

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

2014

The Relationship Between Teacher Perception Of Principals' Leadership Behaviors And Student Achievement

Monte Damon Ladner
University of Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ladner, Monte Damon, "The Relationship Between Teacher Perception Of Principals' Leadership Behaviors And Student Achievement" (2014). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 515.
<https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/515>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHER PERCEPTION OF PRINCIPALS'
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

A Dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Leadership & Counselor Education
The University of Mississippi

by

MONTE DAMON LADNER

May 2014

Copyright Monte Damon Ladner 2014
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research study was to determine whether a relationship exists between student achievement, as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score, and school leadership based on staff perceptions of school leadership, as measured by the Survey of Supervisory Behavior. The leadership of seven schools was assessed by staff members in five different sub scales of leadership domains: human relations, trust/decision making, instructional leadership, control, and conflict. The seven schools sampled were comprised of four rural or county schools and three city schools. The subjects for this study were principals of standalone schools containing grades five, six, seven, and eight or some combination of the four grade levels.

All 60 respondents to this study were teachers from a rural southern state. Of the respondents, 48.33% held a Bachelors degree, 71.66% had been at their schools six years or more, 81.66% had taught for six or more years, 95.00% were white, and 91.66% of participants were found to be teaching in their subject area.

The survey instrument was comprised of five domains. All five domains and the instrument were correlated with QDI to determine whether relationships exist. None of the five domains were found to be statically significant in relation to QDI. Additionally, the Survey of Supervisory Behavior Instrument was not found to be statistically significant in relation to QDI.

DEDICATION

This paper is dedicated to my family. I began the doctoral process as a single school teacher, and complete the process as a married – father of three – middle school principal. The journey has been long, but the lessons learned during the process are invaluable.

To my wife, Mandy, I thank you for allowing me to spend time at the office and in the classroom. Your dedication to our family has allowed me to achieve career success and complete my education. Behind every great man is a better woman, and I have the best of all.

To my children, Carter, Rich, and Kate, never give up on a dream. This paper has seemed impossible, but I achieved it by never giving up and constantly working. The three of you are my greatest achievement and I will always love and be proud of you.

To my parents, grandparents, and in-laws I thank you for aiding me in this task. Also, I thank you for laying a foundation of expectations and importance of education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my committee members I say thank you for continuing to work with me and challenge me in this process. It is through your dedication to your job and excellence in your field that I completed this dissertation. I have grown as a student and person from your guidance.

To the graduate faculty in the School of Education, and at the University of Mississippi, I appreciate your commitment to quality higher education. You bring tremendous honor to yourself, the university and most importantly the students that sit before you. I appreciate all that you have taught me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER I	1
CHAPTER II.....	11
CHAPTER III	30
CHAPTER IV	38
CHAPTER V	48
REFERENCES	56
APPENDICES	62
VITA.....	83

LIST OF TABLES

1. Demographics of Schools Selected for Study.....	32
2. Response Rates	33
3. Demographic Response Rates.....	40
4. Degree Level	40
5. Experience at School.....	41
6. Teaching Experience.....	41
7. Ethnicity	42
8. Years Teaching in Subject Area	42
9. Mean Scores and QDI.....	43
10. Survey Instrument and QDI.....	44
11. Human Relations Domain.....	44
12. Trust Domain	45
13. Instructional Domain	45
14. Control Domain	46
15. Conflict Domain.....	46

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this research study was to determine if a relationship exists between student achievement, as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index (QDI) score, and school leadership based on staff perceptions of school leadership, as measured by the Survey of Supervisory Behavior. The leadership of seven schools was assessed by staff members in five different sub scales of leadership domains: human relations, trust/decision making, instructional leadership, control, and conflict. The seven schools sampled were comprised of four rural or county schools and three city schools. The subjects for this study were principals of standalone schools containing grades five, six, seven, and eight or some combination of the four grade levels. The instrument used for the study was derived by Bulach, Boothe, and Pickett (2006) and attained a +.95 correlation coefficient as measured by Cronbach's alpha.

Student Achievement and School Leadership

One of the most comprehensive studies on the relationship between school leadership and student achievement was conducted by Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2003). The researchers conducted a meta-analysis of school leadership for the last 30 years. The final sample for the study consisted of 70 studies involving 2,894 schools, approximately 1.1 million students, and 14,000 teachers (Waters et al., 2003). The finding of greatest importance from this study is the evidence of a substantial relationship between leadership and student achievement. The

researchers found that the average effect size (expressed as a correlation) between leadership and student achievement was .25 (Waters et al., 2003).

In dissecting existing research, Waters et al. (2003) identified 21 key leadership responsibilities. It was further determined that if a principal improved upon all 21 of these key leadership responsibilities by one standard deviation, his/her school could move 10 percentile points higher. This improvement would result in a school scoring in the 50th percentile improving the next year to the 60th percentile. Ten percentile points represent a statistically significant difference in achievement (Waters et al., 2003).

Bulach et al. (2006) also considered school leadership. The researchers derived a survey instrument that can be utilized to measure behaviors principals use while supervising subordinates. The use or failure to use these behaviors creates a certain leadership style that positively or negatively affects the supervisory climate and learning environment. A positive score on this instrument should be accompanied by a more positive faculty morale and school climate (Bulach et al., 2006).

Bulach et al. (2006) identified five domains of leadership. The five domains consist of Control Leadership Domain, Conflict Leadership Domain, Instructional Leadership Domain, Trust Leadership Domain, and Human Relations Leadership Domain. The important aspect of Bulach et al. (2006) research is that the study is from the perspective of the subordinate.

Research on the perspective of subordinates is supported by the work of Scotti (2001) who contends that although subordinates spend their days in direct contact with their leader they are not usually asked for honest feedback regarding perceptions of their leader's behavior. Considering the complexity of organizations and the amount of time that subordinates spend

with their superiors, subordinate feedback is a valuable ingredient in our understanding of leadership effectiveness (Scotti, 2001).

Statement of the Problem

The current educational system focuses on accountability. School accountability systems became mandated nationally with the passage of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001.

Currently, accountability has been reaffirmed and strengthened with the implementation of President Barack Obama's "Race to the Top" initiative (2009).

The Quality of Distribution Index, QDI, is one of three components the department of education uses to rate each school in the accountability system. The 2010 - 2011 school year was the second year in which the accountability model was used. The QDI is a composite score that takes into account all of the student testing in one year. Each year for the first four years of the new accountability model the cut points will be changed to make the standards tougher. The goal is to make the ratings system for school districts comparable to the ratings of school districts across the nation (MDE, 2011).

The other component is whether school growth goals are met. The cut points in the Quality of Distribution Index are: 0 - 99 = Failing, 100 - 132 = At-Risk of Failing, 133 - 165 = Academic Watch, 166 - 199 = Successful, 200 - 300 = High Performing (MDE, 2011).

Accountability measures directly impact school leaders through the possibility of termination due to low performing schools. Termination is feasible through two means. One mean is the school district terminating due to lack of student performance. The second mean of termination is due to community pressure. All accreditation levels are made available to the public annually. Each community has set educational standards they demand to be achieved.

Failure to meet community standards leads to pressure on school boards and superintendents to find personnel that can meet desired standards (Crisafulli, 2006).

As these measures continue, educators and educational institutions must take advantage of every opportunity to determine if the instructional staff is performing in concert with its administrators to positively affect student achievement. In the future, a goal is to have data driven research to evaluate school leadership. This goal is twofold in that it is possible to have preventative data that will improve school leaders, and to provide a data driven improvement plan for school leaders before the termination process (Crisafulli, 2006). Conversely, data driven assessments of school leaders will help school districts in evaluating personnel. The research found in this study will examine what relationship exists between student achievement and school leadership based on staff perceptions of school leadership.

Empirical research has shown a correlation between school leadership and student achievement, and school leadership, school climate, and teacher satisfaction (Bulach et al., 2006; Kruger, Witziers, & Slegers, 2007; Reavis, Vinson, and Fox, 1999; Waters et al., 2003; Youngs, 2007). This information coincides with early research by Blanchard and Hersey (1969) showing the needs of leaders to fulfill the relationship side of management, as well as the task side. Too much attention on the task side, a fairly common occurrence by school leaders, may lead to teachers feeling they are not being treated as a person (Hilliard, 2000). As more demands for increased student achievement are placed on school leaders, this could lead to even more teachers feeling unappreciated. Teacher unrest and dissatisfaction are also factors leading to poor school performance and termination of school leaders.

Bulach et al. (2006) found that the reasons principals are either successful or not successful as educational leaders include often one or more of the following: a lack of human

relation skills; low levels of trust; poor decision making skills, failure to empower subordinates, and poorly dealing with conflict. The survey instrument used by Bulach et al. (2006) will be used in this research as a validated tool to measure teacher perceptions.

Bulach et al. (2006) suggest that their survey instrument could be used by principals as a pro-active tool to gather self-analysis data regarding the impact of their leadership behavior on student achievement. Central office personnel also could make use of the instrument to help principals plan their own professional development activities.

The ultimate responsibility of student achievement resides with school principals. A clear, concise, and objective review by staff members can help identify deficiencies in leadership traits that most affect student achievement. Early detection and planning can correct problems and present solutions to aid principals in raising student achievement.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship exists between student achievement, as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score, and school leadership based on staff perceptions of school leadership in three city schools and four rural schools. If a relationship is found, schools will have a data driven research based method to adequately identify behaviors that should be modified to increase student achievement. Additionally, with teacher retention being tied to student performance on state tests, it is important to have a school leader with leadership behaviors that foster teacher success and retention.

Null Hypothesis

The researcher, at the onset of the research project, determined a research question. After a review of the literature in Chapter II, the researcher developed the research question into a hypothesis. The following null hypotheses was tested in this study:

H₀-1: There is no significant relationship between instructional staff members' perceptions of administrative leadership behaviors as measured by the cumulative score on the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-2: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Human Relations domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-3: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Trust/Decision Making domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-4: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Instructional Leadership domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-5: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Control domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-6: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Conflict domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

Significance of the Study

By conducting this study, the researcher will determine what possible relationships exist between instructional staff members' perceptions of administrative leadership behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

A principal who uses Bulach et al. (2006) as a resource tool will better meet the professional development needs of instructional staffs. Professional development needs that are adequately determined and then fulfilled help develop and grow teachers into more professional educators. Improvement in both areas is important when applied to test scores, adequate yearly progress, and other measures dictated by No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top.

Also, as noted in the study by Waters et al. (2003), if a school leader improves upon leadership behaviors in a systematic process, leaders can move students 10 percentile points. A constant evaluation of behaviors and methods can serve to aid in teacher retention, help schools attain high performance, and help schools maintain community standards all which lead to school leader termination.

Limitations/Delimitations

The following assumptions are made in conducting this study:

1. Respondents did not alter their responses to reflect how they think the researcher wanted them to respond.
2. Respondents answered the questionnaire truthfully and without fear of retaliation by administrators.
3. The intended individuals answered the questionnaire.
4. The findings in this study can only be generalized to administrators of a rural southern U.S. state.
5. This study is not designed to identify causal relationships but to determine what relationships may exist.
6. The study is delimited to schools in Northeast Mississippi who have a poverty percentage between 44% and 54%, and a student population of approximately 500.

7. The study is delimited to schools consisting of grades five through eight. Schools do not have to have all four grades, but must be a self-contained school only housing students in those grade ranges.
8. Staff perceptions of school leaders' leadership will be measured on a five point Likert-type scale.
9. The study will be delimited to the Quality Distribution Index scores for the May 2012 testing session of the 2011 – 2012 school year.

Terms and Definitions

The definitions presented here are the perceptions and interpretations of the author and are reflective of how they will be used in the framework of the study.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) – The Mississippi Accountability System evaluates schools based on expected growth and overall student achievement; NCLB focuses on the achievement of subgroups within a school. If one group does not meet AYP, the whole school does not (Mississippi Department of Education, 2010).

Conflict Leadership Domain - Identified by the administrator's perceived behavior in the areas of keeping a confidence, questioning his/her superiors, passing the buck, having double standards, showing partiality to influential parents, showing favoritism to some teachers, and supporting teachers even if wrong (Bulach et al., 2006).

Control Leadership Domain - Identified by the administrator's perceived behavior in the areas of delegating responsibility, having flexibility/rigidity, providing work expectations, providing duty assignment, completing paperwork requirements, emphasizing control, and using of the words "I" and "my" (Bulach et al., 2006).

Human Relations Domain – Identified by the administrator’s perceived behavior in the areas of my principal calls me by name, my principal uses eye contact, and my principal demonstrates a caring attitude (Bulach et al., 2006).

Instructional Leadership Domain - Identified by the administrator’s perceived behavior in the areas of interrupting teaching frequently, lacking vision, being knowledgeable about the curriculum, being knowledgeable about instructional strategies, applying procedures consistently, shrugging off or devaluing a problem or concern, failing to follow up, failing to always enforce rules, holding people accountable, providing feedback regarding teaching (Bulach et al., 2006).

Leadership Domains – a specific expert knowledge valid for a pre-selected area of leadership activity (Bulach et al., 2006).

Meta-analysis – A quantitative method of combining the results of independent studies (usually drawn from the published literature) and synthesizing summaries and conclusions which may be used to evaluate therapeutic effectiveness and/or plan new studies (Gall et al., 2007).

Mississippi Curriculum Test Second Edition (MCT2) – The MCT2 consists of customized criterion-referenced language arts and mathematics assessments that are fully aligned with the 2006 Mississippi Language Arts Framework-Revised and the 2007 Mississippi Mathematics Framework-Revised. These assessments allow Mississippi to be in compliance with the requirements of the federal legislation No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The assessments are administered to students in grades 3 through 8, including special education students whose Individual Education Plans specify instructional goals that are aligned with the 2006 Mississippi Language Arts Framework-Revised and the 2007 Mississippi Mathematics Framework-Revised for the aforementioned grades (Mississippi Department of Education, 2010).

No Child Left Behind – An Act written to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind academically (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

Race to the Top - Rewards States that have demonstrated success in raising student achievement and have the best plans to accelerate their reforms in the future with federal funding. These States will offer models for others to follow and will spread the best reform ideas across their States and across the country (U.S. Department of Education, 2010).

Situational Leadership Model - Developed in the late 1960s by Ken Blanchard and Paul Hersey, it is based on the idea that leaders use different leadership behaviors based on the situation and the followers' level of readiness (Blanchard & Hersey, 1969).

Trust/Decision Making Leadership Domain – Identified by the administrator's perceived behavior in the areas of making snap judgments and evaluating situations carefully before taking action (Bulach et al., 2006).

Study Organization

This study consists of five chapters. Chapter I introduces the study, states the problem, and presents the hypothesis. Chapter II is a review of relevant literature. Chapter III presents methodology, details the design of the study, subjects, instrument, procedures, and data analysis. Chapter IV states the results of the study. Chapter V is a discussion of the results and offers conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Chapter II begins with an analysis of leadership theories and how the theories are applied to schools. The review then presents Waters et al.'s (2003) Meta-analysis and the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors (Bulach et al., 2006). A summation of the relationship of Waters, et al.'s (2003) Meta-analysis to the Survey of Supervisory Behavior concludes the review.

Leadership Theory and Schools

Much is made of the term leadership. Leadership has been defined in many ways and in many contexts. Vroom and Jago (2007) state that, "One of the problems stems from the fact that the term leadership, despite its popularity, is not a scientific term with a formal, standardized definition" (p. 17). This lack of a formal definition leads researchers to use various models to reference leadership rather than a single definition from which to work.

There are certain roles and functions the head of any organization needs to fulfill to be successful. Those roles include directing the core processes of the organization and integrating functions such as staffing, finance, and external relations. In a school there may be additional requirements of a leader due to the school being a professionally staffed organization. (Morgan, Hall, & McKay, 1983).

Fidler (1997) noted that schools have some special features that may have implications for leadership at both theoretical and practical levels. Special features of a school are value-based outcomes such as character based initiatives and anti-bullying policies. Additionally, a school

organization commonly has a moral purpose. This moral purpose has been put into writing by some states and districts. Teachers' contracts may now contain clauses stating teachers must conduct themselves by state adopted teacher codes of conduct (Hughes, 1985). Failure to adhere to these codes of conduct can lead to termination and possible revocation of teacher licensure. Lastly, the core workforce is professional. All teachers at a school have completed degree programs and are highly trained in their respective pedagogy. The leader of a professionally staffed organization also needs to be the leading professional or at least a leading professional (Hughes, 1985). He or she must espouse professional values and possess appropriate professional knowledge and judgment (Fidler, 1997).

An additional study by Barnett and McCormick (2004) found that most of the variations in teachers' perceptions of leadership occurred at the teacher level, and a smaller but significant amount occurred at the school level. The researchers contended that this meant that each teacher perceived her or his leader uniquely and was less likely to be influenced by group views about leadership behavior and the leader. This statement is consistent with the challenge that leadership has as many definitions as people defining it.

Ask anyone who has had one or more years working in a school whether leadership has made a difference in his work and the answer will be an unhesitating "Yes." No matter whom the respondent is—teacher, custodian, education assistant, specialist, and office support staff—all seem to know effective and ineffective leadership when they experience it (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Furthermore, most people can identify particular behaviors of school leaders that they remember being effective. For example, they may recall discrete events where they felt supported working in a team or having a sense of freedom to challenge leaders in new and exciting ways. Whatever the circumstances, the individual, as part of a collective group working

in a school, has clear sensibilities about effective leadership when it happens (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008).

Support is especially important when looking at first-year teachers. Youngs (2007) found that first-year teachers need constant support, reinforcement, and guidance. If scored, these first year teachers would score fairly low on the follower readiness scale, based on the Situational Leadership Model (Blanchard & Hersey, 1969). Therefore, a school leader would need to be in constant contact with these teachers. Additionally, the researcher found that leaders, who want to retain a teacher for years to come, must meet teacher needs on the relationship side of the scale (Youngs, 2007).

If school leaders are going to work with people with varying views on leadership, leaders must be able to adapt to each person. The administrator also must be able to understand each context or background from which each person is coming. The leading factor in determining the culture of a school is the school principal. A strong administrator who incorporates a vision and involves everyone in the development of culture can make a huge impact (Reavis, Vinson, & Fox, 1999).

In looking at the school culture as a whole, it was found that leaders have as much effect negatively as they do positively on a school (Barnett & McCormick, 2004). This effect is derived in part by the leader's goals, vision, and the overall direction of the school. This research again emphasizes that if a school is to do well, the leader must be able to control various situations (Barnett & McCormick, 2004). Barnett and McCormick's (2004) research primarily focused on the negative aspects. A study by Reavis, Vinson, and Fox (1999) focused on positive aspects. The study showed that a school could be turned around in one year by a strong positive situational leader. The environment studied showed a 49 percent increase in the number of

students passing the state test in a one year's time. All results were tied back to the hiring of a new principal who worked with everyone in the school to change the school's culture. An ideal principal not only manages the school's day to day business affairs, but also provides leadership and direction (Reavis, et al., 1999).

Another common situation for school leaders is leading students. A recent study by Kruger, Witziers, and Slegers (2007) considered the relationship between school leadership and student achievement. Originally, the researchers thought that no relationship existed between school leaders and student achievement. However, it was found that a reciprocal relationship existed between students and strategic leadership (Kruger et al., 2007).

This reciprocal relationship is especially important in the era of No Child Left Behind. In addition to overall student population effects, recent evidence points to the potential for principals to have a significant direct relationship with the reading achievement of students with disabilities, and those who are not yet proficient in English (Nettles & Petscher, 2006). This relationship is especially true now that achievement data are routinely disaggregated by student groups. For many schools, small improvements within and among student subgroups can be the difference between making adequate yearly progress or not (Nettles & Herrington, 2007). With accountability tied directly back to student test scores, strong leadership is a necessity for school leader longevity.

Waters et al. (2003) *Meta-analysis*

In reviewing literature pertaining to the possible relationship between school leaders and student achievement, the most complete research assembled is a study by Waters et al. (2003). The three researchers conducted the study while working at Mid-Continent Regional

Educational Laboratory in Aurora, Colorado. McRel bills itself as a private, nonprofit corporation dedicated to making a difference in public education.

The data studied was compiled from examining 5,000 studies conducted since the early 1970s. Of those 5,000 studies, 70 studies met the following criteria for design, controls, data analysis, and rigor: Quantitative student achievement data; Student achievement measured on standardized, norm-referenced tests or some other objective measure of achievement; Student achievement as the dependent variable; Teacher perceptions of leadership as the independent variable. These 70 studies involved 2,894 schools approximately 1.1 million students, and 14,000 teachers (Waters et al., 2003).

All these studies were synthesized to reveal 21 specific leadership responsibilities significantly correlated with student achievement. Additionally, the researchers identified 66 practices which school leaders use to fulfill the 21 responsibilities that positively influence student achievement. The 21 responsibilities and their accompanying practices are:

1. Culture – fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation
2. Order – establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines
3. Discipline – protects teachers from issues and influences the would detract from their teaching time and focus
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 and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school’s attention

7. Knowledge of curriculum, Instruction assessment – fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation
8. Visibility – has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students
9. Contingent rewards – recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments
10. Communication – establishes strong lines of communication with teachers and among students
11. Outreach – is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders
12. Input – involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies
13. Affirmation – recognizes and celebrates school accomplishments and acknowledges failures
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. Ideals/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 in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems

21. Intellectual stimulation – ensures that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school's culture (Waters et al., 2003).

Waters et al. (2003) present these 21 leadership responsibilities as a process - not a cure - for all educational woes. The researchers admit that even if school leaders were to follow the 21 responsibilities, leaders still may have a negative impact on student achievement. These responsibilities are instrumental to attaining a positive effect on student achievement, but leaders must understand why this is important to student achievement, what they need to do with the information, how to proceed with implementation, and when they need to use various practices and strategies. Again, the 21 responsibilities are part of a systematic process.

However, if the process is followed; a leader is accessed by the staff, the leader reviews the results, the leader properly implements an orderly action plan; gains are found. To be more exacting, if a school leader moves one standard deviation after a second assessment the leader will have a correlated effect of .25 on the students. In the Waters et al. (2003) study the move of one standard deviation translated to a ten percentile jump in student achievement on standardized assessment. Again, the process can only begin by a school leader determining where they stand in relation to their staff.

Survey of Supervisory Behaviors

The Survey of Supervisory Behavior is the creation of Bulach et al. (2006). The study was derived when the researchers set out to create an instrument that focused on specific behaviors that if changed, would improve a school administrator's leadership ability. Researches noted that a positive score on the instrument should be accompanied by more positive faculty morale and higher test scores. This is especially important considering the authors of the survey

conclude that the instrument be used as a research tool to examine relationships between leadership behaviors and teacher morale, teacher efficacy, test scores, and overall school climate (Bulach et al., 2006).

The survey is broken into five sub-scales or domains: Control Leadership Domain, Conflict Leadership Domain, Instructional Leadership Domain, Trust Leadership Domain, and Human Relations Leadership Domain. Each domain is measured on the instrument by positive and negative behaviors based on how a principal interacts with the staff. The total number of behaviors on the instrument is 49. A discussion of each domain, the identified behaviors, and the relevant literature is presented below.

Control Leadership Domain

The idea of control in relation to this study is identified by the administrator's perceived behavior in the areas of: delegating responsibility, flexibility/rigidity, work expectations, duty assignment, paperwork requirements, emphasis on control, and use of the words "I" and "my" (Bulach et al., 2006).

This concept is consistent with that of Sergiovanni (1994) who stated that the traditional view of schools as formal organizations is a constraint on school improvement. Sergiovanni (1994) contends that schools should become professional communities. Furthermore, it is believed that if the school becomes a community the school will form a tight bond. A bond bound together through shared ideals and ideas. Sergiovanni (1994) states that the connection will be tight enough to transform schools from a collection of "I's" into a collection of "we."

Another aspect of the control leadership domain is the command-and-control leadership style. Command-and-control demonstrates low regard for the capability of teachers. In

schools with command-and-control leadership styles, positional power is concentrated in the office of administrators, who use their authority to discipline teachers by enforcing compliance with organizational directives. There is a rigid adherence to rules and policies such that little discretion is granted to teachers in the conduct of their work. Processes are designed to closely monitor teachers, and coercive means are used to ensure that potentially recalcitrant and irresponsible teachers do what the organization prescribes (Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

A large issue that comes into play with the control trait is the idea of trust. Effective administrators nurture teacher participation through the development of trust and respect in relationships with teachers (Blasé, 1987). Teachers more readily participate in decision making in relationships they perceive to be open. If they perceive a relationship with an administrator as closed or controlling, teachers are less likely to participate (Blasé, 1987).

Kouzes and Posner (1987) found that to gain trust and share control, leaders must make certain that people have the skills and knowledge needed to make good judgments, keep people informed, develop relationships among the players, involve people in important decisions, and acknowledge and give credit for people's contributions. In doing so, leaders create a feeling of influence and ownership among followers.

Another method employed to defuse control is distributed leadership. Distributed leadership enhances opportunities for the organization to benefit from the capacities of more of its members; it permits members to capitalize on the range of their individual strengths; and develops among organizational members a fuller appreciation of interdependence and how one's behavior affects the organization as a whole (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008).

Additionally, the increased self-determination arising from distributed leadership may improve members' experience of work. Such leadership allows members to better anticipate and

respond to the demands of the organization's environment. Solutions to organizational challenges may develop through distributed leadership that would unlikely emerge from individual sources (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008).

The final issue in control is the effect it has on students. Student needs are complex and they are constantly changing, thereby necessitating a perennial adaptation of strategies. Principals' attempts to improve performance outcomes by instituting standardized, one-size-fits-all procedures often backfire because they strip teachers of the discretion necessary to be responsive to diverse student needs.

Conflict Leadership Domain

The trait of conflict is identified by the administrator's perceived behavior in the areas of: keeping a confidence, questioning his/her superiors, passing the buck, having double standards, partiality to influential parents, favoritism to some teachers, and supporting teachers even if wrong (Bulach et al., 2006).

In researching mistreatment of teachers, Blasé and Blasé (2004) broke the mistreatment into three different levels. Level one was the least severe and level three the most severe. Blasé and Blasé's findings for category one mistreatment are consistent with the identifiers used by Bulach et al. (2006). Blasé and Blasé found that level one behaviors discussed by teachers included: stonewalling, nonsupport of teachers in regards to students and parents, ridicule of teachers in front of parents or students, withholding resources and denying opportunities, taking credit for teacher's accomplishments, favoritism, and rewarding select faculty while punishing select faculty.

In reviewing this domain, two main themes developed. The first was teacher job satisfaction and retention. This is an important consideration because there are relatively few

policy tools that local school administrators have the power to manipulate. The district usually controls things such as pay incentives and other formal retention efforts, so anything an administrator can do to change workplace conditions can aid in retention (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009). These findings are consistent with Cheek and Linsey (1986) who noted that tension and conflict can exist with teachers when principals assume or do not assume their roles. This is particularly important because these roles are important to a teacher's job effectiveness and satisfaction.

Littrell and Billingsley (1994) found that there is a gap between the amount of support teachers need and the amount they often receive. Additionally, teachers rated emotional support as the most important. The study also found that principals who are emotionally supportive are more likely to have teachers who are satisfied with their work. Additionally, emotional support provides teachers with a sense of belonging that motivates them to high performance and involvement.

The second theme to develop when researching the conflict domain is the health of teachers. This finding was reported by Litreell and Billingsley (1994) in considering the emotional support of teachers. Principals who were emotionally supportive were more likely to have teachers who are satisfied with their work. Also, teachers who reported more emotional support reported fewer health problems.

The types of health problems reported by teachers ranged from physical to psychological to social problems. Symptoms of psychological problems were: anger, rage, depression, powerlessness, distrust, guilt, shame, insecurity, and low self-esteem. Physical health problems were: headaches, backaches, sleep disorders, weight changes, heart arrhythmia,

substance abuse, ulcers, and suicide. Social symptoms were loss of friendships and isolation (Blasé & Blasé, 2004).

While this domain does present some serious problems, literature offers several possible solutions to limiting conflict and the harmful problems that can result from conflict. One method is by principals practicing tact, being able to interact with individuals with varied personalities, by showing respect and understanding, by motivating school personnel and pupils, and by working constantly to get along with the educators they like as well as dislike (Cheek & Lindsey, 1986).

Another method to relieving conflict is to provide an atmosphere of optimism and camaraderie rather than an environment of competition. Researchers deemed this as uniting the staff through a “we” approach rather than a hierarchical approach (Littrell & Billingsley, 1994). Juhasz (1990) found camaraderie and coworker support to be major factors in boosting teacher self-esteem and job satisfaction. Lastly, direct principal involvement can increase job satisfaction and resolve conflict. Direct involvement is greatly exhibited in instances when the principal deals with disruptive and difficult students. The involvement may include removing or punishing the student or communicating the rules to the offender (Kukla-Acevedo, 2009). Any variety of these approaches can aid principals in limiting conflict and increasing the health and job satisfaction of staff members.

Instructional Leadership Domain

The idea of instructional leadership in relation to this study is identified by the administrator’s perceived behavior in the areas of: interrupting teaching frequently, lacking of vision, knowledgeable about the curriculum, knowledgeable about instructional strategies, applying procedures consistently, shrugging off or devaluing a problem or concern, failing to

follow up, failing to always enforce rules, holding people accountable, and providing feedback regarding teaching (Bulach et al., 2006).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2001, as cited in Nettles & Herrington, 2007) defined instructional leadership as “leading learning communities” (p. 4). This definition views principals as facilitators, guiding and encouraging an educational environment in which administrators and teachers work collaboratively to diagnose and solve the problems facing their schools (Nettles & Herrington, 2007).

Studies of effective schools have identified five instructional leadership priorities of effective principals: (a) defining and communicating the school’s educational mission, (b) managing curriculum and instruction, (c) supporting and supervising teaching, (d) monitoring student progress, and (e) promoting a learning culture (Bateman & Bateman, 2001; Blasé & Kirby, 1992; Nettles & Herrington, 2007).

A central issue to school leader effectiveness is the promotion of meaningful dialogue. If a principal effectively communicates to staff members on instructional issues, school leaders enhance their leadership perspective. Research pointed to the performance expectations held by the principal as an important aspect of effective schools. Professional development can become beneficial in improving a school leader’s knowledge and comprehension of classroom methods. An additional practice associated with professional development that has been cited as being displayed by effective principals is the ability to acquire professional development resources for their school (Nettles & Harrington, 2007).

Instructional leadership also has been shown to influence student achievement through its affect on the development of professional learning communities (Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010). Professional learning communities are viewed as educators committed to

working collaboratively in an ongoing process of collective inquiry and action research often achieve better results for the students they serve. Professional learning communities operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for educators (Waters et al., 2003). The effect of professional learning communities as a part of instructional leadership is hardly surprising considering the arguments for shared leadership, which generally focus on expanding the sphere of responsibility and creativity to meet pressing needs (Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010). The principal's role in instructional leadership is still consistent, but the role changes in directing professional development in conjunction with the professional learning community. The principal is now a facilitator working with teachers to advance teachers professional development as a year round learning process (Louis, et al., 2010).

Trust Leadership Domain

This domain is blended in that trust is the overriding theme, but the decision making actions or methods of the administrators play a considerable role. Bulach et al. (2006) state that such behaviors as “making snap judgments” and “evaluates situations carefully before taking action” apparently can cause teachers not to trust the principal. Bulach (1993) stated “ability” was part of the trust construct. It would follow that if principals were to be perceived as making bad decisions, their ability would not be trusted. This would explain why trust and decision-making are in the same domain (Bulach et al., 2006).

Organizational trust has been examined in business and management settings for more than 30 years. An early study by Driscoll (1978) found that trust in decision-making capacity of the organization's leadership predicted overall satisfaction with the organization better than did employee participation in decision making. A more recent study examined changes in trust in

work teams and found that perceived ability of colleagues was a strong predictor of trust and that trust was a significant predictor for risk-taking behavior (Serva, Fuller, & Mayer, 2005).

Tarter, Bliss, and Hoy (1989) found that supportive principal behavior and faculty trust were significantly correlated in their sample of secondary schools and that schools with higher levels of engaged teachers (including commitment to students) had higher levels of trust in colleagues. The study implies that principals can build trust indirectly through supportive behavior, but they cannot make teachers trust one another through direct action (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008).

Another aspect related to trust is the component of relational trust. In this time of high-stakes accountability, principals and district administrators often feel vulnerable. Part of this vulnerability is related to how principals discern the beliefs and behaviors of others, especially superiors in the central office (Chhuon, Gilkey, Gonzalez, Daly, & Chrispeels, 2008). The same principle applies to the school level and how much teachers feel vulnerable in relating to principals. A bond of trust built on a relationship of respect and professionalism is essential to keeping a school from being low performing.

With the threat and potential sanctions of NCLB hanging over school leaders, the question is raised of whether the changes made to build trust are sufficiently far reaching (Chhuon et al., 2008). The leading factor in building trust is time, but time is also the biggest barrier to building trust. NCLB demands for results to be produced yearly. If trust must be established for results to prosper, school leaders may not last to see the results.

In addition, differential levels of trust can affect patterns of communication between levels of hierarchy. When one is interacting with a distrusted person within an organizational hierarchy – especially if that person holds more power – the goal of communication often

becomes the protection of one's interest and the reduction of one's anxiety rather than accurate transmission of ideas (Tschannen-Moran, 2009). Similarly, teachers in low-trust schools have described communication as being guarded in what they said – that they often blocked or distorted communication to avoid confrontation with colleagues and administrators (Tschannen-Moran, 2009).

Human Relations Leadership Domain

This domain, when studied by Bulach et al. (2006), garnered the greatest amount of variance. Some of the key descriptors were “my principal calls me by name,” “my principal uses eye contact,” and “my principal demonstrates a caring attitude.” Bulach et al. (2006) contend that practicing the behaviors in the human relations' domain is a very important leadership skill. Additionally, when it comes to human relations, there is a need to decrease the use of negative behaviors and increase the use of positive behaviors.

Scotti (2001) approached human relations in schools from the aspect of subordinates. In framing his research he states that feedback and participation in decision making have been shown to be predictors of variables related to the domains of school productivity and human relations. Scotti (2001) found that teacher experience and teacher age accounted for a significant percentage of the variance in the subordinates' perceptions of the leadership performance. The older and more experienced a teacher was the less discrepancy they had with a principal. This could be due to those teachers being around the principal more or having a better understanding of the top down bureaucracy that can happen in the education system. If this is the case, then principals may be better served to educate young teachers on the issues principals face and some of the restraints placed upon principals by administrators.

Scotti (2001) derived three main themes in his research. The first theme Scotti (2001) derived was teacher evaluation of a principal's leadership performance can indicate and predict variables relating to human relations, productivity, and administrative tenure. Second, teacher feedback is a valuable tool for providing constructive feedback for school improvement. Third, principals must integrate and use the feedback for the data to be successful. Principals adept at gathering information formally or informally from subordinates will improve a school and strengthen ties with teachers.

Roby (2010) found several issues in human relations that lead to a negative school climate and view of leadership; teachers who felt isolated, had no opportunities for informal leadership, felt a lack of trust, no personal relationships, and lack of support all rated leadership and climate poorly. Roby's findings are consistent with Carter and Osler (2000) who noted a current restricted state of participation doesn't allow input in shaping an institution. Those involved in the organization appear to lack confidence or skills to effect meaningful change.

To combat these issues, Roby (2010) cited the need for having a communication and relationship audit. In initiating open dialogue to tackle key issues that are confirmed by the audit, teachers would be given a chance to discuss potentially negative aspects of school culture and leadership. Additionally, leaders can create a professional focus, involve teachers in decision making, and develop a community of learners. Teachers can enact change by becoming proactive, participating in two-way mentoring, and creating an atmosphere of sincere interest in helping coworkers. Teachers have the potential to have a dramatic impact in school leadership. By taking a positive leadership role, it can create a continuous learning environment for all.

The Relationship of Waters, Marzano, and McNulty to Bulach, Boothe, and Pickett

Two studies were highlighted in reviewing the literature due to their significance to this study. The first study conducted by Waters et al. (2003) shows a direct correlation between school leadership and student achievement at the .25 level. The .25 correlation translates into a ten percentile jump in student achievement on standardized assessments. The second study highlighted was conducted by Bulach et al. (2006). The researchers derived a survey instrument that can be utilized to measure behaviors principals use while supervising subordinates. The use or failure to use these behaviors creates a certain leadership style that positively or negatively affects the supervisory climate and learning environment. A positive score on this instrument should be accompanied by a more positive faculty morale and school climate.

The Waters et al. (2003) study was framed by leadership behaviors and practices while the Bulach et al. (2006) study was framed by domains and behaviors. The important ideal is the compatibility to one another. Appendix A shows the Water et al. (2003) study identifiers and their relation to the Bulach et al. (2006) study identifiers. While there is not always a direct match in the wording, the similarities in the study are identifiable. Additionally, some of the practices identified are applicable across multiple leadership behavior domains.

Waters et al. (2003) derived the following criteria for design, controls, data analysis, and rigor: Quantitative student achievement data; Student achievement measured on standardized, norm-referenced tests or some other objective measure of achievement; Student achievement as the dependent variable; Teacher perceptions of leadership as the independent variable. By using the survey developed by Bulach et al. (2006), this study will use QDI score as our quantitative student achievement data measured on a standardized, norm-referenced test and as the dependent variable. Additionally, the school leaders score on the survey instrument as perceived by staff

members will be the independent variable. Bulach et al. (2006) may not be directly measuring student achievement, but by setting the design of the study in the same frame as Waters et al. (2003) the researcher will be able to determine if a relationship does exist between Bulach et al. (2006) and student achievement.

Conclusion

A review of the research literature related to principal leadership styles and student achievement highlighted several important findings. The first finding being that principal leadership is a multi-faceted endeavor. School leaders must be able to not only meet managerial needs but also meet the personal and emotional needs of teachers. Additionally, the success of a teacher, student, and ultimately the school are dependent on the degree or level to which the principal meets individual needs. The second finding is that an analysis needs to be conducted to find what areas or ways a school leader may be deficient. Data from a school leadership analysis can be used to develop a professional development program for school leaders. A tailored professional development program creates a win-win situation for improving school leadership and student achievement.

This study will examine if a relationship exists between staff perceptions of school leaders' leadership abilities and student achievement as measured by the Quality of Distribution Index score in public schools in a region of a rural Southern state. Chapter III, Methodology, outlines the quantitative study, the research design, population and sampling, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis. Chapter IV states the results of the study. Chapter V is a discussion of the results and offers conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research methodology used in conducting this study to determine whether a relationship exists between student achievement and principal's leadership behavior as perceived by the teachers, using the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors. The research procedures are divided into five categories: (1) research design, (2) population and sampling, (3) instrumentation, (4) data collection, and (5) data analysis.

Research Design

The research design used a web-based survey instrument to determine the perceived leadership behaviors of school leaders. Eleven schools, five county and six city schools, consisting of grades five through eight, in a rural southern state were invited to participate in the study. Participating schools did not have to have all four grades, but had to be a self-contained school only housing students in those grade ranges. Each participating school was emailed an individualized link to the survey instrument (Appendix B). Details of the instrument are found in this chapter in the instrumentation section.

Teachers at each participating school were asked to complete the survey instrument. In using the survey instrument, the study is termed descriptive in nature, and the research is correlational in nature. In this study, each principal will have a mean score for each subset on the questionnaire and a mean score for the complete instrument. Through the use of correlational methods, each subset score and instrument score was compared to student achievement on the

MCT2 as expressed through the Quality Distribution Index score to determine if a relationship existed.

Population and Sampling

The population for this study consisted of all stand alone middle schools in the northeast corner of a rural southern U.S. state. The researcher used purposeful criterion sampling to identify eleven schools for participation in the study. The most limiting criterion was that all schools had to be within ten percentage points of each other in the poverty category. Poverty is based on the number of students who receive free and reduced lunch. The significance of poverty to education and particularly assessment was highlighted in the latest National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) report. NAEP (2013) data found that students eligible for free and reduced lunch did significantly worse on the tests than students not eligible for free and reduced lunch. Thus, the researcher selected schools within ten percentage points in the poverty demographic, to prevent this phenomenon from affecting the study. Next, schools had to consist of grades five through eight or some variation of those grades. The formula for calculating QDI at a standalone middle school is different than the formula for calculating the QDI for a K-12 school or high school. With QDI being the dependent variable, it was essential all were calculated the same. Last, schools were selected based on student enrollment. Student enrollment was used for two purposes. The first being that schools with similar enrollment will have a comparable number of staff members since class sizes have a maximum number of allowable students per classroom. Second, a schools' QDI is calculated by the percentage of students that score in one of four categories (advanced, proficient, basic, minimal). In selecting schools with similar student populations, it prevented the percentages from being skewed due to the student population. The sample for this study originally consisted of eleven middle schools. Three

superintendents and one principal chose not to participate in the study, one school was omitted due to small response rate, and another was omitted due to ethical concerns. A final sample size consisted of five schools. Table 1 displays the student data for the selected schools.

Table 1

Demographics of Schools Selected for Study

School	a~	b	c	d	e	f~	g^	h^	i	j^	k^
Female*	47	45	49	55	46	50	48	49	46	47	53
Male*	53	55	51	45	54	50	52	51	54	53	47
Asian*	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	3	0
Black*	31	27	13	9	2	45	35	37	27	43	25
Hispanic*	9	6	6	6	1	3	1	4	1	3	6
Native American*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White*	60	66	80	86	97	49	63	58	72	50	69
Multi-Racial*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poverty*	53	50	45	48	47	46	53	49	48	44	49
QDI	190	186	165	187	177	171	179	180	169	182	208

Note. *Shown as percent of students ^Superintendent or principal chose not to participate
 ~omitted

All data was coded for the protection of the individual schools. Each teacher anonymously submitted responses to the survey. Data was only coded in relation to the school. Anonymity was assured to protect the subject from fear of repercussions and to ensure responses were not altered. The researcher took precautions to ensure no harm to the subject or schools involved in the study.

An incentive of a \$25 gift card per school was offered to participating teachers by the researcher. Anyone wishing to be eligible for a gift card entered their email address, after they had completed the survey instrument. Email addresses entered were housed in a separate file from survey responses to ensure anonymity was maintained at all times, and data could not be back tracked.

Non-respondents were emailed a follow-up reminder on the seventh and fourteenth day of the study. The study concluded twenty-one days after it was initiated. This was consistent with research by Ladner (2001) that showed web-based responses are greatest in the first seven days of the study, and subside after the twenty-first day. The study targeted eleven schools to study, but three superintendents and one principal chose not to participate. The study was completed in seven schools. Table 2 shows the response rates of the participating schools.

Table 2

Response Rates

School	Number of Teachers	Respondents	Response Rate
b	26	13	50%
c	15	8	53.33%
d	25	14	56%
e	22	14	63.63%
i	31	11	35.48%
Study	119	60	50.42%

Instrumentation

This study was a new application of the research and instrumentation conducted by Bulach et al. (2006). The survey instrument was the Survey of Supervisory Behavior (Appendix C) derived by Bulach et al. (2006). The researcher of this study received prior permission from Bulach et al. (2006) for the use of the survey instrument (Appendix D).

The instrument was constructed while the researchers were at the University of West Georgia. The researchers collected data from 375 graduate students in the educational leadership program. Students were asked to list the mistakes their principals made. The mistakes that occurred most frequently tended to be in the area of human relations and interpersonal communications (Bulach et al., 2006). These findings are supported by the research of Bulach

and Peterson (2001) that found teachers are not open or trusting with administrators that do not listen.

The instrument consists of 49 positive and negative behaviors. Respondents are asked to respond on a Likert five-point scale ranging from “never” to “always” in terms of how frequently their principal practiced each behavior. A response of “never” was scored as a 1.0; “seldom” was scored as 2.0; “sometimes” was scored as a 3.0; “often” was scored as a 4.0; and “always” was scored as a 5.0. Negative behaviors were reverse scored (Bulach et al., 2006). If a school leader is using all behaviors in the most desired way, the leader will achieve a score of 5.0 on the instrument. The lowest a school leader could possibly score on the instrument is 1.0.

A factor analysis was used to analyze the data and determine how many factors were being measured by the instrument. A factor analysis revealed that nine factors account for 64% of the variance in the instrument. Four of the factors that accounted for smaller amounts of variance were consolidated with other factors reducing the instrument to five factors. The five factors were the following: human relations, trust/decision making, instructional leadership, control, and conflict (Bulach et al., 2006).

A Cronbach alpha was computed on each subset. The human relations domain yielded a +.86 coefficient; trust/decision making domain a +.84 coefficient; instructional leadership a +.85; control domain a +.83 coefficient; conflict domain a +.81 coefficient. A correlation coefficient of +.95 was obtained indicating the instrument has excellent reliability. Additionally, the instrument was replicated in an unpublished study by Bulach. In that study, a Pearson correlation of +.984 was found between principal leadership style and overall school climate (Bulach et al., 2006).

Quality of Distribution Index (QDI) served as the dependent value for this study.

Students are tested in the areas of language arts, mathematics, and science. A total of six tests are

used in calculating QDI. The six tests are reading, English, math, science, Algebra I, and Biology I. Reading and English tests are taken as separate parts but combined for one category – language arts. Algebra I includes students who take Algebra I in the eighth grade and students who take Algebra I in the ninth grade. Ninth grade students taking the test are back mapped to middle school. High school students Biology I test scores are also back mapped to middle school.

QDI is calculated by the percentage of students scoring in one of four categories of achievement; advanced, proficient, basic, and minimal. To achieve QDI points, each category is assigned a value. Minimal is 0, basic is 1, proficient is 2, and advanced is 3. A perfect QDI is 300, ie. 100% advanced multiplied by 3 equals 300. An example of QDI calculation is: a school has a total of 1,350 tests taken and 93 of those tests are in the minimal category, then 6.9% are minimal. If 17.3% are basic, 52.3% are proficient, and 23.50 are advanced, then $17.3 \times 1 = 17.3$, $52.3 \times 2 = 104.6$, and $23.5 \times 3 = 70.5$. The values are then summed and round to the whole number, $17.3 + 104.6 + 70.5 = 192.4$. Therefore, the QDI for our example middle school is 192.

Data Collection

The survey instruments were administered using the internet via a link distributed in informational emails specific to each school. The emails (Appendix B) introduced the survey and contained a link to take respondents to the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors. Non-respondents were emailed a follow-up reminder (Appendix E) on the seventh and fourteenth day of the study. The study concluded twenty-one days after it was initiated. The data was then transferred from the web hosting site to SPSS Version 22.0 for analysis by the researcher.

Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using SPSS Version 22.0 statistical software. Descriptive statistics were derived for each section of the survey instruments and the survey instrument as a whole. QDI scores for each school were retrieved from the state department of education website. The demographic data was analyzed using percentages and frequencies.

The following null hypotheses were tested in this study:

H₀-1: There is no significant relationship between instructional staff members' perceptions of administrative leadership behaviors as measured by the cumulative score on the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-2: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Human Relations domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-3: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Trust/Decision Making domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-4: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Instructional Leadership domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-5: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Control domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-6: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Conflict domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

A correlation was computed based on the mean score for the whole instrument and QDI for each school. Subsequent correlations were computed using mean scores for each domain and QDI for each school. The correlation determined to what level the survey instrument and school QDI have a positive or negative relationship or association. In all hypotheses, the instrument score, mean score, and ODI are all continuous and linear variables. A Pearson r is the appropriate calculation when the relationship between two variables is linear (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996).

Conclusion

The methodologies presented in this chapter are the processes the researcher followed to conduct the study. The statistical data derived from the study are explained in Chapter IV. A summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations are found in Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the findings of the research conducted to determine whether a relationship exists between teachers' perceptions of school leadership and student achievement as measured by the Quality Distribution Index. The chapter describes (1) null hypothesis, (2) population demographics, (3) results of hypothesis, and (4) summary.

Null Hypothesis

The researcher at the onset of the research project determined a research purpose. The researcher wanted to determine whether a relationship, if any, existed between the perceived leadership behaviors of middle school principals and student achievement. After a review of the literature in Chapter II, the researcher developed the research purpose into hypotheses. The following hypotheses were tested in this study:

H₀-1: There is no significant relationship between instructional staff members' perceptions of administrative leadership behaviors as measured by the cumulative score on the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-2: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Human Relations domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-3: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Trust/Decision Making domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-4: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Instructional Leadership domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-5: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Control domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

H₀-6: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Conflict domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

Sample Demographics

A group of eleven schools were originally selected to participate in the study. In the recruitment process, three schools were removed due to superintendents declining to participate in the study. One school was removed due to the principal of a school declining to participate in the study, one school was omitted due to small response rate, and another was omitted due to ethical concerns.. The final sample size consisted of five schools. The number of teachers for the participating schools was 119 with a respondent number of 60 for a response rate of 50.42%.

Table 3

Response Rates

School	Teachers	Respondents	Response Rate
b	26	13	50%
c	15	8	53.33%
d	25	14	56%
e	22	14	63.63%
i	31	11	35.48%
Study	119	60	50.42%

A subset of five questions was used to determine the demographics of the respondents.

The five areas questioned were: 1) highest degree, 2) length of employment at school, 3) number of years teaching, 4) ethnicity, and 5) teaching in subject area.

The first demographic subset, highest degree, revealed that of the 60 participants in the study 29 held a Bachelors degree. This was the highest percentage, 48.33%, of all degrees held. The next closet category was Masters degree, which consisted of 27 participants or 45.00% of respondents.

Table 4

Degree Level

Degree	Number	Percent
Bachelors	29	48.33%
Masters	27	45.00%
Specialist	3	5.00%
Doctorate	0	0%
Other	1	1.67%
Total	60	100%

The second demographic subset surveyed was the length of employment at the respondent's current school. In this demographic, the highest two areas were six to ten years and eleven plus years. These two categories combined for 71.66% of the entire demographic.

Table 5

Experience at School

Time at School	Number	Percent
Less than one year	3	5.00%
1 year but less than 2 years	2	3.33%
2-5 years	12	20.00%
6-10 years	26	43.33%
11+ years	17	28.33%
Total	60	100%

An overwhelming 49 of the 60 participants had been in the teaching profession for six or more years. The largest percentage had taught for 11 to 20 years. This category was followed by the categories six to ten years and 21 plus years of teaching.

Table 6

Teaching Experience

Number of years teaching	Number	Percent
First year	1	1.66%
1 year but less than 2 years	0	0.00%
2-5 years	10	16.66%
6-10 years	15	25.00%
11-20 years	21	35.00%
21+ years	13	21.66%
Total	60	100%

Ethnicity was dramatically slanted towards White. White participants accounted for 95% of those responding. Black participants accounted for the other 5% of respondents.

Table 7

Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Number	Percent
Black	3	5.00%
White	57	95.00%
Hispanic	0	0.00%
American Indian	0	0.00%
Other	0	0.00%
Total	60	100%

The final demographic category focused on the percentage of respondents teaching in their respective subject areas. It was found the 91.66% of the respondents did teach within their subject area, while 8.33% of respondents did not teach within their subject areas.

Table 8

Teaching in Subject Area

Teaching in Subject Area	Number	Percent
Yes	55	91.66%
No	5	8.33%
Total	60	100%

Results of Hypothesis

The researcher used the Survey of Supervisory Behavior to attain the perceptions of instructional staff members in regard to administrative leadership. The survey instrument is comprised of five domains: human relations, trust/decision making, instructional leadership, control, and conflict. A score was calculated for each domain and for the entire instrument. The domain and instrument scores were then measured against school QDI to determine if a relationship existed. The scores for each domain, the instrument, and school QDI are listed in Table 9.

Table 9

Mean Scores and QDI

	b	c	d	e	i
Human	4.75	4.22	4.12	4.39	3.63
Trust	4.67	4.25	4.12	4.39	3.94
Instructional	4.64	4.21	3.91	4.60	4.15
Control	4.67	4.35	4.16	4.27	3.64
Conflict	4.64	4.34	3.83	4.27	3.91
Instrument	4.67	4.27	4.03	4.38	3.85
QDI	186	165	187	177	169

Because there was no attempt by the researcher to control or manipulate the variables, a Pearson’s r correlation was used to identify any relationships. Correlations do not identify cause and effect relationships, but identify whether a relationship exists and to what extent (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003).

A perfect correlation in a positive direction is +1.00 and a perfect negative correlation is -1.00. A correlation from .90 to 1.00 or -.90 to -1.00 is deemed to have a very high correlation. A high correlation will range from .70 to .90 or -.70 to -.90. Moderate correlations compute from .50 to .70 or -.50 to -.70. Correlations ranging from .30 to .50 positive or negative are considered to have a low correlation. Low correlations are from .00 to .30 and .00 to -.30 (Hinkle, et al., 2003).

The first hypothesis tested was:

H₀-1: There is no significant relationship between instructional staff members’ perceptions of administrative leadership behaviors as measured by the cumulative score on the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

The correlation analysis measured the relationship of Survey of Supervisory Behavior instrument mean score and QDI score. Results of a Pearson correlation ($r=.362$ $p=.530$) were not significant at the .05 level showing no correlation between the Survey of Supervisory Behavior instrument and QDI. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Table 10

Survey Instrument and QDI

Measure	Coefficient
Pearson Correlation	.362
Sig. (2-tailed)	.530
N	5

The second hypothesis tested was:

H₀-2: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Human Relations domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

The correlation analyzed teachers' perception of school leadership in the human relations domain and QDI. Results of a Pearson correlation ($r=.527$ $p=.332$) were not significant at the .05 level showing no correlation between the human relations domain and QDI. The null hypothesis is not rejected.

Table 11

Human Relations Domain

Measure	Coefficient
Pearson Correlation	.527
Sig. (2-tailed)	.332
N	5

A correlation was computed for the third hypothesis:

H₀-3: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Trust/Decision Making domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

Results of a Pearson correlation ($r=.457$ $p=.414$) were not significant at the .05 level.

While the correlation was deemed moderately positive, it cannot be deemed as having a relationship due to not being significant. The null hypothesis is not rejected.

Table 12

Trust Domain

Measure	Coefficient
Pearson Correlation	.457
Sig. (2-tailed)	.414
N	5

The fourth hypothesis tested was:

H₀-4: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Instructional Leadership domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

The correlation analysis was between teachers' perception of school leadership in the instructional domain and QDI. Results of a Pearson correlation ($r=.117$ $p=.846$) were not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis is not rejected.

Table 13

Instructional Domain

Measure	Coefficient
Pearson Correlation	.117
Sig. (2-tailed)	.846
N	5

A fifth hypothesis tested was:

H₀-5: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Control domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

The results of a Pearson correlation ($r=.441$ $p=.433$) between the control domain and QDI were not significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Table 14

Control Domain

Measure	Coefficient
Pearson Correlation	.441
Sig. (2-tailed)	.433
N	5

The sixth and final hypothesis studied was:

H₀-6: There is no significant relationship between school leaders' scores on the Conflict domain sections of the Survey of Supervisory Behaviors and student achievement as measured by school Quality of Distribution Index score.

The correlation analysis measured teachers' perception of school leadership in the conflict domain and QDI. Results of a Pearson correlation ($r=.069$ $p=.909$) were not significant at the .05 level. Even if the correlation had been statistically significant, the correlation would still show little to no relationship between conflict and QDI. The null hypothesis is not rejected.

Table 15

Conflict Domain

Conflict	QDI
Pearson Correlation	.069
Sig. (2-tailed)	.909
N	5

Summary

The purpose of this research was to determine whether relationships exist between instructional staff members' perceptions of administrative leadership behaviors and student achievement. A total of 60 participants rated administrators using the Survey of Supervisory Behavior. The survey instrument was comprised of five domains. All five domains and the instrument were correlated with QDI to determine if relationships exist.

Respondents' to this study were teachers from a rural southern state. Of the respondents, 48.33% held a Bachelors degree. The amount of time respondents had at their current school was slanted heavily to six years or more with 81.66% of the population. The respondents were a moderately veteran group. 34 of the 60 respondents fell between eleven and twenty years of teaching experience, the highest of all categories. The most dramatic demographic finding was in ethnicity. 57 of the 60 respondents identified as White. Lastly, 91.66% of participants were found to be teaching in their subject area.

None of the five domains were found to be statically significant in relation to QDI. Additionally, the Survey of Supervisory Behavior Instrument was not found to be statistically significant in relation to QDI. Therefore, all six of the null hypotheses were not rejected.

Chapter V will provide further discussion, conclusions, and recommendations of the findings outlined in this chapter.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether a relationship exists between teachers' perceptions of school administrators' leadership behaviors as measured by the Survey of Supervisory Behavior and student assessment as measured by the Quality of Distribution Index. Chapter V provides a summary of the study and addresses directions for future research. The chapter consists of the following sections: a) summary, b) conclusions, and c) recommendations.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between teacher perception of principals' leadership behaviors and student achievement. Previous studies by Waters, et al. (2003) showed a direct correlation between school leadership and student achievement at the .25 level. Waters, et al.'s research was then paired with the instrument developed by Bulach, Boothe, and Pickett (2006). Bulach's instrument is applicable in that the instrument measures the behaviors of principals as perceived by supervised subordinates. These two studies create the framework and mechanics for the basis of the research study.

The Survey of Supervisory Behavior (Bulach et al., 2006) was used to measure the teachers' perception of leadership behaviors displayed by their principals. The survey attained perceptions in five different domains; control, conflict, instructional leadership, trust, and human relations. The school Quality of Distribution Index score was attained as a universal standard of

student achievement. Descriptive statistics were used to present the characteristics of the schools.

The Pearson r correlation was used to examine if a relationship existed between the principals' score on the Survey of Supervisory Behavior, the five leadership domains, and school QDI. The five domains were found to not be statistically significant in relation to QDI. Additionally, the Survey of Supervisory Behavior Instrument was found to not be statistically significant in relation to QDI.

Conclusions

In developing conclusions, the researcher first reviewed the research process of the study. As shown in table 1, the researcher initially started with eleven schools to be studied but that number was reduced to five. The school identified as a was dismissed from the study due to school a being the researcher's school. Additionally, school a should have been excluded from the initial population due to school a being the researcher's school. School f had a response rate of 8.3%, but was excluded from the statistical analysis. The school does meet the criteria set forth by the researcher; however, if the school is to be included, a higher response rate should be attained. The researcher should have worked to ensure a larger sample size or determined if inclusion of the entire population would have been more appropriate for the study.

The researcher determined that the study would have been greatly strengthened by broadening the population of the study. In limiting the population to a small geographic footprint of the state, it severely limited the ability to generalize the study to a broader population. If the entire state had been sampled, the researcher could have used the state demographics as parameters for purposeful sampling. Broadening the scope or population of the study also would have aided in increasing the response rate leading to a better analysis of the hypothesis.

The overall response rate for the study was 50.42%. While the researcher did follow up with two reminders, a better response may have been achieved through direct contact with the teachers. The researcher chose to contact administrators and have administrators forward emails to teachers. The researcher believed that an email coming from administrators to teachers would encourage participation. This may be true, but having an email coming from an administrator asking teachers to rate that administrator could have the opposite effect as well. In future research, the researcher will request or collect the email addresses' of staff members and engage in direct contact.

One anomaly brought forth in analyzing the demographic data is 95% of the respondents identified their ethnicity as White. This is in comparison to an average of 80.2% of the student population identifying as White. As equally intriguing, 5% of respondents identified as Black while an average of 15.6% of the student population identified as Black. These discrepancies in teacher and student racial percentages are worth further research.

The first hypothesis was not rejected due to the Pearson r correlation not being significant at the .05 level. This finding coincides with the previous conclusion by the researcher that the population for the study should have been larger. If the results of the study had remained constant and the researcher had a sample size of 24, then the null hypothesis would have been rejected. The researcher recommends increasing the size of the study for a better analysis of the hypothesis.

A review of the correlation between each of the domain areas and school QDI showed no significant relationship. However, closer analysis revealed that in the human relations domain, trust domain, and control domain a significant relationship is achievable if results remain constant in a sample size of 22 schools. The instructional domain ($r=.117$) and conflict domain

($r=.069$) showed the least possibilities of being statistically significant even in a larger sample. A statewide population and a larger sample size for better analysis of the hypothesis are recommended in a replicated study.

A replicated study performed by the researcher would consist of first defining a population of all the stand alone middle schools in an entire state. In defining the population as all middle schools in a state, the researcher could then employ random sampling for selection of study participants. A minimum sample size would be derived from the population number to ensure the sample is truly representative of the population. Additionally, the researcher would ensure that the sample size would provide enough data for proper analysis of the hypothesis.

The researcher would again make contact with the superintendent and principals for permission, but would request that the email addresses of teachers be forwarded to the researcher. If emails could not be provided to the researcher, the researcher would try to collect emails through school websites. If both methods are not available, the researcher would resort to paper and pencil methodology. The researcher would make initial and follow-up contact with the teachers directly. Additionally, the researcher could monitor response rates to determine if other issues may be playing a role in teachers not responding. The researcher would maintain the study run for same length of time.

A web hosting site would again be used for data collection and SPSS would again be used for analysis. All six hypotheses would remain as written, and a Pearson r at the .05 level would remain the standard. Results could then be interpreted to see if a statistical significance does exist. Additionally, the researcher would compare results back to this study to see what similarities and differences exist.

The researcher deems that the Survey of Supervisory Behavior should not be used as a standalone tool to aid in improving a schools' QDI. A positive school climate and positive relationships between leaders and teachers are all vital components to a successful school. The Survey of Supervisory Behavior is valid as a research tool to examine relationships between school leadership behaviors and teacher morale, teacher efficacy, and overall school climate (Bulach et al., 2006).

Additionally, the instrument could be as Bulach et al. (2006) states as a pro-active practice to gather self-analysis data regarding the impact of leadership behavior on the supervisory climate. It also could be used by principals who are having problems creating a healthy supervisory climate. By using the instrument and compiled data, professional development plans can be made that target specific needs of administrators not generalities (Bulach et al., 2006).

Barnett and McCormick (2004) found that in looking at school culture, as a whole, administrators have as much effect negatively as they do positively. A strong administrator who incorporates a vision and involves everyone in the development of culture can make a huge impact (Reavis, et al., 1999). Thus, we cannot totally disregard school culture nor make it the entire focus. Culture must be incorporated as part of total or whole school improvement.

The idea of whole school improvement is a central theme in the research of Waters et al. (2003). Effective leaders understand how to balance pushing for change while at the same time, protecting aspects of culture, values, and norms worth preserving. Effective leaders know which policies, practices, resources, and incentives to align and how to align them with organizational priorities (Waters et al., 2003).

Waters et al. (2003) meta-analysis consists of 21 research based responsibilities, including culture, and associated practices that are significantly associated with student achievement. By combining the responsibilities with associated practices in an organized framework, we begin to have balanced leadership that affects student achievement (Waters et al., 2003).

Recommendations

Although the study may not have unlocked a new resource, the information does reinforce four ideas: leadership is multi-faceted, many variables must be taken into account when leading a school, all tools used in education should be data driven, and any instrument used by a school leader should match the needs of the school and school leader.

As seen with Waters et al. (2003) 21 different responsibilities are put before school leaders that affect student achievement. A leader does many types of work, and is in a constant swing between the relationship and task side of the Situational Leadership Model (Blanchard & Hersey, 1969). Leaders must ensure that the personal needs of the staff are being met as well as the task needs of the organization are being met.

The multi-faceted nature of leadership is also why it is never clearly defined, but most commonly expressed in a model. Vroom and Jago (2007) state it best that leadership is not a scientific term with a formal, standardized definition. Therefore the act of leadership must take on many acts and not just one role.

Fidler (1997) found schools have special features at theoretical and practical levels, due to certain outcomes as character based initiatives and anti-bullying policies. Also, school leaders need to be the leading professionals in their fields, due to having a professional staff (Hughes, 1985). Barnett and McCormick (2004) found that most of the variations in teachers' perceptions

of leadership occurred at the teacher level, and a smaller but significant amount occurred at the school level. The building of relations and professional learning communities within a school help build strong instructional staffs and ensure teacher retention (Youngs, 2007; Sergiovanni, 1994).

Data driven decision making in education refers to teachers, principals, and administrators systematically collecting and analyzing various types of data, including input, process, outcome and satisfaction data, to guide a range of decisions to help improve the success of students and schools. Achievement test data, in particular, play a prominent role in federal and state accountability policies (Marsh, Pane, & Hamilton, 2006). Data has become the measuring stick in the quantification of school success. An educator's ability to interpret data and manage data is the next act in the multifaceted role of school leadership.

In using data, school leaders should be careful in using data from instruments that do not measure their intended outcomes. In this study, the Survey of Supervisory Behavior was looked upon as a tool to measure student achievement. In turn, it only measures one portion of the entire process of student achievement. As more instruments become available for use in education, pairing the correct instrument with the intended measurement will remain vital.

A school leader wishing to increase student achievement must first be able to self-evaluate their performance using teacher feedback. Second, a school administrator must be able to use the data as a guide for self improvement and to strengthen areas through the use of professional development.

In relation to the use of the Survey of Supervisory Behavior, a school leader should use the instrument as an annual self-evaluation tool of school culture. Waters et al. (2003) found five practices associated with culture: 1) Promotes cooperation among staff; 2) Promotes a sense of

well being; 3) Promotes cohesion among staff; 4) Develops a shared understanding of purpose, and; 5) Develops a shared vision of what the school could be like. Waters et al. (2003) then take the practices a step further in noting that knowledge of the practices is not enough. Effective leaders understand both the order of change they are leading and how to select and skillfully use appropriate leadership practices (Waters et al., 2003).

A first order change may be incremental, linear, marginal, or even an extension of the past. In contrast, a second order change may be complex, nonlinear, a disturbance of every element in a system, or a total break with the past (Waters et al., 2003). A first order change to culture may be accomplished by simply using the first three practices listed above. However, for second order changes a school leader may have to work far more deeply with staff and the community by using the later two practices to convey understanding of the overall purposes of schooling and the proposed changes (Waters et al., 2003).

The average correlation between all 21 responsibilities and student achievement was .25 (Waters et al., 2003). Waters et al. (2003) found the correlation between culture and student achievement to be .29. A school leader can implement the Survey of Supervisory Behavior as an early indicator of what is happening to a school's culture and climate and eventually student achievement (Bulach et al., 2006). School leaders can then determine what practices from Waters et al. (2003) need to be applied and whether change will be first or second order. In knowing what, how, when, and why to implement change, school leaders can be more successful.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to Research in Education*. 5th Ed. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Barnett, K., & McCormick, J. (2004). Leadership and individual principal-teacher relationships in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40 (3), 406 – 434.
- Bateman, D., & Bateman, C.F. (2001). *A principal's guide to special education*. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Bigley, G. A., & J. L. Pearce. (1998). Straining for Shared Meaning in Organization Science: Problems of Trust and Distrust. *Academy of Management Review* 23 (3) 405-421.
- Blanchard, K. H., & Hersey, P. (1969). Life-Cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*.
- Blasé, J. (1987). Dimensions of effective school leadership: The teacher's perspective. *American Educational Research Journal*, 24, 589-610.
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (2004). School principal mistreatment of teachers: Teachers' perspectives on emotional abuse. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 4(3/4), 151-175.
- Blasé, J., & Kirby, P.C. (1992, December). The power of praise – A strategy for effective principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, pp. 69-77.
- Bulach, C. R. (1993). A measure of openness and trust. *People in Education*, 1(4), 382-392.

- Bulach, C. R., Boothe, D., & Pickett, W. (August 21, 2006). Analyzing the leadership behavior of school principals. In National Council of the Professors of Educational Administration. Retrieved from <http://cnx.org/content/m13813/1.1/>.
- Carter, C., & Osler, A. (2000). Human rights, identities and conflict management: a study of school culture as experienced through classroom relationships. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(3), 335-356.
- Cheek, E. H., & Lindsey, J. D. (1986). Principal's roles and teacher conflict: A recapitulation. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 19(5), 280-284.
- Chhuon, V., Gilkey, E. M., Gonzalez, M., Daly, A. J., & Chrispeels, J. H. (2008). The little district that could: The process of building district-school trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(2), 227-281.
- Driscoll, J. W. (1978) Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 21, 44-56.
- Fidler, B. (1997). School leadership: Some key ideas. *School Leadership & Management*, 17 (1), 23 – 37.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Hilliard, A. G. (2000). Excellence in education versus high-stakes standardized testing. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(4), 293–304.
- Hughes, M. (1985). Leadership in professionally staffed organizations. *Managing Education*.
- Juhasz, A. M. (1990). Teacher self-esteem: A triple-role approach to this forgotten dimension. *Education*, 111(2), 234-241.

- Kruger, M. L., Witziers, B., & Slegers, P. (2007). The impact of school leadership on school level factors: Validation of a casual model. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 18 (1), 1 – 20.
- Kukla-Acevedo, S. (2009). Leavers, movers, and stayers: The role of workplace conditions in teacher mobility decisions. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 102(6), 443-452.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ladner, M. D. (2001) Comparison of Web-Based and Traditional Paper Based Survey Methodologies. Master's Thesis
- Leithwood, K., & Mascall, B. (2008). Collective leadership effects on student achievement. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 529-561.
- Littrell, P. C., & Billingsley, B. S. (1994). The effects of principal support on special and general educators' stress, job satisfaction, school commitment, health, and intent to stay in teaching. *Remedial & Special Education*, 15(5), 297-311.
- Louis, K. S., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national us survey. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement*, 21(3), 315-336.
- Marsh, J.A., Pane, J.F., & Hamilton, L.S. (2006). Making sense of data-driven decision making in education. *Rand Education*. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/occasional_papers/2006/RAND_OP170.pdf

- Mississippi Department of Education. (December 6, 2010). Mississippi Public Schools Accountability Manual. Retrived from http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/docs/accreditation-library/final_2010_11-30-10_manual.pdf?sfvrsn=2
- Morgan, C., Hall, V., & McKay, H. (1983). The selection of secondary school head teachers. *Milton Keynes, Open University Press.*
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). (2013). A First Look: 2013 Mathematics and Reading. Retrieved from: <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>
- Nettles, S. M., & Herrington, C. (2007). Revisiting the importance of the direct effects of school leadership on student achievement: The implications for school improvement policy. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 82(4), 724-736.
- Nettles, S. M., & Petscher, Y.M. (2006). The relationship between principal implementation behaviors and student achievement in reading. Unpublished manuscript.
- Reavis, C. A., Vinson, D., & Fox, R. (1999). Importing a culture of success via a strong principal. *The Clearing House*, 72(4), 199-202.
- Roby, D. E. (2010). Teacher leaders impacting school culture. *Education*, Summer.
- Scotti, Jr., W. H. (2001). Analysis of organizational incongruity using teacher perception of the principal's leadership behavior. *Education*, 108(1), 27-33.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). The roots of school leadership. *Principal*, 72(2), 6-10.
- Serva, M. A., Fuller, M. A., & Mayer, R. C. (2005). The Evolution of Trust between Interdependent Teams: A Model of Reciprocal Trust. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, September.
- Tarter, C. J., Bliss, J. R., & Hoy, W. K. (1989). School characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 25(3), 294-308.

- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 45 (2), 217-247.
- U.S. Department of Education, (2001). No Child Left Behind. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html>
- U.S. Department of Education, (2010). Race to the Top Fund. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html>
- Vroom, V. H., & Jago, A. G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62 (1), 17-24.
- Wahlstrom, K. L., & Louis, K. S. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*. 44,(4), 458-495.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement* (Working Paper). Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Youngs, P. (2007). How elementary principals' beliefs and actions influence new teachers' experiences. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43 (1), 101–137.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COMPARISON OF THE WATER ET. AL STUDY TO BULACH ET. AL STUDY

Leadership Responsibilities	Leadership Practices	Observed Behavior	Leadership Domains
Culture	fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation	My principal calls me by name.	Human Relations Domain
Focus	establishes clear goals and keeps those goals in the forefront of the school's attention	My principal uses eye contact.	
Knowledge of curriculum, Instruction assessment	fosters shared beliefs and a sense of community and cooperation	My principal demonstrates a caring attitude.	
Visibility	has quality contact and interactions with teachers and students	My principal involves me in decisions.	
Outreach	is an advocate and spokesperson for the school to all stakeholders	My principal interacts with faculty and staff.	
		My principal does not listen.	
		My principal practices good communication skills.	
		My principal tells teachers to make due with what they have.	
		My principal provides positive reinforcement.	
		My principal remains distant.	
		My principal compliments me.	
		My principal remembers what it is like to be a teacher.	
		My principal has not supported me when parents are involved.	
Contingent Awards	recognizes and rewards individual accomplishments	My principal corrects me in front of others instead of privately.	Trust/ Decision Making Domain
Communication	establishes strong lines of communication with teachers and among students	My principal "nit picks" on evaluations.	
Affirmation	recognizes and celebrates school accomplishments and acknowledges failures	My principal gossips about other teachers or administrators.	
Relationship	demonstrates an awareness of the	My principal uses	

	personal aspects of teachers and staff	coercion to motivate me.	
		My principal implements the latest fads without thorough knowledge.	
		My principal makes decisions as “knee jerk” reactions to an incident.	
		My principal displays a lack of trust.	
		My principal listens to both sides of the story before making a decision.	
		My principal evaluates situations carefully before taking action.	
		My principal makes “snap judgments.”	
		My principal bases evaluations on a short observation.	
Resources	provides teachers with materials and professional development necessary for the successful execution of their jobs	My principal frequently interrupts my teaching.	Instructional Leadership Domain
Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment	is directly involved in the design and implementation of curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices	My principal demonstrates a lack of vision.	
Optimizer	inspires and leads new and challenging innovations	My principal is knowledgeable about the curriculum.	
Ideals/ Beliefs	communicates and operates from strong ideals and beliefs about schooling	My principal is knowledgeable about instructional strategies.	
Intellectual Stimulation	ensures that faculty and staff are aware of the most current theories and practices and makes the discussion of these a regular aspect of the school’s culture	My principal applies procedures consistently.	
		My principal shrugs off or devalues a problem or concern.	

		My principal fails to follow up.	
		My principal has rules, but does not always enforce them.	
		My principal holds people accountable.	
		My principal provides feedback regarding my teaching.	
Order	establishes a set of standard operating procedures and routines	My principal expects paperwork to be done “yesterday” with no notice.	Control Domain
Input	involves teachers in the design and implementation of important decisions and policies	My principal delegates responsibilities.	
Monitors/ Evaluates	monitors the effectiveness of school practices and their impact on student learning	My principal assigns duty during planning periods.	
		My principal is rigid and inflexible.	
		My principal assigns too much paperwork.	
		My principal overemphasizes control.	
		My principal uses the words “I” and “my” too frequently.	
Discipline	protects teachers from issues and influences the would detract from their teaching time and focus	My principal is able to keep a confidence.	Conflict Domain
Change Agent	is willing to and actively challenges the status quo	My principal is afraid to question his/her superiors.	
Flexibility	adapts leadership behavior to the needs of the current situation and is comfortable with dissent	My principal “passes the buck” rather than dealing with a situation.	
Situational Awareness	is aware of the details and undercurrents in the running of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems	My principal has double standards.	
		My principal is partial to influential parents.	

		My principal shows favoritism to some teachers.	
		My principal supports me as a person even if I am wrong.	

APPENDIX B
LETTER TO SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

Dear School Superintendent,

I am, Monte Damon Ladner, a doctoral candidate in Educational Leadership at the University of Mississippi, and I am conducting research for my dissertation under the direction of Dr. Susan McClelland. As a component of this effort, middle school/junior high teachers in your school district have been selected as participants in my research. Therefore, I am requesting permission to survey middle school/junior high teachers in your district.

The information gathered will be used in my dissertation at the University of Mississippi. The research will examine the perceptions of middle school and/or junior high school teachers. The data will be kept confidential in a safe location with only the researcher having access to the participants' responses.

If granted permission, I will undergo the survey process immediately and the survey should only take about 15 minutes. No district, school, or educator, will be identified and only summary data will be reported in my dissertation. Participation is completely voluntary and may be discontinued at any time without penalty or prejudice to the participant. There are no foreseeable risks associated with this survey.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) has reviewed and approved my dissertation research to ensure that I follow ethical and federal guidelines regarding human subjects. I request that you permit participation in this study by completing the form below and e-mailing it back to me. If you have any questions about my research, please contact me at (662) 538-9083 or by email at mdladner@olemiss.edu. My dissertation advisor, Dr. Susan McClelland, can be reached at (662) 915-7350 or by email at ssmc@olemiss.edu.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Monte Damon Ladner

Doctoral Candidate

Name: XXXXXXXX, Superintendent

School District: XXXXXXXXX School District

Yes, I give permission for the teachers in my school district to participate in the survey.

No, I do not give permission for the teachers in my school district to participate in the survey.

APPENDIX C
SURVEY OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIOR

A SURVEY OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS

Part I--Demographics

Directions: Respond to each item by filling in the blank on the computer scan sheet that most accurately describes you (**Please choose only one response per item**).

1. **What is your highest degree?**

- | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|
| A. Bachelor's Degree | D. Doctorate Degree |
| B. Master's Degree | E. Other |
| C. Specialist's Degree | |

2. **How long have you been at this school?**

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| A. Less than one year | D. 6-10 years |
| B. One year but less than two years | E. 11+ years |
| C. 2-5 years | |

3. **How many years have you been teaching?**

- | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| A. This is my first year | D. 11-20 years |
| B. 2-5 years | E. 21+ years |
| C. 6-10 years | |

4. 1. **What is your ethnicity?**

- | | |
|-------------|--------------------|
| A. Black | D. American Indian |
| B. White | E. other |
| C. Hispanic | |

Copyright c 2000

Part II--Survey items

Directions: Use the scale below to respond to each item by filling in the blank on the computer scan sheet for the response which comes closest to **describing how often you see your principal exhibit this behavior.**

A NEVER	B SELDOM	C SOMETIMES	D OFTEN	E ALWAYS
--------------------------	---------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------

5. My principal displays a lack of trust.
6. My principal demonstrates a caring attitude.
7. My principal provides positive reinforcement.
8. My principal interacts with faculty and staff.
9. My principal remains distant.
10. My principal calls me by name.
11. My principal delegates responsibilities.
12. My principal compliments me.
13. My principal uses coercion to motivate me.
14. My principal does not listen.
15. My principal uses eye contact.
16. My principal provides feedback regarding my teaching.
17. My principal corrects me in front of others instead of privately.
18. My principal practices good communication skills.
19. My principal is able to keep a confidence.
20. My principal gossips about other teachers or administrators.
21. My principal shows favoritism to some teachers.
22. My principal has double standards.
23. My principal has not supported me when parents are involved.
24. My principal demonstrates a lack of vision.
25. My principal is knowledgeable about the curriculum.

A	B	C	D	E
NEVER	SELDOM	SOMETIMES	OFTEN	ALWAYS

26. My principal is knowledgeable about instructional strategies.
27. My principal is partial to influential parents.
28. My principal supports me as a person even if I am wrong.
29. My principal is afraid to question his/her superiors.
30. My principal shrugs off or devalues a problem or concern.
31. My principal “passes the buck” rather than dealing with a situation.
32. My principal remembers what it is like to be a teacher.
33. My principal frequently interrupts my teaching.
34. My principal assigns too much paperwork.
35. My principal tells teachers to make due with what they have.
36. My principal assigns duty during planning periods.
37. My principal “nit picks” on evaluations.
38. My principal expects paperwork to be done “yesterday” with no notice.
39. My principal overemphasizes control.
40. My principal involves me in decisions.
41. My principal uses the words “I” and “my” too frequently.
42. My principal is rigid and inflexible.
43. My principal applies procedures consistently.
44. My principal holds people accountable.
45. My principal fails to follow up.
46. My principal has rules, but does not always enforce them.
47. My principal makes “snap judgments.”
48. My principal listens to both sides of the story before making a decision.
49. My principal implements the latest fads without thorough knowledge.
50. My principal bases evaluations on a short observation.
51. My principal evaluates situations carefully before taking action.
52. My principal makes decisions as “knee jerk” reactions to an incident.

53. Are you currently teaching in your subject area?

A. Yes B. No

APPENDIX D

PERMISSION TO USE SURVEY OF SUPERVISORY BEHAVIORS

[Print](#) - [Close Window](#)

Subject: Re: Leadership Behavior Instrument
From: Clete Bulach (cbulach@comcast.net)
To: ladnermd@yahoo.com;
Date: Monday, March 23, 2009 10:23 AM

Attached are the survey and documents that can be generated from the survey. You are welcome to use the survey at no charge. If you wish, I can provide scoring service and data analysis and I can run your stats. I provide this service for doctoral students at a minimum charge. If you decide to avail yourself of my services, you will need to purchase computer scan forms for teachers to respond to the survey.

Thank you and have a great day!

Dr. Clete Bulach
7256 Confederate Lane
Villa Rica, GA 30180
770 214 8318
770 605 8724 (cell)
770 214 8318 FAX
www.westga.edu/~cbulach

APPENDIX E
EMAIL TO PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Hello, I'm Damon Ladner a doctoral candidate at the University of Mississippi. You are invited to participate in a research study on teachers' perception of school administrator leadership and how this relates to student achievement as measured by state tests scores.

You will be asked to complete an online survey, taking approximately 10 minutes of your time, about your principals' leadership characteristics and rank them on a scale of 1 (never) to 5 (always). Your decision to participate or decline participation in this study is completely voluntary and you have the right to terminate your participation at any time without penalty. In the study, your principal for the 2011-2012 school year is being researched and your rankings should reflect your perception of his/her leadership abilities.

Your participation in this research will be completely confidential and data will be averaged and reported in aggregate. Possible outlets of dissemination may be my dissertation and scholarly journals. Although your participation in this research may not benefit you personally, it will help us understand what affect school leadership has on student achievement.

There are no risks to individuals participating in this survey beyond those that exist in daily life. This study has been reviewed by The University of Mississippi's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has determined that this study fulfills the human research subject protections obligations required by state and federal law and University policies. If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a participant of research, please contact the IRB at (662) 915-7482. Also, you may contact me at mdladner@olemiss.edu or dladner@newalbany.k12.ms.us.

Please print a copy of this consent form for your records, if you so desire.

Please click on the following link to participate in the study:
<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/ZTHNP9Q>

APPENDIX F
SECOND EMAIL TO PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

I just wanted to drop you a note saying thank you for allowing your teachers to participate in my study. Also, I wanted to remind you and your staff about the gift card someone in your building will win. They must complete the survey by Thursday if they wish to be entered. Here is the link: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/KPQBRGW>

Thanks again for you help and participation. Have a great break.

APPENDIX G

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

Mr. Ladner:

This is to inform you that your application to conduct research with human participants, "The Relationship between Teacher Perception of Principals' Leadership Behaviors and Student Achievement" (Protocol 13X-015), has been approved as Exempt under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2).

Please remember that all of The University of Mississippi's human participant research activities, regardless of whether the research is subject to federal regulations, must be guided by the ethical principles in The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research.

It is especially important for you to keep these points in mind:

- You must protect the rights and welfare of human research participants.
- Any changes to your approved protocol must be reviewed and approved before initiating those changes.
- You must report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated problems involving risks to participants or others.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at [\(662\) 915-7482](tel:662-915-7482).

Diane W. Lindley

Research Compliance Specialist, Division of Research Integrity and Compliance

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs

The University of Mississippi

100 Barr Hall, P.O. Box 907

University, MS 38677

Tel.: [\(662\) 915-7482](tel:662-915-7482) Fax: [\(662\)915-7577](tel:662-915-7577)

dlindley@olemiss.edu

VITA

MONTE DAMON LADNER

405 S Central Ave New Albany, MS 38652 (662) 538-9083 ladnermd@yahoo.com

EDUCATION

Ph.D., Education, University of Mississippi, May 2014
Concentration: Educational Leadership, K – 12
Dissertation: The Relationship between Teacher Perception of Principals' Leadership Behaviors and Student Achievement

M.S., Education, Mississippi State University, August 2001
Thesis: Comparison of Web-Based and Traditional Paper Based Survey Methodologies

B.S., Education, Mississippi State University, May 1999

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Principal, 2012 – present
New Albany Middle School
New Albany, MS

Assistant Principal, 2011 - 2012
New Albany Middle School
New Albany, MS

Instructor, 2001 – 2011
New Albany High School
New Albany, MS
Courses: Agricultural and Environmental Science and Technology

PUBLICATIONS and PRESENTATIONS

Wingenbach, G.J., Ladner, D., Newman, M.E., & Raven, M.R. (2003). AAAE Members' Computer Technology Assessment; *Proceedings of the 53rd Southern Agricultural Education Research Conference*, Orlando, FL, 53, 28-40.

Ladner, D., Wingenbach, G.J., & Raven, M.R. (2002). Internet and Paper Based Data Collection Methods in Agricultural Education Research; *Journal of Southern Agricultural Education Research*: 52, 1, 40-53.

Ladner, D. (2002). Internet Versus Paper Based Data Collection Methods; *Proceedings of the 52nd Southern Agricultural Education Research Conference*, Orlando, FL, 52, 40-51.

Ladner, D. (2002). Presenter 52nd Southern Agricultural Education Research Conference, Orlando, FL. Internet Versus Paper Based Data Collection Methods.

Ladner, D. (2000). Land Grant University Faculties' Perceptions of Teaching Skills and Educational Technologies; *Proceedings of the 27th Annual National Agricultural Education Research Conference*, San Diego, CA, 27, 599-611.

Ladner, D. (2000). Presenter 27th Annual National Agricultural Education Research Conference. Land Grant University Faculties' Perceptions of Teaching Skills and Educational Technologies.