and services and test scores. The effect size as measured by r^2 was large (r^2 = .24). With the EOG / EOC test scores 24% of variance was accounted for by school facilities and services.

Community pressures had the fifth largest correlation (r = .57) with the EOG / EOC test scores. The effect size as measured by r^2 was considerably large (r^2 = .32). A little more than 32% of the variance in EOG / EOC test scores was accounted for by the factor of community pressures.

Table 30 shows Pearson's correlations of the 11 teacher morale variables with End-of-Grade / End-of-Course scores.

Table 30

Pearson's Correlations of the 11 Teacher Morale Variables With End-Of-Grade / End-Of-Course Scores

Teacher Morale Factor	N	End of Grade / End of Course r	EOG / EOC r^2
Teacher Rapport with Principal	7	.19	.04
Satisfaction with Teaching	7	.67	.45
Rapport Among Teachers	7	.42	.18
Teacher Salary	7	.67	.45
Teacher Load	7	.41	.17
Curriculum Issues	7	.73	.53
Teacher Status	7	.37	.14
Community Support of Education	7	.61	.37
School Facilities and Services	7	.49	.24
Community Pressures	7	.57	.32
Total PTO Score	7	.47	.22

As shown in Table 30, the overall PTO score had a moderate correlation ($r = .47$) with the EOG / EOC test scores. The effect size as measured by r^2 was for the overall PTO score was significantly large ($r^2 = .22$). Overall, almost 22% of the variance in EOG / EOC test scores was accounted for by the total morale factors of the schools of Mitchell County, North Carolina.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The primary goal of this study was to attempt to identify a clear and understandable definition of teacher morale and to measure the morale of all the teachers in Mitchell County Schools. As well, an effort was made to determine the leadership behaviors of the principals at each school. By examining the data, a determination can be made as to the relationship of high and low teacher morale with student achievement. The population consisted of all faculty and administrators in Mitchell County Schools in North Carolina.

Several instruments were used in the study. The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* that was administered to all teachers in the system was answered by 113 teachers out of 134. The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* consists of 100 questions that break down morale into 10 specific dimensions for more meaningful discoveries and was administered at regularly scheduled faculty meetings. The 10 dimensions, as defined by Bently and Rempel (1980), are as follows:

1. Teacher Rapport With Principal deals with the teacher's feelings about the principal, his professional competency, his interest in teachers and their work, his ability to communicate, and his skill in human relations.

2. Satisfaction With Teaching pertains to teacher relationships with students and feelings and satisfaction with teaching. According to this factor, the high morale teacher loves to teach, feels competent in his job, enjoys his students, and believes in the future of teaching as an occupation.

3. Rapport Among teachers focuses on a teacher's relationship with other teachers. The items here solicit the teacher's opinion regarding the cooperation. Preparation, ethnics, influence, interests, and competency of his peers.

4. Teacher Salary pertains primarily to the teacher's feelings about salaries and salary policies. Are salaries based on teacher competency? Do they compare favorably with salaries in other school systems? Are salary policies administered fairly and justly, and do teachers participate in the development of these policies?

5. Teacher Load deals with such matters as record-keeping, clerical work, "red tape," community demands on teacher time, extra-curricular load, and keeping up to date professionally.

94

6. Curriculum Issues solicits teacher reactions to the adequacy of the school program in meeting student needs, in providing for individual differences, and in preparing students for effective citizenships.

7. Teacher Status sample feelings about the prestige, security, and benefits afforded by teaching. Several of the items refer to the extent to which the teacher feels he is an accepted member of the community.

8. Community Support of Education deals with the extent to which understands and is willing to support a sound educational program.

9. School Facilities and Services has to do with the adequacy of facilities, supplies and equipment, and the efficiency of the procedures for obtaining materials and services.

10. Community Pressures gives special attention to community expectations with respect to the teacher' personal standards, his participation in outside-school activities, and his freedom to discuss controversial issues in the classroom. (p. 4)

The *Leadership Practices Inventory* was also administered to all teachers in the Mitchell County System with 115 responding out of 134. The *Leadership Practices Inventory* is composed of 30 questions that break down leadership practices into 5 categories. The Inventory comes in two forms, one for the leader to take themselves, and one for the observers (teachers) to answer. The following is a brief explanation of the five dimensions of the *Leadership Practices Inventory*:

a. Modeling the way specifically deals with the credibility of the leader and specifically deals with setting examples.

b. Inspiring a shared vision deals with a leader's ability to envision a future and to bring others into the practice of making a difference while creating a shared vision.

c. Challenging the process specifically focuses in on the ability of the leader to find opportunities through innovative practice, innovation, and change.

d. Enabling others to act deals with the ability of the leader to give strength and power to others as well as building strength and confidence with all involved.

e. Encouraging the heart specifically deals with the ability of leaders to create a spirit of community through celebration, caring, and recognition of contributions by others.

In addition, the North Carolina End-Of-Grade / End-Of-Course was used as the instrument to indicate student achievement. The North Carolina Test aligns itself with the North Carolina Standard Course of Study that is the curriculum mandated by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction to be taught to all students in public schools.

Data from the survey instruments were analyzed using the SPSS System for statistical analysis and were presented in Chapter 4. The data were analyzed though the use of means, standard deviation, median, statistical analysis, correlation tests, and reliability coefficients.

Summary of the Findings

Six research questions were addressed. The following section addresses the findings obtained from the data analysis that was related to the research questions.

Research Question #1

What is the level of teacher morale exhibited by teachers in this study?

Teacher morale levels can range from that of very low, to moderately low, to moderate, to moderately high, to high teacher morale. The total *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* mean score of 3.07 resulted in an overall moderately high level of teacher morale. Of the 10 factors, teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, and community pressures fell within the range of moderately high teacher morale. Teacher salary and school facilities and services were within the moderate teacher morale range. Teacher salary was the factor with the lowest level of teacher morale whereas satisfaction with teaching was the highest. There were no factors that had a mean score below moderate level of teacher morale.

What is the level of teacher morale exhibited at each school in this study?

Seven schools were surveyed to determine their mean scores for each factor of teacher morale as well as the total teacher morale score.

The total teacher morale score for School 1 was one of a high level of morale. Teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, and curriculum issues were within and contributed to the high teacher morale level. Teacher salary, teacher load, teacher status, community support of education, school facilities and services, and community pressures fell in the range of moderately high teacher morale. Rapport among teachers had the highest mean score whereas teacher salary possessed the lowest mean score.

School 2 had a total teacher morale score that fell into the moderately high level of morale. Satisfaction with teaching, alone, was in the range of high teacher morale. Teacher rapport with principal, rapport among teachers, teacher load, curriculum issues, and community pressures were within the moderately high teacher morale category. Teacher salary, community support of education, and school facilities and services were within the moderate teacher morale range. Satisfaction with teaching had the highest mean score for School 2 whereas teacher salary had the lowest.

The total teacher morale score was moderately high for School 3. Teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, teacher load, curriculum issues, school facilities and services, and community pressures were within the moderately high teacher morale range; rapport among teachers, teacher salary, teacher status, and community support of education fell within the moderate teacher morale category. Satisfaction with teaching had, by far, the highest mean score whereas teacher salary had the lowest.

School 4 had a total morale mean indicating that the teacher morale fell into a moderately high level. Satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, and community pressures were within the

moderately high range of teacher morale. Teacher rapport with principal, teacher salary, and school facilities and services were categorized within moderate teacher morale. Satisfaction with teaching was the highest morale factor for the teachers of School 4 whereas teacher rapport with principal was the lowest.

Results from School 5 indicated that the school fell within the range of moderately high teacher morale. Teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher load, curriculum issues, community support of education, school facilities and services, and community pressures were within the moderately high level of teacher morale. Teacher status and salary were found to be in the moderate teacher morale category. Satisfaction with teaching was the highest morale factor with teacher salary being the lowest.

Data for School 6 indicated that the school had a moderately high level of teacher morale. Rapport among teachers was the only factor that was in the range of high teacher morale. Teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, school facilities and services, and community pressures all fell with the moderate teacher morale level. Rapport among teachers had the highest teacher morale mean whereas teacher salary had the lowest.

The total teacher morale score for School 7 fell in the moderately high level category. Teacher rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher load, curriculum issues, teacher status, community support of education, and community pressures fell with the category of moderately high level of teacher morale. Teacher salary and school facilities and services were within the moderate teacher morale category. Satisfaction with teaching was the factor with the highest level of teacher morale whereas teacher salary was the lowest.

Five of the seven schools indicated that satisfaction with teaching was the factor that had the highest level of teacher morale. The other two schools listed rapport among teachers as their highest. Interestingly, all but one school indicated that the factor with the lowest level of teacher

98

morale was teacher salary. As indicated by the data analysis of the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire*, morale for each school was either high or moderately high for all schools in Mitchell County.

Research Question #3

Is there a difference between the self-reported leadership practices of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner Norms for these leadership practices?

In comparing the leadership practices reported by principals in Mitchell County Schools with the norm of those in the Kouzes-Posner study, two were statistically significant and substantively different whereas three were not. School leaders in Mitchell County reported they were engaged in inspiring a shared vision and encouraging the heart more frequently than those leaders in the Kouzes-Posner study. The difference between modeling the way, challenging the process, and enabling others to act and the Kouzes-Posner norms were minimal and statistically not significant.

Ho3$_1$: There is no difference between the mean of modeling the way on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

The null hypothesis was retained. Both groups reported being engaged in practices related to modeling the way with essentially the same level of frequency.

Ho3$_2$: There is no difference between the mean of inspiring a shared vision on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

The null hypothesis was rejected. The principals of Mitchell County Schools reported practiced behaviors associated with inspiring a shared vision more frequently than those who were part of the Kouzes-Posner norm.

Ho3$_3$:   There is no difference between the mean of challenging the process on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

The null hypothesis was retained. Both groups reported being engaged in practices related to challenging the process with essentially the same level of frequency.

Ho3$_4$:   There is no difference between the mean of enabling others to act on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

The null hypothesis was retained. Both groups reported being engaged in practices related to enabling others to act with essentially the same level of frequency.

Ho3$_5$:   There is no difference between the mean of encouraging the heart on the self-reported leadership practice of principals in the current study and the Kouzes-Posner norms.

The null hypothesis was rejected. The principals of Mitchell County Schools reported they practiced behaviors associated with encouraging the heart more frequently than those who were part of the Kouzes-Posner norm.

Research Question #4

Is there a difference between the perceptions of leadership by the leaders themselves (LPI-self) and their teachers (LPI-observer)?

Ho4:   There is no difference between the principal's LPI self-score and the teachers' LPI observer mean.

All comparisons (5 LPI leadership categories with 7 schools = 35 comparisons), with the exception of one, were statistically significant. School 5 on encouraging the heart was not statistically significantly.

There was a significant difference between the teacher's perception of their principals' leadership practices (LPI-observer) and the perceptions of the leaders themselves (LPI-self). For Schools 1 and 7, the teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership practices were higher than the principal's perceptions of their own leadership practices. Conversely, for Schools 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, the teachers' perception of their principal's leadership practices were lower than the principal's perceptions of their own leadership practices.

Research Question #5

Is there a difference in the mean teacher morale score (PTO) and specific leadership behaviors as perceived by their teachers (LPI-observer)?

Ho5:   There is not a difference among the levels of teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership practice and teacher morale.

Five principal-controlled teacher morale factors: rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher load, and school facilities and services were used as dependent variables and matched with selected LPI-observer leadership practices as the independent variables. All of the independent LPI-observer variables were collapsed into three categories representing low, moderate, and high scores of teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership practices.

The teacher morale factor rapport with principal had a significant relationship with the teachers' perception of their principals' enabling others to act leadership practice and the effect size was large. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. Morale factor rapport with principal also had a significant relationship with the leadership practice of encouraging the heart, thus rejecting the null. The strength of the relationship was also large.

Satisfaction with teaching morale factor had a moderate but significant association with the teachers' perception of their principals' ability to inspire a shared vision. Satisfaction with teaching morale factor had a moderately significant relationship with the teachers' perception of

101

their principals' effort to enable others to act. For both, the null hypothesis was rejected. However, the null was retained for the morale factor satisfaction with teaching because it had a low insignificant relationship with encouraging the heart.

Teacher morale factor rapport among teachers did not have a significant relationship with the teachers' perceptions of their principals' modeling the way leadership practices. The strength of the relationship was low and the null hypothesis was retained. Rapport among teachers had a high strength relationship that was significant with the principals' perceived ability to enable others to act and a moderate strength relationship that was significant with the perceived leadership practice of encouraging the heart. For both the null hypothesis was rejected.

The teacher load morale factor had a moderate significant relationship with both the teachers' perception of the principals' leadership practice of sharing a vision and enabling others to act. Because of this significant difference and relationship, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The morale factor of school facilities and services also had a significant association with a moderate strength with the perceived leadership practice by the principal of inspiring a shared vision and enabling others to act. For both, the null hypothesis was also rejected.

Research Question #6

Is there a relationship between teacher morale (PTO) and student achievement on the End-Of-Grade / End-Of-Course Tests? All of the 10 teacher morale factors from the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* were correlated with the EOG / EOC and had a positive relationship. Teacher rapport with principal had a weak correlation with EOG / EOC test scores. Rapport among teachers, teacher status, teacher load, community pressures, and school facilities and services showed a moderate correlation with the EOG / EOC test scores. Finally, satisfaction with teaching, teacher salary, curriculum issues, and community support of education proved to have a moderately strong to strong correlation with EOG / EOC test scores. The overall teacher morale (PTO) score had a moderate correlation with the EOG / EOC with a significantly large

effect size. Overall, 21.9% of the variance in EOG / EOC test scores was accounted for by the total morale factors of the schools of Mitchell County.

Conclusions

Based on the analysis of the findings from this study, a correlation exists between certain perceived leadership practices, teacher morale, and End-Of-Grade/End-Of-Course test scores. The following conclusions emerged as a result of this study:

1. Overall, for Mitchell County Schools, there was a moderately high level of teacher morale as measured by the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire*.

2. Satisfaction with teaching had the highest level of teacher morale of all of the 10 different morale factors.

3. Teacher salary had the lowest level of teacher morale of the 10 different morale factors.

4. One school in the study showed a high level of morale while the other six schools indicated moderately high levels of teacher morale.

5. School leaders in Mitchell County Schools reported they practiced inspiring a shared vision and encouraging the heart more frequently than leaders in the Kouzes-Posner study.

6. Two of the seven schools perceived principal leadership practices higher than did the principals themselves. Five of the seven schools perceived their principals' leadership practices at a lower level than did the principals themselves.

7. A significant relationship was shown to exist between the teacher morale factor of rapport with principals and the principal's leadership practice of enabling others to act and encouraging the heart.

8. A significant relationship was shown to exist between the teacher moral factor of satisfaction with teaching and the perceived ability of the principals to inspire a shared vision as well as enabling others to act.

9. There was not a significant relationship between the moral factor of satisfaction with teaching and the perceived leadership practice of encouraging the heart.

10. There was not a significant relationship between the morale factor of rapport among teachers and the perceived leadership practice of modeling the way.

11. A significant relationship was shown to exist between the morale factor of rapport among teachers and the perceived leadership practice of enabling others to act and encouraging the heart.

12. There was a significant relationship between the teacher morale factor of teacher load and the perceived leadership practice of inspiring a shared vision and enabling others to act.

13. A significant relationship was shown to exist between the teacher morale factor of school facilities and services and the perceived leadership practice of inspiring a shared vision and enabling others to act.

14. All 10 factors of teacher morale as measured by the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* had a positive correlation with the End-Of-Grade/End-Of-Course test scores.

Mitchell County Teachers had a slightly higher level of morale than that of most other groups studied in a review of similar instruments. Teachers were consistent with others from around the country who participated in the PTO in that the morale factor satisfaction with teaching was a positive factor leading to higher morale. However, teachers in Mitchell County differed with most other participants in the factor that contributed most to lowering morale. Mitchell County's teachers overwhelming chose teacher salary as the factor that most contributed to lowering their morale. Others throughout the country who participated in the study generally choose teacher status or community support of education as being the largest contributors to

lowering their morale. The area and region in which these teachers reside could certainly be a contributing factor to this difference.

Mitchell County's school administrators did seem to participate in the leadership factors that contribute to inspiring a shared vision, enabling others, and encouraging from the heart more successfully than did most others in the previous studies. Interestingly, two of the seven principals rated themselves lower on their leadership practices than their own faculty did. This tends not to be the case with most other studies. As found consistent with most studies and reviews, all factors of morale had positive correlation to student achievement and outcomes.

Recommendations for the Improvement of Practice

The following recommendations are made based on the analyses of the surveys and testing instruments regarding teacher morale, leadership practices, and End-Of-Grade/End-Of-Course Test scores.

1. Bi-yearly checks of teacher morale should be taken so that school leaders could be in touch better with the morale of their teachers.

2. Mitchell County's school administrators should improve their ability to enable others to act by developing better cooperative working relationships, by listening more to diverse points of view, by supporting decisions made by others, by fostering and developing trust, and by giving the freedom and latitude for teachers to act.

3. Because teacher salary has the largest effect on lowering morale, Mitchell County should consider including a local supplement to teacher salaries such as many other school systems offer.

4. Mitchell County's school administrators should improve their ability to model the way for their teachers by asking for feedback, building consensus, defining philosophical leadership ideas, and discussing the future and direction of the school.

5. Mitchell County's school administrators should improve their ability to challenge the process by offering new and innovative ways for teachers to work and by encouraging teachers to take more risks and experimentation in the classroom.

6. Mitchell County's administrators should be better informed about how their faculty perceives their leadership practices.

7. Training opportunities for school principals at the local, regional, and state level should be offered to aid in improving the building-wide morale and climate.

8. Principals in Mitchell County Schools need to constantly work to keep morale high as this, in turn, can help keep EOG/EOC Test scores high.

Recommendations

This study focused on the overall level of morale among teachers in Mitchell County, leadership practices, and End-Of-Grade/End-Of-Course test scores. It is the hope of the researcher that an awareness will prevail over all school leaders of the importance and role that teacher morale plays in the success of a school. At the very least, teacher quality can be improved just by creating an awareness and recognition of morale in our schools. The impact that certain leadership practices have on morale and, ultimately, on high stakes testing are immense. The following are recommendations for future research:

1. A study conducted with a larger and more diverse population of teachers and administrators would prove interesting and only enhance our knowledge.

2. A more comprehensive study one that includes all three factors over a larger span of time should be valuable and of interest.

3. A qualitative or mixed-methods study with rich descriptive analysis would provide and deliver a precise level of information. A deeper understanding of leadership behaviors and teacher morale could be acquired.

REFERENCES

Adams, B., & Bailey, G. D. (1989). School is for teachers: Enhancing the school environment. *NASSP Bulletin, 73*, 44-48.

Adams, C. F. (1992). Finding psychic rewards in today's schools': A rebuttal. *Clearing House, 65*, 343-347.

Andain, I. (1990). Protest of the undervalued. *Guardian*, *4, 17.*

Anderson, L. D. (1985). *Administrator's handbook for improving faculty morale.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Babbie, E. (1990). *Survey research methods* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bartell, C.A. (1990). Outstanding secondary principals reflect on instructional leadership. *The High School Journal, 72*, 118-128.

Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bentley, R., & Rempel, A. (1968). *Purdue teacher opinionaire*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue Research Foundation.

Bentley, R., & Rempel, A. (1980). *Manual for the Purdue teacher opinionaire.* West Lafayette, IN: University Book Store.

Bess, J. L. (Ed.). (1997). *Teaching well and liking it: Motivating faculty to teach effectively*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Blackbourne, L. (1990). All's fair in the hunt for better jobs. *The Times Educational Supplement*, *11*, 4-11.

Blasé, J., & Kirby, P. (1992). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Bossert, S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 18,* 34-64.

Brodinsky, B. (1994). *Building morale…motivating staff: Problems and solutions*. Sacramento, CA: American Association of School Administrators.

Chapman, D. W. (1982). Teachers' satisfaction with teaching. *Journal of Educational Research, 75*, 241-247.

Clough, D. B. (1989). *Yes, we can improve staff morale*. Address at the 51ˢᵗ annual Conference of the American Association of School Personnel Administrators. Cleveland, Ohio.

Cook, D. H. (1979). Teacher morale: Symptoms, diagnosis, and prescription. *The Clearing House, 79*, 355-358.

Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Coulson, A. A. (1988). An approach to headship development through personal and professional growth. In M. Clark (Ed.), *Emerging issues in primary education* (pp. 74-92). Lewes, England: Falmer.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dinham, S. (1994). *Societal pressures and teaching.* Paper presented to the Australian Association for Research in Education, Annual Conference. Newcastle, England.

Dinham, S., & Scott, C. (1996). *Teacher satisfaction, motivation and health: Phase one of the teacher 2000 project.* New York. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 405 295)

Elam, S. M. (1989). The second gallup/phi delta kappan poll of teachers' attitudes toward the public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 70*, 785-798.

Ellenburg, F. C. (1972). Factors affecting teacher morale. *NASSP Bulletin, 56*, 76-87.

Evans, L. (1997). Understanding teacher morale and job satisfaction. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*, 831-845.

Evans, L. (1998). *Teacher morale, job satisfaction, and motivation*. London, England: Paul Chapman.

Garner, R. (1985). Slump in morale affecting both staff and pupils. *The Times Educational Supplement*, *29,* 10.

Getzel, J. W., & Guba, E. G. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process. *The School Review, 65*, 423-441.

Gold, K. (1990). True confessions. *The Times Educational Supplement*, *29,* C2.

Graves, D. H. (2001). *The energy to teach.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gurr, D. (1997) *Principal leadership: What does it do, what does it look like?* Department of Education Policy and Management, University of Melbourne. Melbourne, Australia.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principals' contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9,* 157-191

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1993). *The motivation to work.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Hofkins, D. (1990). More staff exit early. *The Times Educational Supplement, 16,* 3.

Hood, E.C. (1965). *A study of congruence of perceptions concerning factors which affect teacher morale.* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, East Texas State University, Commerce.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1987). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (3rd ed.). New York: Random House.

Keeler, B. T., & Andrews, J. H. (1963). The leader behavior of principals, staff morale, and productivity. *Alberta Journal Of Educational Research, 9*, 179-191.

Klopf, G., Scheldon, E., & Brennan, K. (1982). The essentials of effectiveness: A job description for principals. *Principal, 61,* 35-38.

Koerner, T. F. (1990). Developing staff morale. *The Practitioner, 16,* 4.

Kottkamp, R. B., Provenzo, E. F., & Cohn, M. M. (1986). Stability and change in a profession: Two decades of teacher attitudes, 1964-1984. *Phi Delta Kappan, 15*, 559-567.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1998). *The leadership challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2002). *The leadership challenge.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, M. (1986). Excellence in education: Lessons from America's best-run companies and schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 63*, 150-186.

Lipham, J. M., Rankin, R. E., & Hoeh, J. A. (1985). *The principalship: Concepts, competencies, and cases*. New York: Longman.

Lumpa, D. K. (1997). *Correlates with teacher and student satisfaction in elementary and Middle schools.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia.

Lumsden, L. (1998). *Teacher morale.* Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED422601)

Lunenburg, F.C., & Ornstein, A. C. (1996). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Maehr, M. L., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. (1993). *School leader as motivator*. Occasional Paper: School Leadership and Educational Reform, Urbana, IL: National Center for School Leadership.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper and Row.

Mendel, P. C. (1987). *An investigation of factors that influence teacher morale and satisfaction with work conditions*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.

Miller, W. C. (1981). Staff morale, school climate, and educational productivity. *Educational Leadership, 38,* 483-486.

Mitchell County Schools Website. (2005). Retrieved October 22, 2005 from http://central.mitchell.k12.nc.us/

Napier, T. G. (1966). *Teacher morale*. Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College.

National Center For Education Statistics. (1997). *Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: Author.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (1999). Understanding testing at grades 3-8: Background. *Assessment Brief, 6,* 1.

Parks, D. J. (1983). Leadership in times of austerity. *Educational Leadership 40,* 11-13.

Raferty, F., & Dore, A. (1993). Concerned heads heckle pattern. *The Times Educational Supplement*, *4,* 4.

Redefer, E. L. (1959). Factors that affect teacher morale. *The Nations Schools 63,* 59-62

Rempel, A. M., & Bentley, R. R. (1970). Relationship with selected factors. *The Journal of Teacher Education 21,* 534-539.

Reyes, P. (Ed). (1990). *Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance, and productivity*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1985). Effective schools: Interpreting the evidence. *American Journal of Education.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Rosner, B. (1974). *Tests and reviews: The seventh mental measurements yearbook*. Highland Park, NJ: Gryphon.

Scarnati, J. T. (1994). Beyond technical competence: Nine rules for administrators. *NASSP Bulletin, 78,* 76-83.

Smith, K. R. (1976). Morale: A refinement of Stogdill's model. *Journal of Educational Administration, 14,* 87-93.

Stedt, J. D., & Fraser, H. V. (1984). A checklist for improving teacher morale. *NASSP Bulletin, 68,* 70-81.

Stogdill, R. M. (1963). *Manual for the leader behavior description questionnaire – form XII; An experimental revision*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Strickland, B. F. (1962). *A study of factors affecting the morale in selected administrative units in North Carolina.* Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Thomas, V. (1997). *What research says about administrators' management style, effectiveness, and teacher morale.* Chicago State University. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED411569)

Von Burg, F. (1963). Faculty morale rests with administrators. *Review of Educational Research, 23*, 267-269.

Washington, R., & Watson, H. F. (1976). Positive teacher morale: The principal's responsibility. *NASSP Bulletin 60,* 4-6.

Waters, T., Marzano, R., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement.* Aurora, CO: McREL.

Whitaker, T., Whitaker, B., & Lumpa, D. (2000). *Motivating and inspiring teachers: The educational leader's guide for building staff morale.* Larchmont, NY: Eye On Education.

Williams, G. (1986). *Improving school morale*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield City Polytechnic/PAVIC.

Wood, C. L., Nicholson, E. W., & Findley, D. G. (1985). *The secondary school principal: Manager and supervisor (*2nd ed.*).* Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Letter of Permission: School System

March 2, 2005

Dear Dr. Bill Sears,

As you know, I am currently a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at East Tennessee State University. The purpose and overall goal of this study is to understand better teacher morale, principal leadership, and student achievement in Mitchell County Schools. I plan on using two instruments for the study, the *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* and the *Leadership Practices Inventory*. For a complete study, I would like to include all eight schools in Mitchell County. All responses will remain confidential, with neither schools, principals, nor teacher's names ever being revealed.

I respectfully request your permission to survey all teachers and principals in all eight schools in Mitchell County. Your permission and support are crucial to this study and will be greatly appreciated. I have included a copy of the survey instruments, letters, and all informed consent forms for your review.

Thank you for your time and consideration with this request. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (XXX) xxx-xxxx or by email at mhouchard@mcsnc.org. The results of this study will be available to you upon your request.

Sincerely,

Morgen A. Houchard

APPENDIX B

Educators' Cover Letter

May 16, 2005

Dear Fellow Educator,

      I am a doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at East Tennessee State University. I am currently conducting a study for my dissertation dealing with principal leadership, teacher morale and student achievement. This study will be conducted through the use of surveys given to all of the teachers of Mitchell County Schools. This instrument will be used for the sole purpose of gathering data for the study and should only take a few moments of your time. Participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may leave before or at any stage of the survey. Participants will be asked to fill out a questionnaire comprised of 100 questions. This questionnaire breaks down morale into 10 specific dimensions for more meaningful discoveries and is designed to estimate individual, school and system morale. Your input is essential to the success of my study. Because these surveys remain "nameless", your anonymity is guaranteed. Again, participation is completely voluntary on your part.

      The objective of this study is as follows: First, the study will examine and begin to define teacher morale as much as possible given that it is an ever-changing individual characteristic; Second, the study will investigate teacher morale and distinguish between high and low elements and characteristics of teacher morale; Third, the study will examine the difficult task of measuring the morale of teachers in public education today; Fourth, the study will attempt to understand the role school leaders play in the development of teacher morale and how their specific behavior affects the morale of teachers; and Finally, the study will review student achievement by using the North Carolina End-Of-Grade, End-Of-Course tests. All of these variables will be examined to determine if there is a connection or pattern to high or low student achievement based on teacher morale.

Sincerely,

Morgen Houchard
Doctoral Candidate

Informed Consent Teacher PTO

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT - TEACHERS

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Morgen A. Houchard

TITLE OF THE PROJECT: Principal Leadership, Teacher Morale, and Student Achievement in Seven Schools in Mitchell County, North Carolina

This informed consent will explain your voluntary participation in a research study. It is important that you read about this study and then decide if you wish to be a volunteer.

PURPOSE:
The purposes of this study are: (1) to examine and begin to define teacher morale (2) to investigate teacher morale and distinguish between high and low elements and characteristics of teacher morale; (3) to examine and understand the difficult task of measuring the morale of teachers (4) to attempt to understand the role school leaders play in the development of teacher morale and how their specific behaviors affect the morale of teachers, and (5) to review student achievement by using the North Carolina End-Of-Grade; End-Of-Course tests.

Duration:
The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* should take fifteen to thirty minutes to complete.

POSSIBLE BENEFITS:
Subjects will not be compensated for their time but could possibly benefit from taking a survey of this nature by simply taking the time to think about their own morale and what possibly motivates them individually.

CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS:
If you have any questions, problems at any time, you may call Morgen Houchard at (XXX) xxx-xxxx or (XXX)-xxx-xxxx. You may call Dr. Terry Tollefson, ETSU, Dissertation Committee Chair at (423) 439-4430 for additional help and the Chair of the ETSU Institutional Review Board at (423) 439-6055 of any questions you may have about your rights as a research participant.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
Confidentiality for the participants will be a primary concern for this research. These surveys will remain "nameless" through the study guaranteeing the anonymity of any and all who participant.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION:
The nature, demands, and benefits of this project have been explained to me as well are known and available. I understand what my participation involves. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to ask questions and withdraw form the survey at any time. I have read, or have had read to me, fully understand the consent form. I sign freely and voluntarily. A signed copy has been given to me.

Signed:_____   Date:_____

Informed Consent Principals LPI

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT - TEACHERS

<u>PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:</u> Morgen A. Houchard

TITLE OF THE PROJECT: Principal Leadership, Teacher Morale, and Student Achievement in Seven Schools in Mitchell County, North Carolina

This informed consent will explain your voluntary participation in a research study. It is important that you read about this study and then decide if you wish to be a volunteer.

<u>PURPOSE:</u>
The purposes of this study are: (1) to examine and begin to define teacher morale (2) to investigate teacher morale and distinguish between high and low elements and characteristics of teacher morale; (3) to examine and understand the difficult task of measuring the morale of teachers (4) to attempt to understand the role school leaders play in the development of teacher morale and how their specific behaviors affect the morale of teachers, and (5) to review student achievement by using the North Carolina End-Of-Grade; End-Of-Course tests.

<u>Duration:</u>
The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* should take fifteen to thirty minutes to complete.

<u>POSSIBLE BENEFITS:</u>
Subjects will not be compensated for their time but could possibly benefit from taking a survey of this nature by simply taking the time to think about their own morale and what possibly motivates them individually.

<u>CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS:</u>
If you have any questions, problems at any time, you may call Morgen Houchard at (XXX) xxx-xxxx or (XXX) xxx-xxxx. You may call Dr. Terry Tollefson, ETSU, Dissertation Committee Chair at (423) 439-4430 for additional help and the Chair of the ETSU Institutional Review Board at (423) 439-6055 of any questions you may have about your rights as a research participant.

<u>CONFIDENTIALITY:</u>
Confidentiality for the participants will be a primary concern for this research. These surveys will remain "nameless" through the study guaranteeing the anonymity of any and all who participant.

<u>VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION</u>:
The nature, demands, and benefits of this project have been explained to me as well are known and available. I understand what my participation involves. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to ask questions and withdraw form the survey at any time. I have read, or have had read to me, fully understand the consent form. I sign freely and voluntarily. A signed copy has been given to me.

Signed:_____   Date:_____

APPENDIX E

Informed Consent Teacher LPI

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT - TEACHERS

<u>PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:</u> Morgen A. Houchard

TITLE OF THE PROJECT: Principal Leadership, Teacher Morale, and Student Achievement in Seven Schools in Mitchell County, North Carolina

This informed consent will explain your voluntary participation in a research study. It is important that you read about this study and then decide if you wish to be a volunteer.

<u>PURPOSE:</u>
The purposes of this study are: (1) to examine and begin to define teacher morale (2) to investigate teacher morale and distinguish between high and low elements and characteristics of teacher morale; (3) to examine and understand the difficult task of measuring the morale of teachers (4) to attempt to understand the role school leaders play in the development of teacher morale and how their specific behaviors affect the morale of teachers, and (5) to review student achievement by using the North Carolina End-Of-Grade; End-Of-Course tests.

<u>Duration:</u>
The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire* should take fifteen to thirty minutes to complete.

<u>POSSIBLE BENEFITS:</u>
Subjects will not be compensated for their time but could possibly benefit from taking a survey of this nature by simply taking the time to think about their own morale and what possibly motivates them individually.

<u>CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS:</u>
If you have any questions, problems at any time, you may call Morgen Houchard at (XXX) xxx-xxxx or (XXX) xxx-xxxx. You may call Dr. Terry Tollefson, ETSU, Dissertation Committee Chair at (423) 439-4430 for additional help and the Chair of the ETSU Institutional Review Board at (423) 439-6055 of any questions you may have about your rights as a research participant.

<u>CONFIDENTIALITY:</u>
Confidentiality for the participants will be a primary concern for this research. These surveys will remain "nameless" through the study guaranteeing the anonymity of any and all who participant.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION:
The nature, demands, and benefits of this project have been explained to me as well are known and available. I understand what my participation involves. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to ask questions and withdraw form the survey at any time. I have read, or have had read to me, fully understand the consent form. I sign freely and voluntarily. A signed copy has been given to me.

Signed:_____   Date:_____

Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

The *Purdue Teacher Opinionaire*
Prepared by Ralph R. Bentley and Averno M. Rempel

This instrument is designed to provide you the opportunity to express your opinions about your work as a teacher and various school problems in your particular school situation. There are no right or wrong responses, so do not hesitate to mark they statements frankly. Please **do not** record your name on this document.

Read each statement carefully. Then indicate whether you (1) <u>disagree</u>, (2) <u>probably disagree</u>, (3) <u>probably agree</u>, (4) <u>agree</u> with each statement. Circle your answers using the following scale:

1=Disagree   2=Probably Disagree   3=Probably Agree   4=Agree

1	Details, "red tape," and requires reports absorb too much of my time.	1	2	3	4
2	The work of individual faculty members is appreciated and commended by our principal.	1	2	3	4
3	Teachers feel free to criticize administrative policy at faculty meetings called by our principal.	1	2	3	4
4	The faculty feels that their suggestions pertaining to salaries are adequately transmitted by the administration to the board of education.	1	2	3	4
5	Our principal shows favoritism in his relations with the teachers in our school.	1	2	3	4
6	Teachers in this school are expected to do an unreasonable amount of record keeping and clerical work.	1	2	3	4
7	My principal makes a real effort to maintain close contact with the faculty.	1	2	3	4
8	Community demands upon the teacher's time are unreasonable.	1	2	3	4
9	I am satisfied with the policies under which pay raises are granted.	1	2	3	4
10	My teaching load is greater than that of most of the other teachers in our school.	1	2	3	4
11	The extra-curricular load of the teachers in our school is unreasonable.	1	2	3	4
12	Our principal's leadership in faculty meetings challenges and stimulates our professional growth.	1	2	3	4
13	My teaching position gives me the social status in the community that I desire.	1	2	3	4
14	The number of hours a teacher must work is unreasonable.	1	2	3	4

15	Teaching enables me to enjoy many of the material and cultural things I like.	1	2	3	4
16	My school provides me with adequate classroom supplies and equipment.	1	2	3	4
17	Our school has a well-balanced curriculum.	1	2	3	4
18	There is a great deal of griping, arguing, taking sides, and feuding among our teachers.	1	2	3	4
19	Teaching gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction.	1	2	3	4
20	The curriculum of our school makes reasonable provision for student individual differences.	1	2	3	4
21	The procedures for obtaining materials and services are well defined and efficient.	1	2	3	4
22	Generally, teachers in our school do not take advantage of one another.	1	2	3	4
23	The teachers in our school cooperate with each other to achieve common, personal, and professional objectives.	1	2	3	4
24	Teaching enables me to make my greatest contribution to society.	1	2	3	4
25	The curriculum of our school is in need of major revisions.	1	2	3	4
26	I love to teach.	1	2	3	4
27	If I could plan my career again, I would choose teaching.	1	2	3	4
28	Experienced faculty members accept new and younger members as colleagues.	1	2	3	4
29	I would recommend teaching as an occupation to students of high scholastic ability.	1	2	3	4
30	If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would stop teaching.	1	2	3	4
31	The school schedule places my classes at a disadvantage.	1	2	3	4
32	Within the limits of financial resources, the school tries to follow a generous policy regarding fringe benefits, professional travel, professional study, etc.	1	2	3	4
33	My principal makes my work easier and more pleasant.	1	2	3	4
34	Keeping up professionally is too much of a burden.	1	2	3	4
35	Our community makes its teachers feel as though they are a real part of the community.	1	2	3	4
36	Salary policies are administered with fairness and justice.	1	2	3	4
37	Teaching affords me the security I want in an occupation.	1	2	3	4
38	My school principal understands and recognizes good teaching procedures.	1	2	3	4
39	Teachers clearly understand the policies governing salary increases.	1	2	3	4
40	My classes are used as "dumping grounds" for problem students.	1	2	3	4
41	The lines and methods of communication between teachers and the principal in our school are well developed and maintained.	1	2	3	4
42	My teaching load at this school is unreasonable.	1	2	3	4
43	My principal shows a real interest in my department.	1	2	3	4
44	Our principal promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in our school.	1	2	3	4
45	My teaching load unduly restricts my nonprofessional activities.	1	2	3	4

46	I find my contacts with students, for the most part, highly satisfying and rewarding.	1	2	3	4
47	I feel that I am an important part of this school system.	1	2	3	4
48	The competency of the teachers in our school compares favorably with that of teachers in other schools with which I am familiar.	1	2	3	4
49	My school provides the teachers with adequate audio-visual aids and projection equipment.	1	2	3	4
50	I feel successful and competent in my present position.	1	2	3	4
51	I enjoy working with student organizations, clubs, and societies.	1	2	3	4
52	Our teaching staff is congenial to work with.	1	2	3	4
53	My teaching associates are well prepared for their jobs.	1	2	3	4
54	Our school faculty has a tendency to form into cliques.	1	2	3	4
55	The teachers in our school work well together.	1	2	3	4
56	I am at a disadvantage professionally because other teachers are better prepared to teach than I am.	1	2	3	4
57	Our school provides adequate clerical services for the teachers.	1	2	3	4
58	As far as I know, the other teachers think I am a good teacher.	1	2	3	4
59	Library facilities and resources are adequate for the grade or subject area which I teach.	1	2	3	4
60	The "stress and strain" resulting from teaching makes teaching undesirable for me.	1	2	3	4
61	My principal is concerned with the problems of the faculty and handles these problems sympathetically.	1	2	3	4
62	I do not hesitate to discuss any school problem with my principal.	1	2	3	4
63	Teaching gives me the prestige I desire.	1	2	3	4
64	My teaching job enables me to provide a satisfactory standard of living for my family.	1	2	3	4
65	The salary schedule in our school adequately recognizes teacher competency.	1	2	3	4
66	Most of the people in this community understand and appreciate good education.	1	2	3	4
67	In my judgment, this community is a good place to raise a family.	1	2	3	4
68	This community respects its teachers and treats them like professional persons.	1	2	3	4
69	My principal acts interested in me and my problems.	1	2	3	4
70	My school principal supervises rather than "snoopervises" the teachers in our school.	1	2	3	4
71	It is difficult for teachers to gain acceptance by the people in this community.	1	2	3	4
72	Teachers' meetings as now conducted by our principal waste the time and energy of the staff.	1	2	3	4
73	My principal has a reasonable understanding of the problems connected with my teaching assignment.	1	2	3	4
74	I feel that my work is judged fairly by my principal.	1	2	3	4
75	Salaries paid in this school system compare favorably with salaries in other systems with which I am familiar.	1	2	3	4

76	Most of the actions of students irritate me.	1	2	3	4
77	The cooperativeness of teachers in our school helps make our work more enjoyable.	1	2	3	4
78	My students regard me with respect and seem to have confidence in my professional ability.	1	2	3	4
79	The purposes and objectives of the school cannot be achieved by the present curriculum.	1	2	3	4
80	The teachers in our school have a desirable influence on the values and attitudes of their students.	1	2	3	4
81	This community expects its teachers to meet unreasonable personal standards.	1	2	3	4
82	My students appreciate the help I give them with their schoolwork.	1	2	3	4
83	To me there is no more challenging work than teaching.	1	2	3	4
84	Other teachers in our school are appreciative of my work.	1	2	3	4
85	As a teacher in this community, my nonprofessional activities outside of school are unduly restricted.	1	2	3	4
86	As a teacher, I think I am as competent as most other teachers.	1	2	3	4
87	The teachers with whom I work have high professional ethics.	1	2	3	4
88	Our school curriculum does a good job of preparing students to become enlightened and competent citizens.	1	2	3	4
89	I really enjoy working with my students.	1	2	3	4
90	The teachers in our school show a great deal of initiative and creativity in their teaching assignments.	1	2	3	4
91	Teachers in our community feel free to discuss controversial issues in their classes.	1	2	3	4
92	My principal tries to make me feel comfortable when visiting my classes.	1	2	3	4
93	My principal makes effective use of the individual teacher's capacity and talent.	1	2	3	4
94	The people in this community, generally, have a sincere and wholehearted interest in the school system.	1	2	3	4
95	Teachers feel free to go to the principal about problems of personal and group welfare.	1	2	3	4
96	This community supports ethical procedures regarding the appointment and reappointment of members of the teaching staff.	1	2	3	4
97	This community is willing to support a good program of education.	1	2	3	4
98	Our community expects the teachers to participate in too many social activities.	1	2	3	4
99	Community pressures prevent me from doing my best as a teacher.	1	2	3	4
100	I am well satisfied with my present teaching position.	1	2	3	4

Leadership Practices Inventory--Self

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY
James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner

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

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

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

26	I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.	
27	I speak with a genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.	
28	I experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.	
29	I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.	
30	I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contribution.	

LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY
James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner

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

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

1	Sets a personal example of what he/she expects of others	____
2	Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.	
3	Seeks out challenging opportunities that tests his/her own skills and abilities.	
4	Develops cooperative relationships among the people he/she works with	
5	Praises people for a job well done.	
6	Spends time and energy making certain that the people he/she works with adhere to the principals and standards we have agreed on.	
7	Describes a compelling image of what our future could be like.	
8	Challenges people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.	
9	Actively listens to diverse points of view.	
10	Makes it a point to let people know about his/her confidence in their abilities.	
11	Follows through on the promises and commitments that he/she makes.	
12	Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.	
13	Searches outside the formal boundaries of his/her organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.	
14	Treats others with dignity and respect.	
15	Makes sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects	
16	Asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect other people's performance.	
17	Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.	
18	Asks "what can we learn?" when things don't go as expected.	
19	Supports the decisions that people make on their own.	
20	Publicly recognizes people who exemplify commitment to shared values.	
21	Builds consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.	
22	Paints the "big picture" of what we aspire to accomplish.	
23	Makes certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.	
24	Gives people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.	
25	Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.	

26	Is clear about his/her philosophy of leadership.	
27	Speaks with a genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.	
28	Experiments and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.	
29	Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.	
30	Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.	

APPENDIX I

Permission Waiver Letter

PURDUE
UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Office of the Dean

May 9, 2005

Morgan Houchard
297 Hillcrest
Spruce Pine, NC 28777

Dear Mr. Houchard:

In response to your telephone call of May 9th, 2005, it appears the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire you refer to was developed in the sixties and the copyright for this instrument has expired. Therefore, you no longer need our permission to use this instrument and should feel free to use it in your research.

Sincerely,

Beth Helton
Assistant to the Associate Deans

VITA

MORGEN A. HOUCHARD

Personal Data: Date of Birth: March 2, 1968
                          Place of Birth: Palm Beach, Florida
                          Marital Status: Married

Education: University of North Carolina – Asheville;
                             Bachelor of Arts – History, Teaching Certificate 6-9 and 9-12;
                             1994

                          Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, North Carolina;;
                             Master of School Administration;
                             2000

                          East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee;
                             Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, Ed. D.,
                             2005.

Professional
Experiences: Teacher, Bowman Middle School, Bakersville, NC;
                             1994-2004.

                          Assistant Principal, Bowman Middle School, Bakersville, NC;
                             2003-2004.

                          Assistant Principal, Mitchell High School, Bakersville, NC;
                             2004-2005.

                          Principal, Tipton Hill School (K-8), Green Mountain, NC;
                             2005-present.

Professional
Achievements: Teacher of the Year – Bowman Middle School
                          Southern Association Accreditation Peer Review Team WNC
                          ABC Committee Member – Bowman Middle and Mitchell High
                          Department Chairperson – History / Social Studies
                          Chair of the School Improvement Team – Bowman Middle
                          Southern Association Team – Bowman Middle and Mitchell High
                          History / Social Studies Textbook Selection Committee
                          Football and Golf Coach – Bowman Middle

Professional
Achievements

Creator and Administrator of the High Adventure Club
Creator and Administrator – annual Eighth Grade Educational Trip
Bristol Motor Speedway Fundraiser – Eight Years - $250,000.00
Board of Directors, Chair – Mitchell County Group Home
Parent Teacher Organization – Bowman Middle and Mitchell High
Academic Boasters Club – Mitchell High
Active Member – Trinity Episcopal Church, Ledger Fire
Department, NCPAPA, ASCD, PENC