

The University of Southern Mississippi  
**The Aquila Digital Community**

---

Dissertations

---

Summer 8-2011

## Teacher and Principal Beliefs About Principal Leadership Behavior

Mary Beth Morris  
*University of Southern Mississippi*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Morris, Mary Beth, "Teacher and Principal Beliefs About Principal Leadership Behavior" (2011).  
*Dissertations*. 406.  
<https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/406>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact [Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu](mailto:Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu).

The University of Southern Mississippi

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL BELIEFS ABOUT  
PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

by

Mary Beth Morris

Abstract of a Dissertation  
Submitted to the Graduate School  
of The University of Southern Mississippi  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

August 2011

ABSTRACT

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL BELIEFS ABOUT  
PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

by Mary Beth Morris

August 2011

The purpose of this study was to examine whether or not there is a difference between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior using a 360-degree evaluation tool. The study also examined whether the difference between teacher and principal beliefs was related to the status of a school relative to the state growth target each school was expected to meet. The study also examined the effects of gender of administrator, number of years of administrator experience, and the performance status of the school that could be discerned through the use of a 360-degree evaluation tool.

Significant research points to the connection between student achievement and the degree to which school leaders practice transformational leadership behaviors. Discrepancies exist between teachers' and principals' perceptions of the actual leadership behaviors displayed. Using a 360-degree evaluation instrument provided principals with feedback from teachers and strategies to increase transformational leadership behaviors, which have been shown to increase student performance and the likelihood of achieving adequate yearly progress in schools.

The project was conducted in three months and involved 34 principal surveys and 238 teacher surveys from 18 districts across the state of Louisiana. Descriptive

statistics and *t* tests were used to assess whether or not a statistically significant difference existed between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors in the leadership domains of employee development, commitment, and the workplace. The effects of independent variables of gender of administrator, administrator years of experience, and performance status of schools were also examined through independent *t* tests. The study showed that a statistically significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior existed in the leadership domain of commitment. The study did not find a statistically significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior in the leadership domains of employee development or the workplace. In addition, there were no statistically significant differences in the effects of gender of administrator, administrator years of experience, or performance status of the school.

COPYRIGHT BY  
MARY BETH MORRIS  
2011

The University of Southern Mississippi

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL BELIEFS ABOUT PRINCIPAL  
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

by

Mary Beth Morris

A Dissertation  
Submitted to the Graduate School  
of The University of Southern Mississippi  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

Michael Ward\_\_\_\_\_

Director

Ronald Styron, Jr.\_\_\_\_\_

Shujie Liu\_\_\_\_\_

Rose McNeese\_\_\_\_\_

Susan A. Siltaen\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate School

August 2011

## DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to the Glory of God and to my husband, Troy C. Morris, for consistently encouraging my growth and success through his willingness to sacrifice.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to thank the committee chair, Dr. Michael Ward, for his persistence, patience, and constant support. Dr. Ward worked very hard chairing this committee and was always available to offer guidance whenever needed.

I would also like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Shujie Liu, Dr. Rose McNeese, and Dr. Ronald Styron.

I would also like to offer a special thanks to Dr. Shelley who was very supportive during this whole process from the beginning. Dr. Kyna Shelley was always available for words of encouragement and support.

I would also like to offer my gratitude to my husband, Troy, who worked long hours and extra shifts so that I could devote my time to my studies and research.

Finally, I would like to give a special thank you to the school districts in Louisiana that welcomed me and allowed me to complete my research.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	ii
DEDICATION .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	v
LIST OF TABLES .....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem	
Background of the Study	
Research Questions	
Delimitations	
Assumptions	
Definition of Terms	
Justification	
Summary	
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	10
Theoretical Foundations	
Pertinent Research and Professional Perspectives	
Summary	
III. METHODOLOGY .....	40
Research Questions and Hypotheses	
Respondents in the Study	
Research Design and Procedures	
Instrumentation	
Variables in the Study	
Data Collection Process	
Analysis of Data	
Summary	
IV. RESULTS .....	47
Description of the Respondents	
Reliability of the Instrument	

Statistical Analysis Results Summary	
V. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	60
Summary of Procedures	
Major Findings	
Discussion	
Limitations	
Recommendations for Policy and Practice	
Recommendations for Future Research	
Summary	
APPENDIXES .....	73
REFERENCES .....	82

## LIST OF TABLES

### Table

1.	Percentages of Respondents' Primary Demographic Data .....	48
2.	Means and Standard Deviations.....	52

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The study will be introduced in this chapter, and a statement of the problem and purpose of the study are provided for the study. Background information is presented to establish the need for this study. The research questions, delimitations, and assumptions of the study are discussed in this chapter. Definitions of related terms are given to provide understanding for the reader, and the chapter concludes with a justification for the study.

Principals are held accountable for student achievement, although many studies find that they have no direct effect on a student's achievement (Ross & Gray, 2006). The question of whether effective leadership can be taught is a deceptive one; interestingly, it seems that there is no simple dichotomous answer to that question. Leadership is multidimensional, and some dimensions are more critical than others depending on the circumstances. Three perspectives relate to unexplained variance in leader effectiveness that remains after controlling for individual differences: (a) individualized assessment and learning which involve determining strengths and weaknesses; (b) designing developmental experiences that target deficiencies and maintain strengths, reappraisal, and feedback (Vecchio, 2007). Simple repetition of tasks without knowledge of results will not change behavior; however, feedback is an effective learning strategy (Mausolff, 2004). Increasing the transformational leadership practices in schools makes a minor but important contribution to overall student achievement (Ross & Gray, 2006). Transformational leadership is described as a

process within which leaders and followers inspire one another to higher levels of motivation (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008).

Transformational leaders motivate their subordinates to do more than they originally expected to do by raising followers' levels of consciousness about the importance and value of designated outcomes and ways of reaching them. Leaders inspire followers to transcend their own self interest for the sake of the team, organization, or larger polity. Lunenburg and Ornstein (2008) assert that such leadership expands followers' need levels, expressed in Maslow's lexicon, to the highest order, which is self-actualization. Principals possess a leadership position through which they are empowered to help others as well as themselves grow, develop, and achieve (Ediger, 2009). Leaders and those who lead have a relationship of power and mutual needs, aspirations, and values; however, followers have knowledge of alternative leaders and programs and the capacity to choose (Burns, 1978).

The purpose of this study was to examine whether there is a difference between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior using a 360-degree evaluation tool. The study also examined whether the differences between teacher and principal beliefs are related to the status of a school relative to the state growth target each school is expected to meet. The study also examined the effects of gender of administrator, number of years of administrator experience, and the performance status of the school that could be discerned through the use of a 360-degree evaluation tool.

#### Statement of the Problem

During the 1963-1964 school year Gentry and Kenney (1966) examined the differences between principals' evaluations of their performance and judgments about

their performance by the teaching staff. Although the researchers concluded that principals and teachers had significantly different perceptions, no further recommendations or plans for actions were recommended (Gentry & Kenney, 1966). Few studies have focused on the understanding of feedback and learning processes in nonprofit organizations. Studies need to be conducted on principal leadership behaviors utilizing teacher feedback and providing necessary tools for strengthening of leadership behaviors. Mausolff (2004) found that in response to poor feedback performance data, problem-solving activities were initiated in action plans. Principal evaluation is mainly formative and focuses on instructional leadership rather than management. Providing intellectual stimulation for self and staff, acting as change agent, and having a flexible leadership style are usually lacking in principal evaluations. Principals might benefit from 360-degree feedback in their evaluations and from having professional discussions about student achievement (Josephsen, 2008). There is a difference in beliefs between teachers and principals displaying transformational leadership behaviors. Understanding these differences and providing principals with a 360-degree evaluation tool could give these leaders the opportunity to strengthen transformational leadership behaviors, which have been shown by a number of studies to improve student achievement.

### Background of the Study

Transformational leadership, according to many theorists, researchers, and practitioners, causes high levels of employee motivation. A Full Range Model Conceptualization of the Leadership Styles was created based on the works of Bass (1990, 1997), Bass and Avolio (1994, 1995), and Hinkin and Schriesheim (2008). This

model conceptualizes leadership in terms of the behaviors associated with various styles and has been empirically supported. Transformational leadership includes the following four styles: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Idealized influence implies that followers imitate the leader's behavior and assume values because of their trust and respect for the leader. Inspirational motivation implies that the leader creates and stimulates similar visions with the followers. Intellectual stimulation refers to a leader who encourages innovation and creativity with followers. Individualized consideration refers to the leader's ability to consider the maturity level of the followers and determine their need for further development (Bass, 1990, 1997; Bass & Avolio; 1994, 1995; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008).

In contrast to transformational leadership, transactional leadership and laissez-faire leadership styles may cause low employee motivation levels. The second style, transactional leadership, involves an exchange where the leader clarifies what the followers need to do in successfully completing their part of the tasks in order to receive the reward and avoid the punishment. In the case of active management by exception, the leader looks for mistakes and infractions of rules and regulations and takes corrective action before or when they occur. Passive management by exception implies that the leader waits to be informed before taking action. Finally, laissez-faire style or passive leadership implies avoidance or absence of leadership. The followers have responsibility for the work, and the leader avoids setting goals and clarifying expectations. If this style is used as a component of other leadership styles, it allows for the possibility of self-management (Van Eeden, Cilliers, & Van Deventer, 2008).

Transformational leadership was one of the criteria considered by Engels, Hotton, Devos, Bouckenooghe, and Aelterman (2008) in comparing teachers' perceptions of school culture with principals' leadership behaviors displayed. One of the criteria considered was meaningful staff development and transformational leadership. The results confirmed that relationships were found when calculating the correlation indices between principals with high self-confidence and achievement orientation with teachers who were moderately satisfied with their principal's support and the professional development support in their schools. The principals within the positive school cultures identify with a role as innovator in which participation, innovation, and support play a major role. Innovators can be categorized as transformational leaders. The innovator knows how to plan for the future, is creative, and knows how to take risks. The profiles of the principals in the negative cases had a commonality—a discrepancy between the role in which they want to identify their priorities and what they actually do with their time. Innovative leaders put effort into creating a flexible environment where participation and support are emphasized (Engels et al., 2008). Principals' self-confidence levels and behavioral practices changed in relation to feedback they received from current and past leadership experiences (Eylar, 2009). Research reveals that transformational leadership improves student achievement and principals desire to improve their leadership behaviors through 360-degree feedback and professional discussions which will lead to the successful creation of professional development plans.

#### Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:



1. Is there a difference between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior?
2. What is the effect of gender of administrator on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors?
3. What is the effect of years of administrator experience on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors?
4. What is the effect of the performance status of the school on the difference between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behaviors?

#### Delimitations

Survey respondents were limited to school districts located in Louisiana. A convenience sample was used from participating school districts. The list of independent variables was limited to gender of administrator, administrator years of experience, and school performance status, which was limited to the single metric of the state growth target each school is expected to meet. The list of leadership behaviors and domains was not all inclusive and focused on three domains from the Profile of Leadership Opportunities (POL) (Hiam, 2003): commitment, the workplace, and employee development.

#### Assumptions

It was assumed that respondents understood and followed survey instructions. Similarly, it was assumed that respondents answered questions honestly and understood the intent of the research which included providing feedback about their supervisor and the benefits of expanding the knowledge base of transformational leadership behavior that leads to increased student achievement. It was assumed that teacher discomfort and

fear of reprisal, based upon ratings of their supervisors, were minimized by lack of identification or demographic information required on the survey.

#### Definitions of Terms

The following definitions provide meaning for terms and variables used in this study.

*360 Evaluation:* Leaders are evaluated by themselves and subordinates using a survey tool and provided feedback to compare responses.

*Adequate yearly progress:* According to the Louisiana Department of Education (2010a) website, each year schools must show improvement in the school performance scores by meeting a growth target. Growth targets represent the amount of progress a school must make every year to reach the state's goal of 120 by the year 2014. Schools must also show improvement in up to nine student subgroups in English language arts and math.

*Administrators or leaders:* This study will encompass school leadership which recognizes the principal as the administrator or leader of the assigned school.

*Commitment:* Hiam (2003) defines commitment as the pride and interest in work and the motivation to further the work of the group.

*Employee development:* Employees are stimulated and motivated to develop and grow through their work (Hiam, 2003).

*Laissez-faire leadership:* The leader avoids leadership behaviors or is absent.

*Transactional leadership:* The leader clarifies what the followers need to do as their part of successfully completing the tasks to receive the reward and avoid the punishment (Van Eeden et al., 2008).

*Transformational leadership:* Bass (1985) defines transformational leadership as a process in which a leader increases followers' awareness of what was right and important and motivates followers to perform beyond expectation.

*Workplace:* Hiam (2003) describes the workplace as the environment in which employees work.

### Justification

Transformational leadership studies have shown that transformational leadership can cause high levels of employee motivation, improve school culture, and improve student achievement. The results of the current study are consistent with past positive conclusions about transformational leadership, and the results can be used to increase knowledge about leadership behaviors and create action plans for change. In other studies, many principals' self-confidence and behavioral levels changed after they received feedback. Understanding the differences between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior by employing a 360-degree evaluation tool may increase transformational leadership behaviors (Youngs, 2001), which have been shown to increase student achievement (Ross & Gray, 2006). Such understanding can also assist Louisiana school districts in improving their school performance status.

### Summary

Transformational leadership is believed to produce high levels of employee motivation and commitment, improve student achievement, enhance the school environment, and encourage employees to develop and grow through their work. The following styles encompass transformational leadership: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration.

Idealized influence implies that followers imitate the leader's behavior and assume values because of their trust and respect for the leader. Inspirational motivation implies that the leader creates and stimulates similar visions with the followers. Intellectual stimulation refers to a leader who encourages innovation and creativity with followers. Individualized consideration refers to the leader's ability to consider the maturity level of the followers and determine their need for further development (Bass, 1990, 1997; Bass et al., 1994, 1995; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 2008). Principals who are transformational leaders play a key role in establishing the school as an intellectual environment. In sharing the responsibility for transformational leadership, teachers enhance this intellectual atmosphere, model what it means to be professional educators, extend personal concern for colleagues, and inspire them to their best efforts (Printy, Marks, & Bowers, 2009). Understanding the differences in beliefs between teachers and principals of leadership behaviors and providing opportunities for strengthening transformational leadership behaviors can assist Louisiana school districts in improving their school performance.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will provide a review of the literature and research related to this study. The effects of No Child Left Behind (U.S. Department of Education, 2006) on the Louisiana Accountability System and Comprehensive Curriculum will be described. Theories and standards of leadership will be discussed with an emphasis on transformational leadership and the difference in perceptions between teachers and principals. Literature will reveal the need to consider the effects of administrator years of experience, gender of administrator, and increases in student achievement as they relate to the workplace, teacher commitment, and employee development. Finally, conclusions of researchers and experts regarding the use of a 360-degree evaluation tool will be presented.

#### Theoretical Foundations

From the beginning of known history, humankind has tried to figure out which qualities are necessary for successful leadership. In 2300 B.C., the following three qualities were attributed to Pharaoh: an authoritative voice, a perceptive heart, and a mouth full of justice. Confucius told his followers that they should set a moral example and manipulate rewards and punishments to teach followers what was right and good. According to Taoism, the leader should work himself out of his job by making people believe that successes were a result of their own efforts. Plato, in *The Republic*, looked at the requirements for the ideal leader of the ideal state. The most important element of good government was to have a leader educated to govern with rule and reason.

Aristotle was disturbed by the lack of virtue of those who wanted to be leaders. The Christian Bible is full of leaders in the Old and New Testament who displayed qualities and behaviors for followers to imitate. Napoleon listed 115 qualities that are necessary for a successful military leader and stated that he would rather have an army of rabbits led by a lion than an army of lions led by a rabbit (Bass, 2007). Sanford (2006) agreed that an army of deer led by a lion is to be more feared than an army of lions led by a deer, but an army of lions led by a lion would be truly unstoppable.

Disparity between advanced theoretical understanding and traditional leadership behavior indicates that a critical emerging dimension of leadership development is not cognitive but behavioral (Hiam, 2003). Behavioral science approach includes consideration of all major elements with intense emphasis on contingency leadership, culture, transformational leadership, and systems theory. Behavior in any social system can be defined as the interaction between personal needs and institutional goals. The behavioral science approach has drawn heavily on the work of Abraham Maslow, who developed a need hierarchy that an individual attempts to satisfy. Maslow's theory suggests that an administrator's job is to provide opportunities for the satisfaction of an employee's needs that also support organizational goals. The leader also has a responsibility to remove obstacles that block need satisfaction and cause frustration, negative attitudes, or dysfunctional behavior (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008).

Maslow proposed that human needs could be classified into five broad categories: physiological, security-safety, social-belonging, esteem, and self-actualization. The key to Maslow's theory is that the need categories are arranged in a hierarchy of prepotency, with individual behavior motivated to satisfy the most

important need at that time. The strength of this need depends on its position in the hierarchy and the extent to which lower order needs are met or satisfied (Sergiovanni, 2001). Workers increase their productivity when their needs are satisfied, thus impacting the organization's level of success. The traditional organization with its centralized decision making, hierarchical pyramid, and external control of work is based on assumptions about human nature and motivation that do not take into consideration Maslow's hierarchy of the individual's needs (Patterson, 2005).

Based on the work of Maslow, Douglas McGregor formulated two contrasting sets of assumptions about people and the management strategies suggested by each. McGregor believed that the classical approach was based on Theory X assumptions about people. A modified version of Theory X was consistent with the human relations perspective and did not go far enough in explaining people's needs and management strategies to accommodate them. Theory Y was a more appropriate foundation for guiding management thinking (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008).

Theory X, which offers an explanation for ineffective organizational performance, represents a traditional mechanistic view and assumes that average human beings dislike and avoid work. Theory X asserts that people prefer coercion, control, threats, and punishment to get them to achieve organizational objectives. Humans wish to avoid responsibility, have a lack of ambition, and want security above all. In contrast, Theory Y represents the human relations view and assumes that the expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest. People will exercise self-control and self-direction toward objectives to which they are committed. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with

achievement. People learn, seek, and accept responsibility. The capacity to exercise imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely distributed in the population. The intellectual potential of the average person is only partially utilized in modern industrial life (Razik & Swanson, 2001).

Renis Likert was a pioneer in the organizational climate literature. According to Likert's theory, school policies, standard operating procedures, administrative actions, and decisions do not directly influence school effectiveness and other end results variables. Instead, they influence (a) how teachers, students, and others perceive and feel; (b) the attitudes and values they share; (c) the trust and support binding them together; and (d) the degree to which they are motivated to work and are committed to school goals and purposes (Sergiovanni, 2001). Likert also was described as an early pioneer in the field of social psychology who designed his scale as a procedure for studying people's attitudes and also introduced the concept of open-ended questions to accompany forced-choice questions (Salopek, 2004).

Likert's survey data showed that emphasis-centered supervisors who focused more on people and relationships typically managed higher producing units than job-centered supervisors who ignored human issues, made decisions themselves, and dictated to subordinates. Survey research paved the way for survey feedback as an approach to organizational improvement. The process begins with questionnaires aimed at human resource issues, and the results are tabulated and then shown to managers. A variant on the survey feedback model that has become increasingly standard in organizations is 360-degree feedback in which managers get survey



feedback about how they are seen by subordinates, peers, and superiors (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

Educational leaders can reassess their skills, address their weaknesses, and become more valuable to their schools and districts by receiving feedback from multiple sources. Principals rarely receive specific constructive feedback that enables them to determine whether their leadership behavior is consistent with their intentions or expectations. Educational leaders have limited opportunities for feedback and tend to focus on past success. As a result, they may not recognize the need for a behavioral change. The role of the 360-degree evaluation tool is to allow leaders to compare their perceptions of themselves with the views that others have of them. Leaders are motivated to reconsider their behavior and the impact that it has on others. The following factors must be present to ensure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the 360-degree evaluation tool. Feedback must be developmental—not evaluative—and be followed by a mentoring session and action development plan (Dyer, 2001).

The use of 360-degree evaluation utilizes multiple independent perspectives to assess teamwork, communication skills, management skills, and clinical decision making. This type of multiple source feedback can be a powerful driver for attitude development, particularly when incorporating the views of peers from a shared working environment. The use of self-assessment was perceived as a useful tool as it emphasized how self-perceptions and other perceptions conflict, prompting reconciliation (Tyler, 2006). An essential element in effectively using the 360-degree evaluation tool is tying the assessment data to an individual development plan (Kelly & Sundet, 2007). With 360-degree feedback, leaders receive feedback from multiple

sources on their behavior, skills, and styles in order to deal with the intention-perception gap (Cashman, 2009). There is a parallel to McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y; however, Likert provides more categories and more specificity (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008). Disparity between theoretical understanding and traditional leadership behaviors can be decreased through effective transformational leadership behaviors, such as Maslow's leadership responsibilities, McGregor's management strategies, and Likert's "emphasis-centered" survey data. The 360-degree evaluation tool was the continuation and expansion of Likert's earlier research. Understanding the differences between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior by employing a 360-degree evaluation tool will increase transformational leadership behaviors (Youngs, 2001) which have been shown to increase student achievement (Ross & Gray, 2006).

#### Pertinent Research and Professional Perspectives

Leadership theory asserts that effective leadership behaviors continue to improve and evolve based on human needs. Behavioral science approaches have considered transformational leadership and the interaction between personal needs and institutional goals. Literature pertaining to Louisiana's system of school accountability and the accountability provisions of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) will also be examined to understand the current institutional goals. The Louisiana Comprehensive Curriculum will be explained to increase the understanding of consequences related to not meeting NCLB standard of adequate yearly progress. Literature emphasizing the correlations between transformational leadership, improving school culture, and student achievement will be described in order to make a connection to the individual's needs.

*Standards for School Leadership*

Principals work within an ethical code to (a) oversee instructional quality; (b) develop teacher talents; (c) establish a learning culture in schools; and (d) work within and beyond the school to secure financial, human, and political capital to maintain and advance organizational operations (Condon & Clifford, 2010). The Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 are standards that have emerged and are highly recognized and referenced (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008). The standards contain six leadership domains for principal professional practice: (a) setting a widely shared vision for learning; (b) developing a school culture and instructional program conducive to students learning and staff professional growth; (c) ensuring effective management of the organization, operation, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; (d) collaborating with faculty and community members; (e) responding to diverse community members; (f) responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources; (g) acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and (h) understanding, responding to, and influencing the political, social, legal, and cultural contexts (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008).

In 2006, Gordon and Patterson critiqued the study of school leadership for its normative, singular, and evolutionary tendencies. Though an empirical study of leadership, Gordon and Patterson offered a new approach for the field. All the effective leaders described exhibited concern for people, demonstrated their own expertise, and recognized it in others. Concern for people and demonstrating as well as recognizing expertise transcend leadership styles. Each successful leader experienced success

through interactions with constituents and negotiated how the manifestation of concern and demonstrating and recognizing expertise would look in each school setting.

Effective leadership behaviors are displayed by leaders who are willing to be held accountable for student success.

Accountability has become a misunderstood word and is so emotionally volatile that some district administrators fear its usage. In most school districts accountability is a litany of test scores, typically reported as the averages of classes, schools, or systems and is perceived as a key mechanism for holding teachers accountable (Sergiovanni, 2009). Many teachers resent this simplistic notion because they understand that accountability is more than one test grade and should involve their broad curriculum, creative energy, and attention to the needs of their individual students. Railing against the system and hoping that testing and standards are a passing fad will not lead to fundamental reformation of educational accountability. Capable leaders who are willing to be held accountable develop systematic ways to catch teachers doing things right, document those successes, make those successes the focal point of faculty meetings and professional development sessions, and leverage those successes when confronting failures and challenges (Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 2007; Reeves, 2004). Crum and Sherman (2008) defined the following qualities of effective leaders during times of increased accountability: (a) developing personnel and facilitating leadership, (b) responsible delegation and empowering the team, (c) recognizing ultimate accountability, (d) communicating and rapport, (e) facilitating instruction, and (f) managing change.

Reeves (2004) also connected accountability and leadership behaviors in his holistic accountability system in which leaders welcomed the opportunity to be held accountable. Specific observable behaviors identified by Reeves included mentoring, use of discretionary time, and the manner in which values are implemented. Behaviors are observed and reported consistently. Data can be collected and reported on the percentage of faculty meeting discussions and professional development activities that are related to student achievement and include recognition of teachers' best practices in assessment curriculum and instruction (Reeves, 2004). Percentage of leader-initiated contacts regarding student achievement and parent participation surveys also can be collected and used for data. Finally, Reeves (2004) suggested that the percentage of students with identified academic difficulty and the additional assistance received can be considered a part of a holistic accountability system.

Standards for leadership behaviors, such as The Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008), have been established. The overarching focus of such standards is the improvement of student achievement. Reeves' (2004) holistic accountability system, which includes a willingness to be held accountable for increased student achievement, also is purported to increase student achievement. In contrast, a system characterized by a lack of understanding of effective leadership behaviors and forced systems of accountability compliance is not likely to increase student achievement.

#### *The Louisiana Accountability System*

Newmann, King, and Rigdon (1997) stated that many politicians and policymakers link school accountability and school performance and discuss the

popular theory that strong external accountability will impel schools to improve student achievement. In a study of 24 restructuring schools, Newmann et al. (1997) found that strong accountability was rare. Organizational capacity, which was defined as the effort to organize the human, technical, and social resources of a school into a collective enterprise, was not related to accountability. Newmann et al. (1997) also noted that there were controversies about strategies and lack of understanding on how to implement the standards. Both internal and external technical assistance must support the transformational actions of leaders to meet student performance goals (Tolbert, 2003).

Hanushek and Raymond (2004) researched state accountability scores and suggested that requiring schools to meet state accountability standards has a beneficial effect on overall school achievement. Meeting the demands of student achievement will not happen solely by principals and district officials establishing systems of compliance. Transformational leaders who partner in establishing cultures of inquiry and change in a nonthreatening environment of continuous improvement will increase student achievement (Ibarra, Santamaria, Lindsey, & Daly, 2010). Strong positive relationships between transformational leadership practices and math test scores were evident when leaders modeled desired behaviors, enabled teachers to act by creating opportunities for them to take risks, and encouraged teachers through positive recognition.

Accountability is more than one test grade and should involve the broad curriculum, creative energy, and attention to the needs of individual students. Teachers and principals are the people who are held most accountable in the system when

parents, support staff, and central administrators also have important roles to play in the achievement of educational results. Staff morale is improved when challenges are faced honestly and leaders recognize that many of the solutions for confronting those challenges are in their own school or district. Outstanding leaders develop systematic ways to catch teachers doing things right, document those successes, make those successes the focal point of faculty meetings and professional development sessions, and leverage those successes when confronting failures and challenges (Reeves, 2004).

The Louisiana Department of Education (2010b) website reports that in 1997 the Louisiana legislature passed into law legislation that mandated several significant changes in public education for grades kindergarten through 12. The law established a student and school accountability system and gave the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) the authority to create the accountability system.

Louisiana's School Accountability System calls for continuous improvement in student achievement, attendance, and dropouts. This system is based upon two principles: rewarding schools that grow academically and assisting schools and students who need help. Each year schools must show an improvement in the School Performance Score (SPS) by meeting a growth target. Growth targets represent the amount of progress a school must make every year to reach the state's SPS goal of 120 by the year 2014. As required by NCLB, schools must also show improvement or adequate yearly progress in up to nine student subgroups in English language arts and mathematics (Louisiana Department of Education, 2010a). An explanation of the Louisiana Accountability System has been provided to assist in understanding the point system and the implications for schools who receive low scores.

*The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 (U.S. Department of Education, 2006) ensured that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state academic assessments. Schools, local educational agencies, and states are held accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students and identifying and turning around low-performing schools that have failed to provide a high-quality education to their students, while providing alternatives to students in such schools to enable the students to receive a high-quality education (LaMorte, 2008).

The NCLB Act required that all states adopt or amend their accountability systems to meet new federal requirements. All states were required to submit accountability workbooks to the U.S. Department of Education on January 31, 2003. The accountability workbook submitted by Louisiana maintained most of the original core elements of Louisiana's School and District Accountability System, but also added additional components as required by the NCLB Act. Louisiana's workbook was peer reviewed on March 31, 2003, and recommended revisions in Louisiana's accountability workbook were completed on May 16, 2003. Louisiana's plan received full approval from the U.S. Department of Education on May 17, 2003 (Louisiana Department of Education, 2010b). The NCLB Act was responsible for prompting major components of many of the states' accountability systems and, according to many studies, has been credited with an increase in student academic achievement (Ahlgrim, 2010; Dillon, 2007; U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Louisiana's approach to accountability



changed as a result of the NCLB Act, and a comprehensive curriculum was created to meet the new requirements.

### *Louisiana's Comprehensive Curriculum*

Louisiana developed a comprehensive curriculum based on the Grade-Level Expectations (GLEs) which are statements of what all students should know or be able to do by the end of each grade, PreK-12, in English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies. The state administers the following large scale testing programs. The I LEAP, which replaced the IOWA test, is administered to Grades 3, 5, 6, 7, and 9. Testing for Grades 4 and 8 is the LEAP test. The Graduation Exit Examination (GEE) is administered at Grades 10 and 11 (Louisiana Department of Education, 2010b). As a part of the school accountability system of the state of Louisiana, each school annually receives a School Performance Score (SPS) which indicates how well its students are performing. The SPS for each school is a weighted composite index, using 60% weight for the LEAP 21/GEE 21 tests, 30% weight for the I LEAP, and a total of 10% for attendance and dropout results. A five-star performance label equals a SPS of 140.0 or above. A four-star performance label equals a SPS of 120.0-139.9. A three-star performance label equals a SPS of 100.0-119.9. A two-star performance label equals a SPS of 80.0-99.9. A one-star performance label equals a SPS of 60.0-79.9. Schools that receive an SPS of 45.0-59.9 are labeled as academic warning, and schools that receive a SPS below 45 are labeled as Academically Unacceptable (Louisiana Department of Education, 2010b).

The Louisiana Department of Education (2010b) website reported that district and school performance scores for the school year 2009-2010 revealed that 192 schools

were under academic watch and 43 were academically unsuccessful. Schools across the West Bank reported that the test scores released by the state of Louisiana represented declines in eighth-grade scores. Charter schools that do not reach a school performance score of 60 do not get an automatic renewal. The renewal decision is up to the discretion of the authorizer, which is a school district and the state Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (Louisiana Department of Education, 2010b). In addition, the Recovery School District (RSD) announced that 47% of RSD schools received a school performance score of < 60 (Louisiana Department of Education, October 7, 2010). Louisiana schools can benefit from an increase in transformational leadership behaviors which, according to Martinez (2009), were found in schools that met the adequate yearly progress standards in Puerto Rico.

#### *Transformational Leadership and Student Achievement*

There is a significant body of research that points to the connection between student achievement and the degree to which school leaders practice transformational leadership behaviors. Martinez (2009) studied 16 Puerto Rican schools and found that school principals in schools that meet the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirements of NCLB exhibit transformational leadership behaviors with more frequency than school principals in schools under an improvement plan for not meeting NCLB standards or AYP requirements. A sample of California principals whose schools were in Program Improvement (PI) or had exited PI were surveyed and interviewed (Fisher, 2010). It was found that 60% of principals who led their schools out of PI were female, with two thirds age 50 years and above. Principals in non-PI settings displayed more transformational behaviors than their peers in PI settings. In

addition, the PI group engaged in 46% of transformational change efforts while the exited PI group engaged in 73% (Ibarra et al., 2010). Research conducted by Fisher (2010) on the effects of not making adequate yearly progress at elementary schools on principals and teachers found low levels of morale and high levels of stress (Fisher, 2010).

Transformational leadership behaviors were exhibited more by principals in schools who met their adequate yearly progress and were able to exit intervention plans. Such principal leadership capacities were also examined in a meta-analysis in which 35 years of research disclosed that school leadership has a substantial effect on student achievement. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) identified the following 21 categories of behaviors that they refer to as the “responsibilities” of school leadership. Behaviors include affirmation, change agent, contingent rewards, communications, culture, discipline, flexibility, focus, ideals/beliefs, input, intellectual stimulation, involvement in curriculum, instruction and assessment, monitoring/evaluating, optimizer, order, outreach, relationships, resources, situational awareness, and visibility (Marzano et al., 2005). Thirty-nine studies focused on elementary schools, six focused on middle or junior high schools, 10 focused on high schools, eight focused on K-8 districts, and six focused on K-12 districts. The typical study in the meta-analysis used a questionnaire asking teachers about their perceptions of the principal’s leadership behaviors (21 responsibilities). The average correlation of the 21 responsibilities was .25. The authors imparted that the improvement of a principal on the 21 responsibilities by one standard deviation would translate to the improvement of student achievement from the 50<sup>th</sup> to the 60<sup>th</sup> percentile on standardized achievement test scores which would

be a significant gain (Rammer, 2007). King (2010) analyzed the relationship between administrator leadership styles and their impact on student achievement and found that it was a combination of an administrator's leadership styles and personality that are most related to student achievement.

### *Transformational Leadership and Differences among Perceptions*

#### *Regarding Leadership Behaviors*

Descriptions of principal leadership behaviors have been created to improve practical leadership knowledge, abilities and skills. Studies have revealed that principals and teachers have different perceptions of the leadership behaviors displayed by school leaders.

Carroll (1999) conducted a study to examine the relationship between perceptions among principals and faculties regarding the leadership behavior demonstrated in schools located in central Mississippi that had been awarded an Excellent Accreditation Level from the Mississippi Department of Education. Additionally, this study sought to determine if the difference in perception was related to the independent variables of grade level of school, number of faculty members, and type of school district, gender of administrator, number of years of experience as an administrator, years of experience of faculty member, and gender of faculty members. The results of the study indicated that the faculty in the low faculty size group perceived that the leadership of the administrator was more effective than the score that the administrator gave himself or herself. The high faculty size group rated the administrator's leadership behaviors lower than the administrator self rated. Administrators with the least amount of experience were perceived as having more

effective leadership than administrators with a higher amount of experience. No significant differences were found on the independent variables of gender of administrator, gender of faculty member, and type of school district (Carroll, 1999).

The Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) (2002) standards, which describe the elements of principal leadership and also provide a framework for the licensure of principals as well as providing a cornerstone for professional development, were used as the framework of a study conducted by Luo and Lotfollah (2007). Master teachers and principals from the Providence of Guangdong located in Southern China participated in research to examine principal leadership capacities that are considered crucial in the effectiveness and improvement of schools and school administration through the perceptions of master teachers. The results of the study revealed that teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership capacities were negative although the principals perceived their own leadership capacities as effective. The gender of the principals and teachers did not significantly influence teachers' perceptions of principal leadership capacities. Principals with higher education attainment levels were perceived to exhibit higher leadership capacities. The researchers recommended that principal training programs should focus on practical leadership knowledge, abilities, and skills instead of traditional theory based studies (Luo & Lotfollah, 2007).

Although research has suggested effective leadership behaviors, discrepancies still exist between leaders' and teachers' perceptions of the actual effective leadership behaviors and responsibilities. Fee (2009) conducted a study to determine if a discrepancy existed between the principal's perception of his or her behavior and

teachers' perception of their principal's leadership behavior. If a discrepancy existed, the next purpose was to determine if there was a relationship between the discrepancy of perceptions of leader behavior and school climate. Discrepancies existed between the principal's self-assessment and the teachers' assessment of their principal's behavior. A sample of 61 schools, including 61 principals and 1,628 teachers from all regions of the state of Tennessee, participated in the study. Results indicated that a discrepancy existed between principal's self-assessment and the teachers' assessment of their principal's leadership behaviors. There were significant negative relationships to school climate. Fee (2009) further recommended bringing the leaders and followers closer to agreement about the leader's behaviors, which involved the leader reflecting, seeking out why the discrepancy existed, and creating strategies to enhance desired leadership behavior.

Green (2009) examined perceptions of faculty and principals in a correlational study to ascertain the relationships between transactional or transformational leadership style and the percentage of experienced staff working under the leadership. The results of this study were mixed. The principals' perceptions were not aligned with teachers' perceptions of their leaders' effectiveness although there was a relationship between principals' transactional behaviors and the percentage of experienced staff. Further study was recommended to analyze the apparent disconnect between principal and teachers' perceptions of leader effectiveness (Green, 2009).

#### *Transformational Leadership and the Workplace*

The proficient principal demonstrates vision and provides leadership that appropriately involves the school community in the creation of shared beliefs; values

demonstrate moral and ethical judgment, creativity, and innovative thinking (Sergiovanni, 2001). The culture of an organization affects many administrative processes. Among these are motivation, leadership, decision making, communication, and change. Culture also affects an organization's structural processes. The selection process, evaluation system, control system, and reward system must fit with the organization's culture. Culture has an influence on employee performance and organizational effectiveness. Administrators are evaluated on the basis of the results they achieve; therefore, the organization's culture is an important concept because of the results it produces. Pros include that the culture can become a family culture. The school as family is nurturing and friendly. The school could also become a cabaret culture where the principal is seen as a master of ceremonies. The school takes great pride in the artistic and intellectual ability of one's teaching which is carried out under the watchful eye of the maestro (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008).

Principal's personality traits are directly related to the leadership styles displayed. Researchers investigated principals' personality traits, aspects of their functioning and well-being, and contextual factors in relation to school culture variables as perceived by teachers (Engels et al., 2008). Principals scored higher in schools where teachers were satisfied with the principal's support and professional development in the school. The principal also had a more internal locus of control. Principals who scored negatively had a discrepancy between the role in which they wanted to identify and what they actually do with their time. Principals who were satisfied with the level of support they received from their school board also were those who experienced a high level of job satisfaction and reported a low level of burnout. Principals who scored

low reported that the school board provided more obstruction than support (Engels et al., 2008). School organizational climate and job satisfaction were examined. A significant positive correlation was found between school climate and teacher satisfaction in the nature of their jobs, and a negative correlation was found between school organizational climate and material conditions, wages, and administration. In schools with good administrative, study, and interpersonal climates, the teachers felt that the opportunities for advanced studies and promotions were good (Xiaofu & Qiwen, 2007).

Teachers and administrators conceptualized, understood, and experienced community in different ways. Administrators saw community as a management tool to generate support for the schools' objectives and a teacher's idea of a community developed from the individual classroom (Barnett & Fallon, 2007). School principals and teachers perceived that school principals exhibited more transformational style than transactional style and there was a positive relationship between transformational leadership style and positive school culture (Sahin, 2004). School climate had a significant correlation with principal's instructional leadership (Williams, 2006).

#### *Transformational Leadership and 360-Degree Feedback*

The purpose of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) is to identify perceptions of a leader's successful behaviors and the perceptions of the subordinates who work with him or her on those behaviors. Research revealed that teachers differ very little from business managers in their perceptions of the ideal attributes of principals. The only difference was that teachers expressed a need for principals who were caring as an important attribute and business managers listed intelligence as an



important attribute. Business managers listed intelligence as an attribute and described this attribute as being smarter than the competition. The similarities of perceptions between teachers and business employees allow the LPI to be utilized for both types of groups (Taylor, Martin, Hutchinson, & Jinks, 2007).

The Mental Measurements Yearbook (Enger & Pearson, 2004) states that the LPI is a widely marketed tool for facilitating workshops for formative evaluation of a supervisor's performance. Interpretations are based on the questionnaires. Normative data supplied in the package are used to interpret the responses. Included with the LPI is a facilitator's guide that provides information on workshop training and instrument usage. As a supplement, a participant's workbook is included that follows the facilitator's guide.

According to Mental Measurements Yearbook (Enger & Pearson, 2004), the development of the LPI began in the mid 1980s. The Leadership Practices Inventory, the Leadership Practices Inventory (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), and the Leadership Practices Inventory-Delta were developed by Kouzes and Posner (2007) and are based on five leadership practices believed to be common among successful leaders. All three versions are divided into five key sets of behaviors: (a) challenging the process, (b) inspiring a shared vision, (c) enabling others to act, (d) modeling the way, and (e) encouraging the heart. The five practices are divided into two components described as the 10 commitments of leadership. There are six questions for each of the five practices. The observer questionnaire can be completed by a peer, subordinate, supervisee, manager, or customer. Responses from the completed questionnaire are

entered into a computer program provided with the LPI package, and comparisons are made to normative information (Enger & Pearson, 2004).

The original LPI was developed and refined with data gathered from more than 1,200 managers. The analysis involved a multi-year study in which managers responded to a survey with behavioral statements that were content analyzed and sorted into various category labels. The five leadership categories were identified and written accordingly. The LPI then was administered to over 2,100 managers and their subordinates. An additional 2,876 managers and subordinates yielded final reliability and validity estimates for the LPI with internal reliability estimates ranging from .70 to .85 for the original self version, and .81 to .92 for the original other version with test-retest reliability estimates ranging from .93 to .95. Various validation efforts have resulted in the 30 items loading on the appropriate dimension and have remained stable. Gender and cross-cultural studies over the years have revealed few biases with the LPI. Now there is a Spanish-language version. Additional research by Enger and Pearson (2005) also provided strong evidence of discriminant and predictive validity using a Leadership Effectiveness Scale. Significant relationships were found between the LPI and job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and productivity (Enger & Pearson, 2004)

Enger and Pearson (2004) have posted current data collected online from 2005-2008 and are available on the leadership challenge website. The current sample was collected from over 1.1 million respondents, and demographic information was voluntarily provided by approximately one in five respondents. Reliability of the LPI was tested through analysis of internal reliability. All five leadership practices had

consistently strong internal reliability coefficients for both the Self and Observers formats. Coefficients ranged from .73 through .92. Internal reliability (Cronbach alpha) for the Positive Workplace Attitude scale was 0.92. The correlations between Positive Workplace Attitude and the Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership were all statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ). All comparisons ( $t$  tests) between Self respondents and Observer respondents as a group were statistically different ( $p < .001$ ).

Observers generally had higher average scores than self respondents for model, inspire, challenge, and encourage but not for enable. Responses from co-workers were generally not statistically different from one another. All comparisons ( $t$  tests) between male and female respondents were statistically different ( $p < .001$ ) for all five leadership practices. Average scores of females were higher than those of males for all five leadership practices. All comparisons (ANOVA) by ethnicity were statistically different ( $p < .001$ ) for all five leadership practices for self respondents. In addition, all comparisons ( $t$  tests) between Caucasians and People of Color (combining all of the ethnic groups or non-Caucasians) were statistically different ( $p < .001$ ) for all five leadership practices for self respondents. All comparisons (ANOVA) by ethnicity were statistically different ( $p < .001$ ) for all five leadership practices for observer respondents. All comparisons (ANOVA) between respondents by their age group were statistically different ( $p < .001$ ) for all five leadership practices. As age increased so did the frequency of their use of each of the leadership practices (Posner, 2009).

Hillman (2008) verifies some of the same conclusions as the research by Posner (2009). The purpose of the research was to determine differences in LPI scores between masters-level seminary students based on the independent variables of student

age, class load, gender, marital status, and parental status. A total of 330 survey packets were returned, and a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to analyze statistical difference. Statistically significant differences were found in the LPI-Self scores between groups based on age (Wilks's Lambda = 0.905,  $F = 2.182$ ,  $p = .006$ ). Nontraditional age students, especially age 40 years and older, scored significantly higher in challenging, enabling, modeling, and encouraging. Other indicators of nontraditional student status (class load, gender, marital status, and parental status) were not significant (Hillman, 2008).

The five practices of LPI correspond directly to the Profile of Leadership Opportunities (POLO) domains. Challenging the process encompasses innovation and transition. Inspiring a shared vision encompasses commitment, communications, and leader's personal perspective. Enabling others to act encompasses workplace, decisions, and development. Modeling the way encompasses leader's personal perspective and supervision. Finally, encouraging the heart encompasses supervision and encouragement (Hiam, 2003).

The elements of 360-degree or multi-rater feedback that were perceived by selected principals and superintendents to enhance the performance of school principals were studied by Youngs (2001). Individual interviews were conducted with five superintendents and 20 K-12 principals selected from five California unified school districts using 360-degree performance feedback with site principals. According to the results, 360-degree performance feedback enhanced the leadership roles of principals to a greater degree than single-rater feedback. Principals valued honest, specific,

meaningful, and constructive feedback when it was used to help them improve their performance and construct professional development plans (Youngs, 2001).

Assessing school principal performance is both necessary and challenging. Principal performance assessments offer districts an additional mechanism to ensure accountability and reinforce the importance of strong leadership practices (Condon & Clifford, 2010). Helping people understand feedback and providing them the necessary help to address their skills gaps will ensure the effectiveness of the tool (Salopek, 2004). Through observation and feedback from colleagues, principals realized that their own words, actions, and manner enhance or inhibit their success as supportive instructional consultants (Donaldson, Mamik, Mackenzie, & Ackerman, 2009).

#### *Transformational Leadership and Commitment*

If employees feel disconnected from or bored by their work, they are not likely to sustain their commitment. Any actions that raise involvement (either emotionally or intellectually) are helpful in building commitment. Commitment can be to fellow employees, a compelling goal, a leader, a tightly knit work group, or an exciting professional challenge. Commitment can be thought of as motivation to further the work of the group (Hiam, 2003). Motivation has been defined as processes within an individual which stimulate behavior and channel it in ways that should benefit the organization as a whole. There are three common aspects of motivation: effort, persistence, and direction. Dissatisfaction seems to result from poor interpersonal relations with students, inadequate styles of supervision, rigid and inflexible school policies and administrative practices, and poor interpersonal relations with colleagues and parents (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008). Diamantes (2004) found mixed results

when comparing principal and teacher responses to explore teacher motivation. In addition, some principals expressed concern that they were out of touch with their teachers. Perceived leadership styles of school principals and teacher job satisfaction have a significant relationship (Eldred, 2010). One key to a successful acceptance of an initiative by teachers is the level of commitment displayed by the principal (Hertberg-Davis & Brighton, 2006).

Estapa (2010) examined the relationship between principals' transformational leadership behaviors, as perceived by teachers and student achievement on standardized tests, and found a correlation between teachers' perceptions of their principal's transformational leadership behaviors and teacher self-efficacy, job satisfaction, and overall organizational commitment. Perceived leader integrity was positively correlated with transformational leadership. Success in transformational leadership is based on a transformation of behaviors of leaders, rather than intentions, and is assessed through frequency of behaviors rather than the moral mindset of the leader (Parry & Proctor-Thomson, 2002). Sun (2004) found that values are the medium in which leadership power exists and through which it functions and that leadership influence is a function of the interaction between the follower's value system and that of the leader. People who have the greatest clarity about both personal and organizational values have the highest degree of commitment to the organization (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

#### *Transformational Leadership and Employee Development*

Transformational leaders demonstrate high standards of ethical and moral conduct. These leaders consider the needs of employees over their own needs. They share risks with employees in goal setting. They use power only when necessary and

never for personal gain (Fiore, 2004). Transformational leadership was positively and significantly related to both task performance and innovation. Transformational leadership may compensate for lack of subordinate self-esteem when innovation is the desired outcome and for a lack of subordinate self-presentation for task performance as the criterion. Subordinates benefited from leaders who instilled optimism and confidence in them (Rank, Nelson, Allen, & Xu, 2009). Graczewski, Knudson, and Holtzman (2009) found a connection between aspects of principal instructional leadership (coherent school-wide vision and leaders' engagement in instructional improvement) and selected research-based characteristics of effective teacher development (coherence and focus on content and curriculum) in case studies of nine schools located in San Diego. The need for instructional leadership in schools was highlighted by the emergence of standards-based accountability and demands that principals take responsibility for student performance.

McGuigan and Hoy (2006) stated that teachers see principals as competent and caring when a principal enables their work and is aware of the impact that school management has on a teacher's work. The main focus of the principal should be the academic success of students and provide opportunities for professional development and teacher success. Finally, the principal should encourage teachers' trust in their students and parents.

Principals tend to be more effective when they lead through example and share knowledge and instructional expertise with teachers. Teachers need to be praised and feel appreciated. Effective principals are willing to assist with discipline problems and offer positive ways to improve student behavior. Strategies include principal visibility

which will reduce discipline problems and quality communication between principals and teachers. Quality communications include politeness, consideration, and acceptance. Effective principals are problem solvers and discourage cliques (Ediger, 2006).

#### *Variables Related to Leadership*

Gender trends among principals have shifted from primarily male to increasing numbers of females. In addition, the number of experienced principals is on the decline. The Condition of Education 2010, a report from the U.S. Department of Education, discussed the characteristics of school principals and made comparisons from the 1999-2000 school year to the 2007-2008 school year (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). The percentages of principals who were female increased from 52% to 59% at public elementary schools and from 22% to 29% at public secondary schools during the 2007-2008 school year. The percentage of experienced public school principals with 20 or more years of experience decreased from 10% to 5% and 6% of public secondary school principals had three or fewer years of experience compared with 30% in the 1999-2000 school year (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010).

Oplatka and Mimon (2008) found that respondents' answers to questionnaires about transformational leadership behaviors displayed were related to gender. A three-year data analysis of the Leadership Practices Inventory was completed by Posner (2009) and found that as research participants reported greater levels of transformational leadership, they also reported feeling more favorable about their



workplace. Self-rated scores were higher than other rated scores, and the average leadership scores of females were higher than males.

Cundiff (2010) conducted research about the potential barriers of followers' reactions to women once they obtain a leadership position. Followers perceived female leaders to be more transformational and less dominant than males. Female leaders also were perceived as having more commitment and being able to produce commitment with followers. Male leaders were perceived as being more dominant and oriented toward work tasks than female leaders. Although it was hypothesized that males would be more likeable than females, there was no significant difference on how much they were liked. Similarly, Gaziel (2003) found that teachers reported that male principals tended to place greater emphasis on facts, logical goals, and planning, while female principals tended to be more human resource oriented.

Years of administrative experience may be connected to the propensity to engage in transformational leadership behaviors. Oplatka and Mimon (2008) found that as age increased so did transformational leadership practices. In contrast, Carroll (1999) found that administrators with lower levels of experience were perceived as being more effective than administrators with a higher level of experience.

### Summary

The literature review has examined qualities, standards, and behaviors which encompass transformational leadership. Discrepancies exist between teachers and principals concerning the actual leadership behaviors that are displayed. Using a 360-degree evaluation instrument provided principals with feedback from teachers and strategies to increase transformational leadership behaviors, which have been shown to

increase student performance and the likelihood of achieving adequate yearly progress in schools. Determining whether there was an effect between the discrepancies of principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors and school performance increased understanding about leadership behaviors and the effect that they have on academic achievement. Trends in the principalship, such as gender and years of experience, have changed in recent years and were also examined for effect.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

This chapter lists the research questions, hypotheses, and the dependent and independent variables addressed in the study. Respondents are described and the chapter explains the data collection process and the instrument that was used. Statistical analyses used to interpret the data are described.

#### Research Questions and Hypotheses

Understanding the difference between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behaviors, which will be discerned through the use of a 360-degree evaluation tool, will encourage principals to strengthen their transformational leadership behaviors that have shown to increase student achievement, employee development, and employee commitment. Transformational leadership behaviors also improve the workplace. The following research questions were examined in the study.

1. Is there a difference between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior?
2. What is the effect of gender of administrator on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors?
3. What is the effect of years of administrator experience on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors?
4. What is the effect of the performance status of the school on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors?

The hypotheses for these questions were as follows:

H<sub>1</sub>: There will be a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior.

H<sub>2</sub>: There will be an effect on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior that will be related to the independent variable of gender of administrator.

H<sub>3</sub>: There will be an effect on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior that will be related to the independent variable of years of administrator experience.

H<sub>4</sub>: There will be an effect on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors that will be related to the independent variable of the performance status of the school.

#### Respondents in the Study

The Louisiana Department of Education (2010a, 2010b) divides school parishes into eight regions. Each region encompasses at least five school districts and all districts were contacted. Of those who responded affirmatively, a selection was made of 34 schools which were more than an adequate number of confirmative responses to meet the required sample. Respondent in the study were principals and school teachers from 34 schools within 18 school parishes located within the eight regions. The Louisiana Department of Education (2010a, 2010b) is divided into eight regions and securing school districts within each region provided a geographically representative sample of Louisiana schools. Inclusion of districts and schools was based upon willingness to participate.

Informed consent was obtained from all respondents. A written statement was handed out to the respondents, read to them, and a request was made for their signature, which indicated their informed consent and willingness to participate. The last page with the signature was removed and respondents retained the first two pages. The statement explained that the study involved research and outlined the purpose of the research. A description of the procedures was also provided. The statement explained that the survey was voluntary and that respondents could discontinue at any time without penalty. Teacher surveys had no demographic or personal information and were not shared with principals. Principals provided gender and administrator years of experience for the study. All interested respondents will be able to obtain a copy of the completed research study, which will not identify individual districts, schools, or principals. Data were gathered onsite by the researcher. Surveys were collected and placed inside an envelope and locked inside a box. One exception to the process was a single school that independently completed the questionnaires before the researcher visited the school. To maintain validity, these data were excluded.

#### Research Design and Procedures

The study used quantitative measures for analyses of responses. A 360-degree evaluation tool questionnaire, which is designed to help principals improve their leadership behaviors, was utilized to obtain principal and teacher responses. A quantitative design was less invasive than a qualitative design. A qualitative design would have required that the researcher ask personal questions about the principal; therefore, teachers might have been less willing to participate. A qualitative design could have reflected any bias and opinions of the researcher. The quantitative survey

distributed to the teachers was worded in a nonthreatening manner and asked questions concerning employees' beliefs about leadership.

Upon receiving consent from the Institutional Review Board of The University of Southern Mississippi and cooperation from participating school districts, the research was completed by May 2011 (see Appendix A). District superintendents were contacted to obtain their permission to conduct research (see Appendix B), and individual schools were contacted (see Appendixes C and D). The survey took less than 15 minutes to complete.

#### Instrumentation

The Profile of Leadership Opportunities (POLO) served as the primary data collection instrument for the study. The instrument was purchased and a letter of permission from the company is included. See Appendix E for the letter of permission. The POLO questionnaire (Hiam, 2003) addresses 10 separate leadership domains that are comprised of six statements, each of which can be used to inspire and motivate leaders to build enthusiasm, unleash initiative, and increase the power of an organization to increase its goal achievements. The questionnaire reveals which leadership domains are high and low for the leader so that focus can be narrowed down to the domains which need the greatest improvement. The leadership domains are commitment, communication, leader's personal perspective, supervision, innovations, the workplace, transitions, encouragement, decisions, and employee development. The 10 domains, comprised of a total of 60 statements, were judged on a 5-point Likert scale. Although the instrument has 10 domains, this study will focus on the following three domains: commitment, the workplace, and employee development. The domains

were chosen based on a field test that was conducted on the instrument and researcher interest. There are two versions that were used: a self-reporting form for the principal and an employee opinion reporting form for the teacher. The leader version includes a workbook tool which allows the leader to improve leadership behaviors after completing the self-analysis (Hiam, 2003).

Morris (2009) conducted a study involving teachers and principals from three charter and three public schools located within the Jefferson Parish Public School District using the POLO instrument and an Occupational Motivation Index and acquired the following results. Cronbach's alpha is a measure of internal consistency and a test of reliability which comprises a number of items that make up a scale designed to measure a single construct and determine the degree to which all the items are measuring the same construct (Cronk, 2006). The affective domain received a score of .927 which means that there is internal consistency and that the reliability is good. The normative domain received a score of .876 which is lower but still scores in the higher internal consistency ranking and the reliability is good. The accumulative domain scored a .842 which means that there is internal consistency and the reliability is good. Finally, the limited domain scored .672 which means that there is lower internal consistency and the reliability level is low. The POLO scored a much lower score by itself so a field test was conducted by the researcher using the instrument to acquire internal consistency and reliability data. Thirteen teachers from a school located in Jefferson Parish, Louisiana, were surveyed and 10 responses were returned. Data analysis was conducted and a Cronbach's alpha score of .982 was obtained indicating strong internal consistency and reliability.

### Variables in the Study

The dependent variables for this study were leadership behaviors, which were operationalized through principal response scores and teacher response scores. The independent variables were gender of administrator, administrator's years of experience, and the performance status of the school.

### Data Collection Process

Upon approval from the Institutional Review Board and after obtaining the principal's permission and agreement for participation, the researcher explained the purpose of the research and invited at least seven teachers and the principal from each school to participate in a survey during their planning time, faculty meeting, or time designated by the principal. The researcher first obtained their consent and gave directions on how to complete the survey. The researcher collected the completed forms as respondents finished. The researcher took the forms and placed them in a lockbox. The lockbox was kept secure in the researcher's home. Surveys were analyzed and information is available via written report to respondents. The results of the study could possibly be used in a future workshop, professional conference, or for publication. At the end of one year, respondents' answers will be shredded. The procedures took no longer than 15 minutes in a place designated by the principal.

### Analysis of Data

Data analysis was conducted using descriptive, *t* test, and correlational statistical processes. Independent *t* tests were utilized for each of the chosen three domains to make the comparisons between teacher and principal beliefs about leadership behaviors.



Correlational statistics were used to examine the effects of administrator's years of experience, the gender of the administrator, and the school's adequate yearly progress.

### Summary

There are standards, studies, and analyses that consistently indicate a list of effective transformational leadership behaviors; however, discrepancies exist between principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of the leadership behaviors displayed. The 360-degree leadership evaluation tool was used to discern whether differences existed. These results may provide a foundation for policy and action strategies to improve transformational leadership behaviors that can increase student achievement.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

Transformational leadership is associated with high levels of employee motivation and commitment, improvement in student achievement, enhancement of school environment, and employee development and growth (Lunenburg & Ornstein 2008; Ross & Gray, 2006). The purpose of this study was to examine whether a difference existed between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior. The study also examined the effects of gender of administrator, administrator experience, and performance status of the school on teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behaviors. This chapter describes the results of the study.

#### Description of the Respondents

Primary data consisted of responses from 34 principal surveys and 238 teacher surveys from 18 districts across the state of Louisiana. Five districts were located in the north Louisiana region and three districts were located in the central Louisiana region. Six districts were located in the Acadiana region, and three districts were located in the Florida Parishes region. One district was located in the Greater New Orleans region. Demographic data were reported for principals and included gender, years of experience, and the adequate yearly progress status of these schools. Ethnicity of principals and demographic data for teachers were not included in order to maintain the anonymity of respondents. The demographic data of principal respondents indicated that principal respondents were 64.7% female and 35.3% male. There was a wide range of years of experience as an administrator: 2.9% had two years of experience, 2.9% had four years of experience, 14.7% had five years of experience, 11.8% had six years of

experience, 5.9% had seven years of experience, 5.9% had eight years of experience, 14.7% had nine years of experience, 8.8% had 10 years of experience, 5.9% had 11 years of experience, 2.9% had 12 years of experience, 5.9% had 13 years of experience, 5.9% had 14 years of experience, 2.9% had 18 years of experience, and 8.8% had 24 years of administrator experience. Adequate yearly progress was met by 37.5% of responding schools, and 62.5% of responding schools did not meet adequate yearly progress (see Table 1).

Table 1

*Percentages of Respondents' Primary Demographic Data*

Demographic descriptor	Respondents	Louisiana Department of Education
Respondents		
Female	64.7	60.0
Male	35.3	40.0
Years of Experience		
0 to 14	16.0	88.3
14 to 24+	84.0	11.7
Adequate Yearly Progress		
No	62.5	75.0
Yes	37.5	25.0.

In order to gain a general sense of the demographic makeup of principals in the state of Louisiana and to find out if this research sample of principals was similar to the statewide demographic profile of Louisiana principals, data were gathered from the Louisiana Department of Education (2011). Across the state, there were 542 male principals (40%) and 816 female principals (60%). There was also a wide range of principal administrator experience. Two percent had zero to three years of experience, 5% had four to 10 years of experience, 9% had 11 to 14 years of experience, 18% had 15 to 19 years of experience, 16% had 20 to 24 years of experience, and 50% had 25+ years of experience. Twenty-five percent of schools that were assigned goals for adequate yearly progress in 2008 met these goals.

The Condition of Education 2010, a report from the U.S. Department of Education, noted that the percentage of principals who were female had increased (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). A description of the research respondents and data from the total population of Louisiana principals were examined to gain a general sense of similarities. In both examples, there were more female principals than male principals. In contrast, the report discussed that the number of principals with less experience had increased, yet principals from the state of Louisiana and research respondents were reported to have more years of experience. The research sample districts and the state of Louisiana both had high numbers of schools that had not met adequate yearly progress.

#### Reliability of the Instrument

The POLO served as the primary data collection instrument for the study. The questionnaire consists of 10 separate leadership domains that are comprised of six

statements each which are rated on a 5-point Likert scale. Three domains were chosen based on a field test that was conducted on the instrument and researcher interest. The results of the field test indicated strong internal consistency and reliability. There are two versions that were used: a self-reporting form for the principal and an employee opinion form for the teacher.

The Employee Opinion Reporting Form (EORF), which is the teacher survey, is divided into 10 sections with six questions in each section. The Profile of Leadership Opportunities (POLO), which is the principal survey, includes 60 questions that are numbered 1 through 60; the POLO is not divided into 10 sections. Each section represents a domain of leadership. Although the survey covers 10 domains, this study focused on the following three: commitment, workplace, and employee development. The first domain in the full survey and the first domain to be discussed represent commitment. The POLO is self-scored by the principal on a worksheet that corresponds with sections on the EORF, and questions 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, and 51 correspond to the six questions listed beside number one on the EORF, which represents the first domain, commitment. The second domain, workplace, includes section 6 on the EORF, which corresponds to questions 6, 16, 26, 36, 46, and 56 on the POLO. The third domain, employee development, includes section 10 on the EORF, which corresponds to questions 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, and 60 on the POLO. Each section of questions on the EORF is designed to measure the same construct as the corresponding questions on the POLO.

Cronbach's alpha test of coefficient reliability was performed on each set of items to determine how well each set of items measured a single construct. This test

was run on survey questions that were averaged together into a subscale score that represented a construct. Cronbach's alpha of 0.70 or greater is considered acceptable. Each of the three domains received an acceptable Cronbach's alpha reliability score of  $> 0.70$ .

Scores from the sets of questions from the survey instruments were averaged for the three domains that were actually used in the analyses. Seven teacher scores from each participating school were averaged and used as a total average mean score for each domain. In addition, the participating principal's score was also used. The first section of the survey identified commitment, which was defined as the pride and interest in work and the motivation to further the work of the group (Hiam, 2003). Section 1 on the EORF and questions 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, and 51 on the POLO were averaged together and received a total Cronbach's alpha score of .75. The sixth section of the survey identified workplace which is identified as the environment in which employees work (Hiam, 2003). Section 6 on the EORF and questions 6, 16, 26, 36, 46, and 56 on the POLO were averaged together and received a total Cronbach's alpha score of .76. The 10th section of the survey identified employee development as the stimulation and motivation of employees to develop and grow through their work (Hiam, 2003). Section 10 on the EORF and questions 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, and 60 on the POLO were averaged and received a total Cronbach's alpha score of .76.

### Statistical Analysis Results

This study was a nonexperimental, quantitative study investigating whether a statistically significant difference existed between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behaviors. This study used primary data collected through surveys

of principals and teachers throughout the state of Louisiana and archival statistics and achievement data collected from the Louisiana Department of Education (2010b) website.

To assess whether a statistically significant difference existed between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behaviors, this study used independent  $t$  tests to determine whether a difference existed among the mean scores of the areas of employee development, commitment, and workplace. The effects of independent variables of gender of administrator, administrator years of experience, and performance status of schools were also examined through independent  $t$  tests. The means and standard deviations for each of these variables are listed in Table 2. Further explanation on the statistical significance of difference will be enumerated following the table.

Table 2

*Means and Standard Deviations*

Independent variable	Employment development		Commitment		Workplace	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Gender						
Female	25.11	2.17	25.93	2.06	24.12	2.53
Male	24.43	1.83	25.57	1.82	24.98	1.67

Table 2 (continued).

Independent variable	Employment development		Commitment		Workplace	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Years of experience						
0-12 years	24.93	2.19	25.83	2.04	24.24	2.42
13-24 years	24.67	1.66	25.68	1.82	25.01	1.71
AYP						
No	24.97	2.19	25.61	2.10	24.16	2.61
Yes	24.62	1.96	25.99	1.75	24.83	1.73

An independent sample *t* test was calculated comparing the employment development mean score of subjects who identified themselves as teachers to the employment development mean score of subjects who identified themselves as principals. No significant difference was found,  $t(66) = -.51, p = .61$ . The employment development mean of teachers ( $M = 2.74, SD = 2.22$ ) was not significantly different from the employment development mean of principals ( $M = 25.00, SD = 1.92$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

An independent samples *t* test was calculated comparing the commitment mean score of subjects who identified themselves as teachers to the commitment mean score of subjects who identified themselves as principals and a significant difference was



found,  $t(66) = 2.71, p = .009$  at the .01 level. The commitment mean of teachers ( $M = 26.42, SD = 1.67$ ) was significantly different from the commitment mean of principals ( $M = 25.18, SD = 2.08$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was statistically higher than the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

An independent samples  $t$  test was calculated comparing the workplace mean score of subjects who identified themselves as teachers to the workplace mean score of subjects who identified themselves as principals. No significant difference was found,  $t(66) = .78, p = .44$ . Workplace mean of teachers ( $M = 24.64, SD = 2.42$ ) was not significantly different from the workplace mean of principals ( $M = 24.21, SD = 2.16$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

An independent samples  $t$  test was calculated comparing the employment development mean score of subjects who identified themselves as females to the employment development mean score of subjects who identified themselves as males. No significant difference was found,  $t(66) = 1.31, p = .19$ . The employment development mean of teachers ( $M = 25.11, SD = .33$ ) was not significantly different from the employment development mean of principals ( $M = 24.43, SD = 1.83$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

An independent samples  $t$  test was calculated comparing the commitment mean score of subjects who identified themselves as females to the commitment mean score of subjects who identified themselves as males. No significant difference was found,  $t(66) = .71, p = .48$ . The commitment mean of teachers ( $M = 25.92, SD = 2.07$ ) was not

significantly different from the commitment mean of principals ( $M = 25.57, SD = 1.82$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principal.

An independent samples  $t$  test was calculated comparing the workplace mean score of subjects who identified themselves as females to the workplace mean score of subjects who identified themselves as males. No significant difference was found,  $t(66) = -1.49, p = .14$ . The workplace mean of teachers ( $M = 24.12, SD = 2.53$ ) was not significantly different from the workplace mean of principals ( $M = 24.98, SD = 1.67$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

An independent samples  $t$ -test was calculated comparing the employment development mean score of subjects who identified themselves as less experienced administrators to the employment development mean score of subjects who identified themselves as more experienced administrators. No significant difference was found,  $t(66) = .45, p = .66$ . The employment development mean of less experienced administrators ( $M = 24.93, SD = 2.19$ ) was not significantly different from the employment development mean of more experienced administrators ( $M = 24.67, SD = 1.66$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

An independent samples  $t$  test was calculated comparing the commitment mean score of subjects who identified themselves as less experienced administrators to the commitment mean score of subjects who identified themselves as more experienced administrators. No significant difference was found,  $t(66) = .27, p = .79$ . The

commitment mean of less experienced administrators ( $M = 25.83$ ,  $SD = 2.04$ ) was not significantly different from the commitment mean of more experienced administrators ( $M = 25.68$ ,  $SD = 1.82$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

An independent samples  $t$  test was calculated comparing the workplace mean score of subjects who identified themselves as less experienced administrators to the workplace mean score of subjects who identified themselves as more experienced administrators. No significant difference was found,  $t(66) = -1.18$ ,  $p = .24$ . The workplace mean of less experienced administrators ( $M = 24.24$ ,  $SD = 2.42$ ) was not significantly different from the workplace mean of more experienced administrators ( $M = 25.01$ ,  $SD = 1.71$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

An independent samples  $t$  test was calculated comparing the employment development mean score of subjects who identified their schools as meeting adequate yearly progress to the employment development mean score of subjects who identified their schools as not meeting adequate yearly progress. No significant difference was found,  $t(62) = .64$ ,  $p = .52$ . The employment development mean of those whose schools did not meet adequate yearly progress ( $M = 24.97$ ,  $SD = 2.19$ ) was not significantly different from the employment development mean of those whose schools met adequate yearly progress ( $M = 24.62$ ,  $SD = 1.96$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

An independent samples *t* test was calculated comparing the commitment mean score of subjects who identified their schools as not meeting adequate yearly progress to the commitment mean score of subjects who identified their schools as meeting yearly progress. No significant difference was found,  $t(62) = -.75, p = .46$ . The commitment mean of those whose schools did not meet adequate yearly progress ( $M = 25.61, SD = 2.10$ ) was not significantly different from the commitment mean of those whose schools met adequate yearly progress ( $M = 25.99, SD = 1.75$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

An independent samples *t* test was calculated comparing the workplace mean score of subjects who identified their schools as not meeting adequate yearly progress to the workplace mean score of subjects who identified their schools as meeting adequate yearly progress. No significant difference was found,  $t(62) = -1.12, p = .27$ . The workplace mean of those whose schools met adequate yearly progress ( $M = 24.16, SD = 2.61$ ) was not significantly different from the workplace mean of those whose schools met adequate yearly progress ( $M = 24.83, SD = 1.73$ ). Thus, the mean rating of principals on this domain was not statistically different from the mean ratings of teachers who also rated the principals.

### Summary

This section offers a brief recap of findings and a summary of the chapter.  $H_1$  was stated as follows: There will be a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about leadership behavior. No significant difference was found for employee development,  $t(66) = -.51, p = .61$ , or for the workplace,  $t(66) = .78, p = .44$ .

However, this study found a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about leadership behaviors of the principal in the area of commitment,  $t(66) = 2.71, p = .009$  at the .01 level. Therefore,  $H_1$  was accepted.

$H_2$  was stated as follows: There will be an effect on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior that will be related to the independent variable of gender of administrator. This study did not find a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior related to the independent variable of gender of administrator in the areas of employee development,  $t(66) = 1.31, p = .19$ ; commitment,  $t(66) = .71, p = .48$ ; and the workplace,  $t(66) = -1.49, p = .14$ . Therefore,  $H_2$  was rejected.

$H_3$  was stated as follows: There will be an effect on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior that will be related to the independent variable of years of administrator experience. This study did not find a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior related to the independent variable of years of administrator experience in the areas of employee development,  $t(66) = .45, p = .66$ ; commitment,  $t(66) = .27, p = .79$ ; and the workplace,  $t(66) = -1.18, p = .24$ . Therefore,  $H_3$  was rejected.

$H_4$  was stated as follows: There will be an effect on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior that will be related to the independent variable of the performance status of the school. This study did not find a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior related to the independent variable of the performance status of the

school in the areas of employee development,  $t(62) = .64, p = .52$ ; commitment,  $t(62) = -.75, p = .46$ ; and the workplace,  $t(62) = -1.12, p = .27$ . Therefore,  $H_4$  was rejected.

This study investigated whether or not there were significant differences between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors. The study also examined the effects of gender of administrator, administrator experience, and performance status of the school on teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behaviors. The study showed that there was a statistically significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership in the area of commitment; however, there was no statistically significant difference in the areas of workplace or employee development. There were no statistically significant differences in the effects of gender of administrator, administrator experience, and performance status of the school. This study may indicate a need for future studies in the area of commitment.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine whether a difference existed between teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior. The study also examined the effects of gender of administrator, administrator experience, and performance status of school on teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behaviors. Identifying a leadership domain that showed a statistical difference may assist principals and teachers when creating action plans to increase transformational leadership behaviors among principals. This chapter includes a summary of the procedures, discussion of the findings, and conclusions. There are also recommendations for policy and practice and for future research.

#### Summary of Procedures

The primary data for this study were obtained from surveys completed by 34 principals and surveys completed by 238 teachers from 18 districts throughout the state of Louisiana. Thirty-four schools from the five regions of Louisiana participated in this study that examined principal leadership behaviors, specifically transformational leadership behaviors as measured by the Profile of Leadership Opportunities (POLO) (Hiam, 2003). Descriptive statistics and *t* tests were used to determine whether differences existed between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors. Descriptive statistics and *t* tests were also used to examine the effects of the independent variables, gender of administrator, administrator experience, and performance status of the school on whether differences existed between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors.

Prior to implementation of the study, permission was obtained from district superintendents and The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board (IRB). From the middle of February 2011 through the last week of March 2011, surveys were distributed onsite to participating principals and teachers by the researcher. Data were compiled and analyzed by the researcher. To measure reliability of items that were to provide data for analysis, a Cronbach alpha test of coefficient reliability was performed on the three domains of survey items that were actually employed for the study.

### Major Findings

The demographic data of principal respondents indicated that these study respondents were 64.7% female and 35.3% male. There was a wide range of administrator experience, with 16.0% of principal respondents having 0-14 years of administrator experience and 84.0% having 14-24 years of administrator experience. Adequate yearly progress was met by 37.5% of schools in which these respondents served and not met by 62.5% of the schools. A description of the research respondents and data from the total population of Louisiana principals were examined to gain a general sense of comparability between the two groups. The groups were somewhat similar in that research sample districts and the state of Louisiana both had higher numbers of female administrators and high numbers of schools that had not met adequate yearly progress. In contrast, research respondents had more years of administrator experience than the Louisiana administrators. Ethnicity of principals and demographic data for teachers were not included to maintain anonymity of respondents.



H<sub>1</sub> was stated as follows: There will be a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about leadership behavior. No significant difference was found for the POLO leadership domain of employee development or for the domain of workplace. However, this study found a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about leadership behaviors of the principal in the area of commitment. Therefore, H<sub>1</sub> was accepted. The differences between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors in the domains entitled employee development, workplace, and commitment were found to be consistent with findings in previous studies in some areas but inconsistent with findings in others. The research studies of Carroll (1999) and Posner (2009) were consistent with this study and found that, although observers had higher scores than self-respondents, overall responses were not significantly different. Graczewski, Knudson, and Holtzman (2009) and McGuigan and Hoy (2006) found connections between aspects of principal leadership behaviors and effective employee development. These findings were not consistent with this study because there were no significant differences between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior in the area of employee development. In addition, this study was not consistent with literature which found that as research respondents reported greater levels of transformational leadership, they also reported feeling more favorable about the workplace (Engels, Hotton, Devos, Bouckennooghe, & Aelterman, 2008; Posner, 2009).

Findings associated with the leadership domain of commitment were consistent with the literature review. Diamantes (2004) found mixed results when comparing principal and teacher responses to explore the domain of teacher motivation. Some

principals expressed a concern about feeling out of touch with their teachers; however, many teachers did not express the same concern. Significant relationships and correlations were found between principal leadership and overall organizational commitment (Eldred, 2010; Estapa, 2010; Fee, 2009; Green, 2009).

H<sub>2</sub> was stated as follows: There will be an effect on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior that will be related to the independent variable of gender of administrator. This study did not find a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior related to the independent variable of gender of administrator in the areas of employee development, commitment, and the workplace. Therefore, H<sub>2</sub> was rejected. The trends in the literature were mixed with regard to the effect of gender. Oplatka and Mimon (2008) stated that answers from respondents on questionnaires about transformational leadership behaviors were related to gender, while Luo and Lotfollah (2007) found that gender did not affect perceptions of leadership behaviors. Posner (2009) found that females scored higher leadership scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory. Although there was no significant difference found in the effect of gender on this study, females' scores were higher.

H<sub>3</sub> was stated as follows: There will be an effect on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior that will be related to the independent variable of years of administrator experience. This study did not find a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior related to the independent variable of years of administrator experience in the areas of employee development, commitment, and the workplace. Therefore, H<sub>3</sub> was

rejected. Researchers disagree on the effect of years of administrator experience. Carroll (1999) found that less experienced administrators were more effective leaders, while Oplatka and Mimon (2008) found that as years increased so did transformational leadership behaviors. The study found no significant difference in the effect of years of administrator experience and was not consistent with the majority of literature reviewed.

H<sub>4</sub> was stated as follows: There will be an effect on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior that will be related to the independent variable of the performance status of the school. This study did not find a significant difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior related to the independent variable of the performance status of the school in the areas of employee development, commitment, and the workplace. Therefore, H<sub>4</sub> was rejected.

Fisher (2010) found low levels of morale and high levels of stress in schools not meeting adequate yearly progress. Principals in schools that met adequate yearly progress goals exhibited transformational leadership behaviors with greater frequency (Fisher, 2010; Martinez, 2009); therefore, the literature was not consistent with the study which did not find significant differences between schools meeting or not meeting adequate yearly progress.

## Discussion

Demographic data were examined and the researcher discussed how findings related to current literature. The researcher also discussed demographic data that could have related to findings which were not consistent with literature. Confirmative

responses needed to meet the required sample size that included more females than males. Many respondents were career principals who had maintained employment within the same school for many years. In many cases, the principal's career originally began with service in the same school as a teacher. Also, many of the teachers were tenured teachers who had several years of experience within the same school. Finally, willingness to participate was not connected with the performance status of the participating school, and principals were appreciative of the 360-degree evaluation tool that could be utilized for future planning.

Some of the findings related to the hypotheses that were examined in this study were consistent with previous research. Commitment was the only leadership domain in which a significant difference was found. This study agrees with other researchers that significant relationships exist between principal leadership and overall organizational commitment. According to Likert's theory, school policies, standard operating procedures, and administrative actions and decisions do not directly influence school effectiveness. However, the degree to which teachers are motivated to work and how committed they are to school goals and purposes are affected (Sergiovanni, 2001). The culture of an organization affects motivation, leadership decision making, communication, and change (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008).

This study also concurs with Hertberg-Davis and Brighton (2006) and Sahin (2004) who concluded that one key to successful acceptance of an initiative by teachers is the level of commitment displayed by the principal. Green (2009) stated that further study was needed to analyze any disconnect between principals and teachers about principal leadership behavior. In addition, Fee (2009) recommended the following

strategies to reduce discrepancies between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors displayed: leader reflection, seeking out why discrepancies exist, and creating strategies to enhance desired leadership behaviors.

Although gender differences were discovered during this research, no significant differences were found. Oplatka and Mimon (2008) stated that research answers were related to gender. Fisher (2010) found that females scored higher leadership scores which were consistent with the descriptive data of the current study. Cundiff (2010) conducted research and found that followers perceived females to be more transformational and less dominating than males; however, traditionally, more females enter education as a career. It is possible that the overall population of teachers and principals within Louisiana school districts is primarily female.

Oplatka and Mimon (2008) linked years of administrator experience to transformational leadership which is contrary to the current study. The remoteness of some of the districts in the sample and the lack of opportunities available could have discouraged some principals from seeking other employment. In addition, the remoteness of some of the districts in the sample and the lack of opportunities available could have had the same effect on teachers, causing a familiarity of thought and agreement in survey responses.

Willingness to participate was not connected with the performance status of the participating school. Newmann, King, and Rigdon (1977) stated that organizational capacity was not related to accountability. There were controversies about strategies on how to implement accountability and assistance required to support the transformational

actions of leaders. School principals and teachers perceived that there was a correlation between transformational leadership style and positive school culture.

This study also agrees with research studies that principal performance assessments offer districts an additional mechanism to increase strong leadership practices and the 360-degree evaluation tool is an effective strategy that can be used in the development of principal transformational leadership action plans. Principals valued honest, specific feedback when it was used to help them improve their performance and construct professional development plans (Condon & Clifford, 2010; Donaldson, Mamik, Mackenzie, & Ackerman, 2009). The use of a self-assessment tool was perceived as a useful tool as it emphasized how self-perceptions and other perceptions conflict, thereby prompting reconciliation (Tyler, 2006). With 360-degree feedback, leaders received feedback to help deal with the intention-perception gap (Cashman, 2009).

#### Limitations

Generalizations about some of the study findings were limited by certain factors. This research only included the following three leadership domains: employee development, commitment, and the workplace. Researchers recognize that there are more than three domains which comprise a total model of transformational leadership. Survey respondents were limited to a convenience sample from participating school districts. Therefore, this study's findings should not be generalized beyond populations of similar demographic and jurisdictional profiles. The sample size ( $N = 34$ ) of schools was not large but was more than enough to meet the minimum requirement for  $t$  tests. However, a large sample might produce greater prospects for significant findings.

## Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Gordon and Patterson (2006) found that successful leaders constructed success through interactions with constituents and negotiated how the manifestation of concerns and the demonstration and recognition of expertise would look in each school setting. The current researcher recommends that a portion of faculty meeting time be dedicated to on-going principal assessment and the creation of action plans resulting from the use of a 360-degree evaluation tool. It is also recommended that principals in a district meet periodically to share transformational leadership action plans with each other. Sharing transformational leadership action plans that address strategies for transformational leadership behavior improve feelings of disconnectedness that can occur from working in isolation and can provide the opportunity for the creation of new ideas. School boards and districts can encourage this practice by allowing principals to leave their designated schools during professional development days at least once a quarter and meet at different designated school locations. Successful leaders look for ways to improve their team, such as networking and taking the initiative to try new approaches. Leaders can prioritize subjects and focus on one major project per quarter (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Some research respondents expressed regrets about the limited opportunities for transfer to other schools. If employees feel disconnected from or bored with their work, they are not likely to sustain commitment. Actions that raise involvement are helpful in building commitment (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008). It is recommended that the superintendent periodically transfer long-time principals and teachers from one school location to another to reduce feelings of familiarity, thus creating the opportunity for the

stimulation and creation of new ideas. Maslow's theory suggests that a school administrator's job is to provide opportunities for the satisfaction of an employee's needs that also support organizational goals. The leader also has a responsibility to remove obstacles that block need satisfaction and cause frustration, negative attitudes, or dysfunctional behavior (Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008). Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) assert that an important leadership responsibility is to become a change agent and open up discussions to the faculty about becoming too comfortable with themselves. Successful leaders challenge the process and do not achieve success by allowing things to remain the same. Workers increase their productivity when their needs are satisfied, thus impacting the organization's level of success.

Both internal and external technical assistance should support the transformational actions of leaders to meet student performance goals (Tolbert, 2003). Superintendents can use this research to create systems of professional development and mentoring. Transformational leaders who partner in establishing cultures of inquiry and change in a nonthreatening environment of continuous improvement are more likely to increase student achievement. Superintendents can use the POLO Leadership Guidebook (Hiam, 2003) to create workshops on transformational topics to inform principals about strategies for increasing transformational leadership behaviors which have shown to increase student achievement. Successful principals from other districts who have met adequate yearly progress also can be invited to serve as transformational leadership mentors (Fisher, 2010). Fee (2009) recommended bringing leaders and followers closer to agreement about the leadership behavior domain of commitment, which involves leader reflection, seeking out why the discrepancy exists, and creating



individualized strategies to enhance desired leadership behavior. Reeves (2004) recommended that accountability and leadership behaviors be linked together in circumstances in which leaders welcome the opportunity to be held accountable. Thus, the researcher recommends that transformational leadership training be ongoing and include superintendents, principals, and teachers.

#### Recommendations for Future Research

As with all studies of this nature, there were lessons learned in the process of conducting the research that could serve as a springboard for further inquiry. As a result of a relatively small sample size and only one leadership domain with statistically significant differences, results were somewhat disappointing. Therefore, the researcher recommends future research on the differences between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behavior in the area of commitment. The researcher further recommends that the effect of gender of administrator be examined. Future research also might address the following:

1. Future studies should focus on and expand the leadership domain of commitment. The leadership domain of commitment includes various leadership behaviors (Hiam, 2003; Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2008) and needs to be expanded from six questions.
2. Future studies also should investigate the effect that gender of administrator has on the difference between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors. Although there was no significant difference in the effect of gender in this study, female scores were higher. Mixed results from

previous studies indicate a need for further research (Luo & Lotfollah, 2007; Oplatka & Mimon, 2008; Posner, 2009).

3. Future studies should include additional leadership domains that were not included in this study. Specifically, research should address the leadership domains of communications, leader's personal perspective, supervision, innovation, transitions, encouragement, and decisions, which are included in the POLO instrument (Hiam, 2003). Previous studies that included these domains were found to have strong reliability (Hiam, 2003; Morris, 2009; Posner, 2009).

### Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if there were statistically significant differences between principal and teacher beliefs about principal leadership behaviors. The study was conducted using a 360-degree evaluation tool. The study also examined whether the differences were related to the status of a school relative to the state growth target each school is expected to meet. The study also examined the effects of gender of administrator and years of administrator experience.

Primary data consisted of 34 principal-reported surveys and 238 teacher-reported surveys from 18 districts across the state of Louisiana. Descriptive data and *t* tests were used to determine whether differences existed between principal and teachers about principal leadership behaviors in the leadership domains of employee development, commitment, and the workplace. Findings from previous studies that differences between principal and teachers perspectives about leadership behaviors in the domains of Employee Development and the Workplace were not consistent with

findings in this study. The statistically significant difference between principal and teacher perspectives about principal leadership behavior in the domain of commitment was found to be consistent with previous studies in some areas.

The domain in which significant differences were found between principal and teacher perspectives about principal leadership behavior was commitment. This finding was consistent with the research of Eldred (2010) and Estapa (2010). The effect of gender of administrator, while not statistically significant, agreed with the research of Luo and Lotfollah (2007).

Although this study had some limitations, recommendations for policymakers were made. Such policy recommendations could include reevaluation of professional development time and the use of 360-degree evaluation tools. Recommendations for further research include using future studies to expand the domain of commitment and examine other leadership domains. Another recommendation was to examine the effect that the gender of administrator has on principal leadership practices.

## APPENDIX A

## INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD PERMISSION




---

**THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI**


---

Institutional Review Board

118 College Drive #5147  
 Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001  
 Tel: 601.266.6820  
 Fax: 601.266.5509  
 www.usm.edu/irb

**HUMAN SUBJECTS PROTECTION REVIEW COMMITTEE  
 NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION**

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Human Subjects Protection Review Committee in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.  
 Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: **10120804**PROJECT TITLE: **Teacher and Principal Beliefs About****Principal Leadership Behavior**PROPOSED PROJECT DATES: **11/30/2010 to 11/30/2011**PROJECT TYPE: **Dissertation**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS: **Mary Beth Morris**COLLEGE/DIVISION: **College of Education & Psychology**DEPARTMENT: **Educational Leadership**FUNDING AGENCY: **N/A**HSPRC COMMITTEE ACTION: **Expedited Review Approval**PERIOD OF APPROVAL: **01/03/2011 to 01/02/2012**

*Lawrence A. Hosman*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.  
 HSPRC Chair

*1-5-2011*  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date

APPENDIX B  
SUPERINTENDENTS' PERMISSION LETTER  
AND CONSENT FORM

2516 Oklahoma Street  
Marrero, LA. 70072  
November 29, 2010

[Superintendent's Name]  
[District's Name]  
[District Address]  
[City, State Zip Code]

Dear Superintendent:

I am Mary Beth Morris, a doctoral candidate at The University of Southern Mississippi. I am conducting research on teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior. I would like your written permission to survey principals and teachers in your district. This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

With your permission, this survey will be distributed to \_\_\_\_\_ [school names inserted here]. I will distribute the survey instrument to building principals and teachers. It is not expected to take longer than 20 minutes to complete. A copy of the survey instrument and instructions are attached for your reference.

If you consent to have the listed elementary schools participate in this research, please sign and date the enclosed consent form and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, you can contact me at [mbmorris1@bellsouth.com](mailto:mbmorris1@bellsouth.com) or 504-220-1720.

Sincerely,

Mary Beth Morris, Ed.S.  
Doctoral Candidate  
The University of Southern Mississippi

### Consent to Participate in Educational Leadership Survey

As superintendent of \_\_\_\_\_ District, I give Mary Beth Morris permission to conduct educational research at the following schools:

\_\_\_\_\_

[schools will be listed here]). This research will be conducted on teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior. Permission is granted to survey teachers and building principals. I understand participation in this survey is voluntary. All responses will be kept confidential. No individuals will be identified in any of the reports.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Superintendent's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## APPENDIX C

PRINCIPALS' PERMISSION TO SURVEY LETTER  
AND CONSENT FORM

2516 Oklahoma Street  
Marrero, LA. 70072  
November 29, 2010

[Principal's Name]  
[School's Name]  
[School Address]  
[City, State Zip Code]

Dear Principal:

I am Mary Beth Morris, a doctoral candidate at The University of Southern Mississippi. I am conducting research on teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior. I would like your written permission to survey teachers in your school. I would also like for you to complete a survey on principal leadership behavior. This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

With your permission, this survey will be distributed to \_\_\_\_\_ [school name inserted here]. I will distribute the survey instrument to you and teachers in your school. It is not expected to take longer than 20 minutes to complete. A copy of the survey instrument and instructions are attached for your reference.

If you consent to participate and allow your teachers to participate in this research, please sign and date the enclosed consent form and return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, you can contact me at [mbmorris1@bellsouth.com](mailto:mbmorris1@bellsouth.com) or 504-220-1720.

Sincerely,

Mary Beth Morris, Ed.S.  
Doctoral Candidate  
The University of Southern Mississippi

### Consent to Participate in Educational Leadership Survey

As principal of \_\_\_\_\_ School, I give Mary Beth Morris permission to conduct educational research at the following school(s):

\_\_\_\_\_

[schools will be listed here].

This research will be conducted on teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior. Permission is granted to survey teachers and I will also complete a survey. I understand participation in this survey is voluntary. All responses will be kept confidential. No individuals will be identified in any of the reports.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Principal's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



## APPENDIX D

## ADULT CONSENT FOR RESEARCH FORM

**University of Southern Mississippi  
118 College Drive #5147  
Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001  
(601)266-6820**

**Consent to Participate in a Research Study**

**Date:**

**Title of Study: Teacher and Principal Beliefs About Principal Leadership Behavior**

**Research will be conducted by: Mary Beth Morris (504) 347-0763**

**Email Address: mbmorris1@bellsouth.net**

**Faculty Advisor: Dr. Mike Ward**

---

**What are some general things you should know about research studies?**

You are being asked to take part in a research study. To join the study is voluntary.

You may refuse to join, or you may withdraw your consent to be in the study, for any reason, without penalty.

Research studies are designed to obtain new knowledge. This new information may help people in the future. You may not receive any direct benefit from being in the research study. There also may be risks to being in research studies.

Details about this study are discussed below. It is important that you understand this information so that you can make an informed choice about being in this research study.

You will be given the first two pages of this consent form and the researcher will keep the third sheet which contains your signature. You should ask the researchers named above, or staff members who may assist them, any questions you have about this study at any time.

**What is the purpose of this study?**

The purpose of this research study is to examine teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior.

**How many people will take part in this study?**

If you decide to be in this study, you will be one of approximately 560 people in this research study.

**How long will your part in this study last?**

You will be asked to sign a consent form and fill out a questionnaire which will last no longer than 15 minutes. A report of my findings will be made available to you upon request at the conclusion of this study by emailing me at [mbmorris1@bellsouth.net](mailto:mbmorris1@bellsouth.net).

**What will happen if you take part in the study?**

You will be asked to sign a consent form and fill out a survey. The researcher will secure the survey in a locked box and collect data from the survey. The survey and consent form will be shredded upon completion of this project.

**What are the possible benefits from being in this study?**

Conclusions can be reached about the potential effectiveness of transformational leadership practices in public education. Research driven recommendations can be made for implementation of practices to increase student achievement. A framework for transformational leadership can be suggested for implementation in public education. A written summary will be provided back to participants upon request. Participants should request summary at [mbmorris1@bellsouth.net](mailto:mbmorris1@bellsouth.net)

**What are the possible risks or discomforts involved from being in this study?**

Participants could feel discomfort and fear of reprisal based upon self ratings or of their supervisor which will be minimized by lack of identification or demographic information located on their survey. Surveys will be collected and locked in the box. Only researchers and faculty advisors will view these surveys. Surveys will be kept secure and locked in the researcher's home. Surveys will be shredded after a year.

**How will your privacy be protected?**

Participants will not be identified in any report or publication about this study. Surveys will be collected and placed in a lockbox. Only researcher and faculty advisors will view these surveys. Surveys will be kept secure and locked in researchers home. Surveys and consent forms will be shredded after a year.

**What if you have questions about this study?**

You have the right to ask, and have answered, any questions you may have about this research. If you have questions, or concerns, you should contact the researchers listed on the first page of this form.

**What if you have questions about your rights as a research participant?**

This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820

**Title of Study: Teacher and Principal Beliefs About Principal Leadership Behavior**

**Principal Investigator:** Mary Beth Morris

**Participant's Agreement:**

I have read the information provided above. I have asked all the questions I have at this time. I voluntarily agree to participate in this research study.

---

Signature of Research Participant	Date
-----------------------------------	------

---

Printed Name of Research Participant	Date
--------------------------------------	------

---

Signature of Research Team Member Obtaining Consent	Date
---	------

---

Printed Name of Research Team Member Obtaining Consent	Date
--	------

APPENDIX E

PERMISSION TO USE POLO INSTRUMENT, EMPLOYEE OPINION REPORTING FORM, AND POLO INSTRUMENT

RE: Mary Beth Morris Graduate Student - Inbox - 'att.net Mail'

Page 1 of 1

Hi, Mary Beth Sign Out All-New Mail Help at&t Mail

Search Web Search



Mail Contacts Calendar Notepad What's New? Mobile Mail Options

Check Mail New Mail Search Try the new att.net Mail

702 VIEW YOUR 3 Credit Scores Now Previous | Next | Back to Messages Mark as Unread | Print

Delete Reply Forward Spam Move...

- Folders**
- Inbox (344)
- Drafts
- Sent
- Spam [Empty]
- Trash [Empty]

My Photos My Attachments

My Folders [Add - Edit] mary beth email...

**RE: Mary Beth Morris Graduate Student**  
From: "Randy Phillips" <randy@hrdpress.com>  
To: "mbmorris1" <mbmorris1@bellsouth.net>  
Monday, October 25, 2010 2:20 PM

Dear Mary Beth,

Consider this note permission to photocopy the employee form in the POLO Leaders Guide for use with purchased POLO self assessments. No training is required to use the POLO assessment. The Leaders Guide contains all information needed to competently use this instrument.

Randall Phillips  
HRD Press  
800-822-2801 x122



**From:** mbmorris1 [mailto:mbmorris1@bellsouth.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, October 25, 2010 2:39 PM  
**To:** Randy@hrdpress.com  
**Subject:** Mary Beth Morris Graduate Student

Good Afternoon. I am requesting permission to use the "Employee Opinion Reporting Form" along with purchased POLO instruments for my dissertation process. I need you to send me back an email that it is okay to use the employee form for teachers (which will be copied) for each Principal which will fill out a purchased POLO instrument. Please state that the employee form may be copied and used for teachers at no additional cost for each Principal (self-rater that is purchased). I have already purchased the leadership manual. Please also state that permission to use instruments is granted upon purchase and that no additional training is needed, as I have already purchased the leadership manual. Thank You, Mary Beth Morris.

Delete Reply Forward Spam Move...

Previous | Next | Back to Messages Select Message Encoding Full Headers

Check Mail New Mail Search

## REFERENCES

- Ahlgrim, R. W. (2010). *A thorough and efficient education: School funding, student achievement and productivity* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3404427)
- Alloway, M. (2010). Facing your reflection. *Principal Leadership*, 10(9), 82-84.
- Baker, B. D., & Dickerson, J. L. (2006). Charter schools, teacher labor market deregulation, and teacher quality. *Educational Policy*, 20(5), 752- 778.
- Barnett, J., & Fallon, G. (2007). Conflicting views of school community: The dichotomy between administrators and teachers. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, 2(1), 1-11.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership theory, research and managerial applications* (Vol. 3). New York, NY: Free Press/Macmillan.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130-139.
- Bass, B. M. (2007). Concepts of leadership. In R. P. Vecchio (Ed.), *Leadership* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame.

- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness* (pp. 1-9). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire report*. Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Carroll, D. H. (1999). *Teachers' and administrators' perceptions of leader behavior* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. ATT 9947681)
- Cashman, K. (2009). 720 development. *Leadership Excellence*, 26(9), 82-84.
- Condon, C., & Clifford, M. (2010). *Measuring principal performance: How rigorous are commonly used principal performance assessment instruments?* Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: ISLLC 2008*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Creelan, P. (1985). The millenarian sources of Watsonian behaviorism. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 24(2), 194-216.
- Cronk, B. C. (2006). *How to use SPSS* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak.
- Crum, K. S., & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Facilitating high achievement: High school principal's reflections on their successful leadership practices. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(5), 562-579.

- Cundiff, N. L. (2010). *Followers' reactions to female leaders: Leaders orientations, prototypical categorizations, and organizational culture* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital database. (Publication No. ATT 340866)
- Dahms, M., Geonnotti, K., Passalacqua, J., Schik, N., & Wetzal, A. (2007). *The educational theory of Lev Vygotsky: An analysis*. Retrieved from [www.newfoundations.com](http://www.newfoundations.com)
- Diamantes, T. (2004). What principals think motivates teachers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 31(1), 68-70.
- Dillon, S. (2007, June 6). New study finds gains since No Child Left Behind. *New York Times*, p. B7.
- Donaldson, G., Mamik, G., Mackenzie, S., & Ackerman, R. (2009). What makes or breaks a principal? *Educational Leadership*, 67(2), 8-14.
- Dyer, K. (2001, February). The power of 360-degree feedback. *Evaluating Educators*, 58(5), 35-38.
- Ediger, M. (2006). Administration of schools. *College Student Journal*, 40(4), 846-851.
- Ediger, M. (2009). The principal in the teaching and learning process. *Education*, 129(4), 574-578.
- Educational Leadership Constituent Council. (2002). *Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELLCC) standards*. Retrieved from <http://leading-education.org/ellcstandards.aspx>

- Eldred, J. A. (2010). *A study to determine the relationship between the perceived leadership styles of school principals and teacher job satisfaction at selected elementary schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT3412477)
- Enger, J. M., & Pearson, C. (2004). Review of the Leadership Practices Inventory. In B.S. Plake & J.C. Impara (Eds.) *The fourteenth mental measurements yearbook* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp.663-664). Lincoln, NE: Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Engels, N., Hotton, G., Devos, G., Bouckenoghe, D., & Aelterman, A. (2008). Principals in schools with a positive school culture. *Educational Studies*, 34(3), 159-174.
- Estapa, A.L. (2010). *The relationship between the transformational leadership characteristics of principals, as perceived by teachers and student achievement on standardized tests* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. ATT3378413)
- Eyler, J. (2009). *An exploration of principal self-efficacy beliefs about transformational leadership behaviors* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3368525)
- Fee, C. E. (2009). *Teachers' and principals perceptions of leader behavior: A discrepancy study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3328192)



- Fiore, D. J. (2004). *Welcome to educational administration*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Fisher, C. A. (2010). *Effects of the emphasis in achieving adequate yearly progress on teachers and administrator at schools under the constraints of No Child Left Behind* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3420365)
- Gawlik, M. (2007). Beyond the charter schoolhouse door: Teacher-perceived autonomy. *Education and Urban Society*, 39(4), 524-553.
- Gaziel, H. (2003). Images of leadership and their effect upon school principals' performance. *International Review of Education*, 49(5), 475-486.
- Gentry, H., & Kenney, J. (1966). The performance of educational research. *Journal of Educational Research*, 60(2), 62-67.
- Glickman, C., Gordon, S., Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2007). *Supervision and instructional leadership*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gordon, J., & Patterson, J. A. (2006). School leadership in context: Narratives of practice and possibility. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 9(3), 25-228.
- Graczewski, C., Knudson, J., & Holtzman, D. J. (2009). Instructional leadership in practice: What does it look like, and what influence does it have? *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 14, 72-96.
- Green, L. K. (2009). *Leadership style, teacher perception of building leadership and the effect on staffing* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3344317)

- Hanushek, E., & Raymond, M. (2004). The effect of school accountability systems on the level and distribution of student achievement. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2(2-3), 406-415.
- Hertberg-Davis, H. L., & Brighton, C. M. (2006). Support and sabotage. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 17(2), 90-102.
- Hiam, A. (2003). *Profile of leadership opportunities*. Amherst, MA: HRD Press.
- Hillman, G. (2008). Leadership practices of non-traditional seminary students. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 17(1), 54-80.
- Hinkin, T., & Schriesheim, C. (2008). A theoretical and empirical examination of the transactional and non-leadership dimensions of the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19(5), 501-513.
- Ibarra, L., Santamaria, A., Lindsey, D., & Daly, A. (2010). From compliance to transformation. *Leadership*, 39(5), 32-36.
- Jorgenson, O., & Peal, C. (2008). When principals lose touch with the classroom. *Principal*, 87(4), 52-55.
- Josephsen, K. B. (2008). *A descriptive study of the perceptions of California principals regarding their evaluation and instructional leadership* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3290078)
- Kelly, M .J., & Sundet, P. (2007). Using 360-degree evaluation to improve clinical skill development by first line child protective services supervisors. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social Work*, 4(3/4), 145-161.

- King, J. (2010). *Adequate yearly progress in elementary, Title I schools: A study on administrator leadership styles and their impact on student achievement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publications. No. AAT 3413168)
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- LaMorte, M. W. (2008). *School law: Cases and concepts* (9<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn and Bacon.
- Louisiana Department of Education. (2010a). *2009-2010 baseline school performance scores*. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.state.la>
- Louisiana Department of Education. (2010b). *2009-2010 district performance scores*. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.state.la.us>
- Louisiana Department of Education. (2010, October 7). *Recovery school district posts strong growth in school performance scores* [Press release]. New Orleans, LA: State of Louisiana.
- Louisiana Department of Education. (2011, March). *Annual financial and statistical report 2008-2009* (160<sup>th</sup> ed.). Baton Rouge, LA: Author.
- Lumpkin, A. (2008). Three keys to success for principals. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 45(1), 22-25.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2008). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cenage Learning.

- Luo, M., & Lotfollah, N. (2007). The Chinese principal leadership capacities as perceived by master teachers. *Academic Leadership Live*. Retrieved from <http://www.academicleadership.org>
- Martinez, D. R. (2009). *Leadership behaviors of school principals in Puerto Rico: Does transformational leadership equate with school success?* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3391608)
- Marzano, R.J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mausolff, C. (2004). Learning from feedback in performance measurement systems. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 28(1), 9-29.
- McGuigan, L. & Hoy, W. K. (2006). Principal leadership: Creating a culture of academic optimism to improve achievement for all students. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 5(3), 203-229.
- Morris, M. B. (2009). *Correlation between administrator leadership styles and teacher commitment in magnet and public schools*. Unpublished manuscript, The University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS.
- Moss, G., & Gasper, R. (2006, August 30). Crack the leadership combination to secure high-performance working. *People Management*, p.50.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *The condition of education 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of

- Education Sciences. Retrieved from  
<http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2010028>
- Newmann, F., King, B. M., & Rigdon, M. (1997). Accountability and school performance: Implications from restructuring schools. *Harvard Educational Review, 67*, 1-75.
- Oplatka, I., & Mimon, R. (2008). Women principals' conceptions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction: An alternative view? *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 11*(2), 135-153.
- Parry, K., & Proctor-Thomson, S. (2002). Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organizational settings. *Journal of Business Ethics, 35*, 75-96.
- Patterson, K. (2005). *The history of leadership focus. Servant Leadership Roundtable Proceedings*. Virginia Beach, VA: Regent University, School of Global Leadership and Entrepreneurship.
- Posner, B. P. (2009). *Leadership practices inventory data analysis*. Santa Clara, CA: University Leavey School of Business.
- Prinity, S., Marks, H., & Bowers, A. (2009, September). Integrated leadership: How principals and teachers share transformational and instructional influence. *Journal of School Leadership, 19*, 504-532.
- Rammer, R. A. (2007). Call to action for superintendents: Change the way you hire principals. *Journal of Educational Research, 101*(2), 67-76.
- Rank, J., Nelson, N., Allen, T., & Xu, X. (2009). Leadership predictors of innovation and task performance: Subordinates' self-esteem and self-

- presentation as moderators. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 82, 465-489.
- Razik, T., & Swanson, A. (2001). *Educational concepts of educational leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Reeves, D. B. (2004). *Accountability for learning: How teachers and school leaders can take charge*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Retna, K., & Tee, N. (2009). The need for transformational leadership in Singapore's school-based reform. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19(1), 33-48.
- Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). School leadership and student achievement: The mediating effects of teacher beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(3), 798-822.
- Sahin, S. (2004). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles of school principals and school culture. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 4(2), 387-396.
- Salopek, J. (2004, September). Rethinking Likert. *Training & Development*, 58(9), 26-29.
- Sanford, M. (2006). *You don't need a title to be a leader*. New York, NY: Currency, Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2001). *The principalship* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Pearson Education.

- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2009). *The principalship* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Pearson Education.
- Stewart, J. (2006). Transformational leadership: An evolving concept examined through the works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, 54, 1-29.
- Sun, J. (2004). Understanding the impact of perceived principal leadership style on teacher commitment. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 32(2), 18-31.
- Taylor, T., Martin, B., Hutchinson, S., & Jinks, M. (2007). Examination of leadership practices of principals identified as servant leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 10(4), 401-419.
- Tolbert, L.B. (2003). *The impact of Louisiana's school and district accountability system on students' performance on the state mandated criterion referenced test* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3135610)
- Tyler, K. M. (2006). Peer-level multiple source feedback for fitness to practice. *Medical Education*, 40(5), 459-489.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2006). *No Child Left Behind is working*. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov>
- Van Eeden, R., Cilliers, F., & Van Deventer. (2008, June). Leadership styles and associated personality traits: Support for the conceptualization of transactional and transformational leadership. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 38(2), 253-267.

- Vecchio, R. P (Ed.). (2007). Can leadership be taught? In R.P. Vecchio ( Ed.) *Leadership* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp.61-68). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame.
- Williams, E. (2006). *Teachers' perceptions of principal leadership in relation to student achievement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No, AAT 3258821)
- Xiaofu, P., & Qiwen, Q. (2007). An analysis of the relation between secondary school organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. *Chinese Education and Society*, 40(5), 65-77.
- Youngs, J. L. (2001). *What elements of 360-degree or multirater feedback enhance the performance of school principals? A descriptive case study analyzing the perceptions of selected California principals and superintendents* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations database. (Publication No. AAT 3037010)