2014

Leadership Style and Readiness to Lead: Perceptions of Florida Level 1 Educational Leadership Preparation Program Participants

Jason Dean Arnold

Leadership Style and Readiness to Lead:

Perceptions of Florida Level 1 Educational Leadership Preparation Program Participants

by

Jason Dean Arnold

A dissertation submitted to the Department of Educational Leadership

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctorate of Education

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

August, 2014

Dedication

This work is foremost dedicated to my wife and the best friend I'll ever know, Anna, who encouraged me to finish what I started several years ago and continues to inspire me each day. I am forever grateful for the opportunity to love her.

This is dedicated to our daughters, Kendyl and Kaylla, who have taught me more than I could ever hope to teach them. This work is also dedicated to my mother and father, Gary and Sharon Medders, and to my brother and sisters for whom they sacrificed. This work is dedicated to my uncle, Bud Hindman. Although this work is considered a dissertation, it serves as a love poem to those named above.

Acknowledgements

I am thankful for the support of my family and peers. Without their constant counsel, I would never have completed this task.

I am thankful for the encouragement of the University of Florida faculty and staff. I am especially grateful to Dr. Tom Dana and Dr. Nancy Dana for their time and valuable insights.

I am thankful for the cohort members of the University of North Florida doctoral program (Cohort 13). I am thankful that I received constant encouragement and support from Dawn Emerick, Rick Kane, Crystal Timmons, Colin Turey, and Annmarie Kent-Willett.

I am thankful for the guidance and mentoring I have received from the entire University of North Florida graduate faculty and staff. Having the opportunity to attend the UNF College of Education has been one of the best experiences of my life. I am grateful for the help of my committee members: Dr. Sandra Gupton, Dr. Warren Hodge (especially for his class discussion of leaving a legacy ten years ago), and Dr. Dan Richard.

Finally, I am grateful for Dr. Larry Daniel. Dr. Daniel's commitment to leadership and his honest humility are examples for me. I am humbled to have had him as my committee chair. His dedication to my work and to me can never fully be repaid. I entered his office in a frenzy to finish my dissertation, and he has stuck with me since. He has impacted many lives at UNF, and I know he will continue to have a strong influence on the next group of students that are lucky enough to meet him.

Table of Contents

Dedication iii

Acknowledgements iv

Abstract x

Chapter 1 1

Introduction to the Study- Education in an Era of Accountability 1

Statement of the Problem 3

Purpose of the Study 4

Research Variables 4

Transactional and Transformational Leadership Style 5

Transformational Leadership and Schools 6

Standardizing Behavioral Expectations of School Leaders 9

Florida Principal Leadership Standards 11

Principal Leadership Preparation in Florida 13

Research Questions 15

Definitions of Terms 16

Rationale 18

Assumptions 18

Limitations 19

Organization of Study 20

Chapter 2- Review of Literature 22

Introduction 22

Leadership Styles and Schools 24

Measuring Leadership Styles 31

Relationship between Leadership Style and Schools 32

Florida Principal Leadership Standards 41

FPLS Categories or Domains 42

Leadership Preparation 46

Perception of Readiness to Lead 49

Perceptions of Leadership Style 52

Conceptual Frameworks 54

Summary 55

Chapter 3- Methods and Procedures 56

Introduction to Methodology 56

Purpose 58

Research Questions 58

Population and Sample 59

Instrumentation 61

Florida Principal Leadership Standards Readiness Survey 61

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire 66

Research Design and Procedures 70

Data Collection 73

Treatment of the Data 75

Data Analysis 75

Ethical Considerations 79

Conclusion 80

Chapter 4- Results 81

Introduction to Results 81

Demographics 81

Review of Methodology 82

Presentation of the Findings 83

Descriptive Statistics 83

Answers to Research Questions 1-3 84

Canonical Correlation Analysis 88

Answers to Research Question 4 95

Summary 96

Chapter 5- Discussion 97

Introduction to Discussion 97

Summary of the Study 97

Conceptual Framework and Research Variables 97

Review of the Methodology and Procedures 99

Summary of Findings 101

Discussion of Relationship between Findings and Research Literature 102

Recommendations for Further Research 107

Implications for Policy Making and Development 111

Conclusion 112

Appendix A. State Board Rule 6A-5.081, Approval of School Leadership Programs

Appendix B. State Board Rule 6A-5.080, Florida Principal Leadership Standards

Appendix C. FPLS Survey Instrument

Appendix D. Demographic Items and Lie Scale Items

Appendix E. MLQ 3rd Edition Sample Set- Leader Form

Appendix F. UNF IRB Approval Letter

Appendix G. UF IRB Approval Letter and Letter of Support

Appendix H. FAU IRB Letter of Support

Appendix I. Recruitment and Informed Consent Email

List of Tables

Table 1. 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards and Domains 12

Table 2. Selected Studies of the Psychometric Properties of the MLQ 67

Table 3. 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards, Domains, and Behavioral Indicators 71

Table 4. Variable Sets to be Weighted and Summed for Calculation of Two Composite Scores 72

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for the MLQ and FPLS Scores 84

Table 6. Bivariate Correlations for MLQ and FPLS Subscales 88

Table 7. Eigenvalues and Canonical Correlations 90

Table 8. Dimension Reduction Analysis 90

Table 9. Raw Canonical Correlations for Dependent Variables 91

Table 10. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Dependent Variables 91

Table 11. Correlations Between Dependent and Canonical Variables 93

Table 12. Raw Canonical Coefficients for Predictor Variables 94

Table 13. Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Predictor Variables 94

Table 14. Correlations Between Predictor Variables and Canonical Variables 95

ABSTRACT

The present study examined the relationship between aspiring school principals' self-perceived competency regarding expected leadership behaviors as indicated by the domains identified in the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards and their perception of their leadership style as indicated by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The conceptual frameworks of this study included leadership style, as defined and conceptualized by Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Model and measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), and leadership behavior, as defined through the domains of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS, 2011). Both the MLQ and the FPLS questionnaire served as data collection instruments. The three main leadership styles measured by the MLQ (including transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership) served as the independent variables, and the four leadership domains measured by the FPLS questionnaire (i.e., student achievement, instructional leadership, organizational leadership, professional and ethical behavior) served as the dependent variables.

The research sample included participants currently enrolled in a state-approved Level 1 Educational Leadership Program and were recruited to participate from 3 state universities in Florida. Both survey instruments were administered via a single, anonymous link embedded in an email containing both an introduction and description of the research study and informed consent. Of 200 potential participants, 48 respondents or 24% of the original sample returned completed surveys.

Using canonical correlation analysis, the study found that the degree of respondents' self-perceived ability to competently perform the leadership behaviors as

identified by the four 2011 FPLS domains could be explained to some degree by respondents' self-perceived leadership style (as identified on the MLQ). Two canonical roots were interpreted. The MLQ predictor variables accounted for 48% of the variance in the FPLS subscale scores (root 1 R_c^2 =.48; $p < .001$). For this root, transformational leadership was the primary independent variable accounting for variance across all 4 FPLS domains. Canonical root 2 (R_c^2 = .117) accounted for a moderate amount of the shared variance between the two sets (i.e., 12%) and was not statistically significant ($p >$ .05). The correlation in this root was due primarily to a direct relationship between MLQ transactional leadership and the professional and ethical behavior domain of the FPLS. Additionally, the findings indicated that participants of Level 1 Educational Leadership programs felt confident in their ability to competently perform the expected behavioral indicators of the 2011 FPLS domains.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Education in an Era of Accountability

Driven by the need to measure student academic growth and to establish a uniform system of accountability, American public schools have evolved over the last 30 years to meet increased public scrutiny. It could be argued that the last few decades have produced more systematic education policy and institutional change than at any other point in the history of the United States (Elmore, 2000). With the publication and subsequent media attention surrounding A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), the great urgency to assist America's "failing public school system" made its way to the evening news. It became generally accepted that the country's public schools were not effective in their form at the time, and that the continued failure of the U.S. schools would lead to America's economic and institutional decline. Although the conceptual underpinnings of A Nation at Risk are debated to this day, the report spurned a shift of educational policy to allow for the measurement of school quality based on distribution of resources and, much later, student performance. These shifts in policy are considered positive by most, and they have helped to shape the dedicated focus of schools to become the continuous academic growth of all students (Guthrie & Springer, 2004).

By 1995, the first Trends in International Math and Science Study (TIMSS) was published, and American student performance data on a set of rigorous standardized tests were compared to the performance data of students from around the world. The report

findings substantiated that in using this method of comparing student achievement, American students were behind most of the developed world.

In 2001, the U.S. Congress passed The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) as the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965), and this legislation provided for more federal oversight of state-created academic standards and standardized assessments. NCLB outlined a path for states that required rigorous annual academic testing, qualifications for teaching staff, and other accountability measures focused on assuring academic proficiency for all students in public schools. This policy came with a deadline that by the 2013-2014 school year, states had to have all students meeting proficiency standards (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). By requiring "adequate yearly progress" (AYP) of all students and increasing sanctions (including the loss of funding and positions) for schools and districts failing to meet targeted goals set forth in the legislation, NCLB's impact on the daily implementation needs and organizational foci of schools and school personnel cannot be underestimated (West & Peterson, 2003).

As the American public education system and the federal and state policy guiding it have become more targeted to measuring student achievement and monitoring school performance, the leadership of schools has been increasingly scrutinized. The means for measuring student achievement growth, the academic effectiveness of schools, and the changes in standardized testing have helped to create a challenging, dynamic culture built on compliance (Abbate, 2010). These changes require the role of the principal to be reinvented constantly to focus on the core responsibility of the school- student achievement (Peariso, 2011). In recent empirical research, it has been claimed that school

leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all the factors that influence student learning (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Although this meta-analysis of research could be contested, Leithwood et al. (2008) cited compelling evidence from a myriad of sources, including but not limited to large-scale quantitative studies of leadership effects on schools and student learning conducted from 1980-1998. The authors concluded that leadership explains about one quarter of the total difference in student achievement across all schools included in the studies (Leithwood et al., 2008, p. 28). Additionally, this same meta-analysis examined research on leadership and its effects on student engagement, a strong predictor of student achievement. Leithwood et al. claimed that, "at least 10 mostly recent, large-scale, quantitative…studies in Australia and North America have concluded that the effects of transformational school leadership on pupil engagement are significantly positive."

Statement of the Problem

In a time when principals have to believe in and embody the relentless pursuit of student learning through effective teaching practices, it is clear that American schools need a breed of principals who are "frequently engaged in all facets of instructional leadership" (Peariso, 2001, p. 183). Although there have been research studies focused on effective principal leadership behaviors (e.g., Cotton & Savard, 1980; Hallinger, 1983; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Larsen, 1984), the behaviors of school leaders associated with positive change (e.g., Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Klar & Brewer, 2013; Leithwood et al., 2004), the links between identified behaviors and principal standards (e.g., Hannigan, 2008; Murphy & Shipman, 1998), and the effects of leadership style on the practice of

effective school leadership as defined by improvements in student achievement (e.g., Estapa, 2009; Gulbin, 2008; Hardman, 2011; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Seashore-Louis et al., 2010), the current body of research is limited with regard future principal leaders' perceptions of their readiness to perform functions aligned to formal state leadership standards. In the state of Florida, there is presently no push for statewide data on school leaders' proficiency (self-perceived or otherwise) to be collected other than the required testing for certification and the renewal of certification.

Purpose

This purpose of the present study was to explore the relationship between future principals' perceptions of their competency regarding expected leadership behaviors as indicated by the Florida Principal Leadership Standards and their perceived leadership style as indicated by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

The present study was an initial attempt at inquiry into leadership development preparation activities and their impact on the perceptions of future leaders. This attention to the students of leadership and their perceptions of themselves can help future programs to possibly differentiate learning experiences for promising new leaders.

Research Variables

The research variables examined in the present study included leadership style and perceived readiness to perform relative to principal leadership standards.

Transactional and Transformational Leadership Style

James Burns (1978) described two very different but complementary leadership styles: transactional and “transforming.” Transforming leadership was defined as leadership that induces “followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations— the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations— of both leaders and followers” (p. 18). Moreover, Burns noted that transforming “leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality” (p. 19). By contrast, transactional leadership may be considered the operational or managerial functions of a leader. Most leaders have some degree of both styles of leadership (Bass, 1985); however, transformational leadership is the style most aligned with facilitating change (Leithwood, 1992). Additionally, transformational leadership may be the leadership style that “elevates” and empowers followers to take initiative and responsibility for the common goal. However, an individual’s leadership style may contain many characteristics associated with transactional and transformational leadership styles (Bass, 1985). Transactional leadership, though not ideal in isolation, is the foundation of leading a group (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Transactional leaders “recognize roles and tasks required for associates to reach desired outcomes” and is often found in career sectors “where the rewards are more personal and social and are based on commitment to ideals” (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 21). Thus, transactional and transformational leadership styles are embodied to some degree in most leaders. In order to affect more than superficial or low-level change and “motivate associates to do more than they originally thought possible,” a leader utilizes attributes more aligned to the transformational leadership style (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 27).

The continuum of leadership style, from the least effective style (laissez-faire or the absence or avoidance of leadership) to the most effective style (transformational or idealized leadership) is captured in Bass and Avolio's Full Range Model of Leadership (1992).

Transformational Leadership and Schools

As the public education system has changed to become more standards-focused with students, schools, teachers, and administrators held to a higher level of accountability, it is clear that the leadership needed for schools must be ready for the challenge. As Shipp and White (2009) have concluded in their interviews of principals in New York City before and after policy changes, principals have external and internal pressures influenced by policy and the school agenda. Individuals need to have professional development that adequately prepares them for the many roles that a principal faces. Principals must continue to advance the core responsibility of the school while buffering internal and external forces. They must understand the contextual nature of leading an institution with such diversity (Elmore, 2000).

The complex environment of today's public schools requires principals prepared not only to manage the operational functions and human capital of the school but also to lead school-wide instructional improvement and academic achievement (Mulford, Silins, & Leithwood, 2004). It should be noted that the move from leadership behaviors associated with management (or transactional leadership) to those associated with transformational leadership does not occur in a vacuum. This highly specialized leadership needed for schools engages several identified behaviors of leadership that should be cultivated and supported by district and state organizational leadership to

ensure positive results in organizational learning and student achievement (Elmore, 2001; Mulford et al., 2004).

Sheppard (1996) concluded the two most influential behaviors of school leaders are “framing school goals” and “promoting professional development.” This seems to echo Burns’ definition of the “transforming” leader for the educational setting and the idea that transformational leadership includes behaviors that influence and motivate followers to produce results beyond expectation (Bass, 1985). Sheppard’s work helps to frame the real work of the school leader and its connection to the theory of transformational leadership. Schools that close achievement gaps and improve student achievement overall have more than a mission; they operate within a culture of improvement and success (Johnson & Uline, 2005). “Leaders must believe every student can succeed” and build “collective relentlessness” toward that goal (Johnson & Uline, 2005, p. 47). Successful schools must have leaders who not only believe in their own ability to achieve success, but also foster the success of their staff through leadership opportunities (Johnson & Uline, 2005). As Elmore (2001) noted, “Administration in education, then, has come to mean not the management of instruction but the management of the structures and processes around instruction” (p. 6). It could be assumed that every effort of the principal for change should be centered on the core responsibility of schools-to support improved student learning and academic achievement.

Numerous studies and surveys of the literature have connected student academic achievement and/or teacher and school performance to school leadership, but these studies, collectively, point to a variety of specific behaviors that promote a shared vision

or goals for improved student achievement and the collaborative work of all stakeholders to achieve those goals (Hallinger, 1983; Ibarra, 2008; Keys, 2010; Larsen, 1984; Leithwood, 1994; Nelson, 2012).

Although various models of effective school leadership have emerged in the last 25 years (e.g., Bass, 1990; Blase & Blase, 2004; Leithwood, 1992; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005), the identified behaviors associated with both instructional and transformational leadership seem to overlap with very minor distinctions in wording (Leithwood & Sun, 2012). Hallinger (2003) elaborated on this similarity of the behaviors shared by both transformational and instructional leadership models. Other than whether the leader exhibits the behaviors directly or shares the responsibility with others, the similarities between the leadership models are greater than the vocabulary-based differences. Hallinger's conceptualization of effective school leadership included the following principal leadership behaviors: setting the vision or instructional goals, providing individualized support, setting high expectations, providing incentives or rewards for performance, promoting professional development and intellectual stimulation, maintaining high visibility and modeling behaviors, and building the culture of the school.

Other leadership behaviors identified in recent literature affirm Sheppard's assessment of the deep connection between instructional and transformational school leadership, including those behaviors that promote shared or distributed leadership (Blase & Blase, 2004; Geijsel, Sleegers, Leithwood, & Jantzi, 2003; Harris & Spillane, 2008), effective and authentic communication with stakeholders regarding instructional practice and academic goals (Blase & Blase, 2004; Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, &

Wahlstrom, 2004; Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010), a system of support for teacher professional development (Harris & Spillane, 2008; Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Sebring & Bryk, 2000; Tucker & Russell, 2004), and a strong and visible focus on achievement for all students (Griffith, 2004; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010). These leadership behaviors, along with others associated with establishing student achievement goals and professional development to that end, were included in Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) 21 Responsibilities of the School Leader and found to have some correlation with improved student learning. In their large meta-analysis of 69 empirical research studies conducted on effective school leadership behavior from the years 1978-2001, Marzano et al. (2005) concluded that the effective behaviors of principals are appreciably related to student achievement (pp. 30-31, 2005).

Standardizing Behavioral Expectations of Principal Leaders

Literature on the type of leadership needed for the ever-present culture of accountability and reform has been widely investigated and synthesized to inform local development of future principals (Catano & Stronge, 2007; Hannigan, 2008). In their review of research on developing school principals from the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, and Meyerson (2005) essentially found that "successful school leaders influence student achievement through two important pathways, the support and development of effective teachers and the implementation of effective organizational processes" (p. 4).

The commonality of behaviors in perceived effective principal leaders was central to the focus of school reform research at the time of the publication of A Nation at Risk

(Hallinger, Murphy, Well, Mesa, & Mitman, 1983). However, it was not until the publication of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium's Standards for School Leaders (ISLLC, 1996) that there was a formal and standardized set of behavioral practices expected by school leaders. In the years following the development of the ISLLC standards, with such a dramatic focus on school and student performance on policy and funding, numerous researchers have made careers out of further documenting and investigating identified effective principal leadership behaviors and their relationship to student achievement.

Since the inception of the ISLLC Standards, 35 states have adopted them. The remaining states have adopted some variation of those standards that have been expounded upon by both recent research and policy change. The ISLLC Standards, unpacked, have associated expectations of core knowledge, dispositions, and performances or behaviors of school leaders (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996). These standards were revised to reflect the current research on leadership, including the seminal review conducted by Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004), which indicated that "effective principals and school administrators set the organizational direction and culture that influences [sic] how their teachers perform" and that this setting of direction "is the area to which educational leaders have the greatest impact" (p. 6). It should be noted that each of the six standards leads off with, "The educational leader promotes the success of every student by." This focus on the core responsibility of schools is threaded through the entire set of standards. Although the 2008 ISLCC Standards represented the "broad, high-priority themes that education leaders must address," they do not include detailed, site-specific behavioral indicators (p.

11). Instead, the standards are further explained as “functions” of the role of the principal that align to the standard (p. 12). This way, states wishing to assess leadership development needs and create an aligned performance-based system may adapt the standards to their local needs. Consequently, the ISLLC 2008 Standards are considered “a starting point for future thought, research, dialogue, and debate about standards for school leaders” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008, p. 11).

Florida Principal Leadership Standards

The State of Florida has recently adopted 10 standards (2011) derived from the 6 standards proposed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and the state’s previous Florida Principal Leadership Standards published in 2005. These standards outline the key attributes of effective school leadership as defined for Florida by a focus group of experts comprised of seated principals, district representatives, higher education partners and professional development providers (J. Hanson, personal communication, June 15, 2008). The focus group identified the behavioral indicators of effective leadership from the research literature and experience. Each standard is also aligned to the body of research on the roles and behaviors of the school leader (Florida Department of Education, 2011). As shown in Table 1, there are 4 leadership domains and 10 shared standards.

Table 1.

2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards (Florida Administrative Code- Rule 6A-5.080)

Leadership Domains	Leadership Standards
Domain 1: Student Achievement	Standard 1- Student Learning Results
	Standard 2- Student Learning as a Priority
Domain 2: Instructional Leadership	Standard 3- Instructional Plan Implementation
	Standard 4- Faculty Development
	Standard 5- Learning Environment
Domain 3: Organizational Leadership	Standard 6- Decision Making
	Standard 7- Leadership Development
	Standard 8- School Management
	Standard 9- Communication
Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior	Standard 10- Professional and Ethical Behaviors

Each of the 10 standards includes several behavioral indicators for high performing school leaders, totaling 45 behaviors in all. The research-based behaviors associated with transformational and effective school leadership are reflected in the Florida Principal Leadership Standards throughout all four domains and include such functions as leading faculty data discussions, facilitating instructional goal setting, targeting professional

development needs of the faculty and staff, and leading the collective understanding of what effective instruction and assessment look like in practice (Barnett, 2004; Elmore, 2000; Hallinger, 1983; Sheppard, 1996; Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Principal Leadership Preparation in Florida

Elmore (2000) famously called for the "de-romanticizing" of leadership in education and simply defined school leadership as "the guidance and direction of instructional improvement" (p. 14). However, it has been argued (Levine, 2005) that the leaders coming into the workplace from university preparation programs are not prepared adequately for the instructional leadership functions they are expected to fulfill. In his searing review of educational leadership preparation programs, Levine (2005) criticized university-based educational leadership programs as "diploma mills" and little more than a system for driving professional pay increases (p. 18). Although this critique was found to be hyperbolic in tone and based on the generalization of a relatively small sample (NCPEA, 2007; Young, Crow, Orr, Ogawa, & Creighton, 2005), the study found support in public media at the time. This critique, following fast on the heels of massive federal policy changes such as the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), seemed to poignantly support the urgency of the NCLB requirement of teachers and leaders becoming "highly qualified." Consequently, there has been a new focus in federal, state, and local policy on aligning principal preparation programs with the current responsibilities of the job. Several agencies have published recommendations for postsecondary institutions and school districts, including the Southern Regional Educational Review Board (2005), which supports the alignment of university school leadership courses to the ISLLC Standards and state standards.

Many states have followed suit. The Florida Legislature currently supports the creation and deployment of approved and aligned programs to better recruit, prepare, and develop school leaders. In order to standardize the development of principals, The Florida Department of Education proactively initiated an application and approval process for all principal preparation programs in the state. The programs fall into two categories (or levels) as indicated in the State Board of Education Rule 6A-5.081:

1. Level 1 Educational Leadership (educational leadership preparation programs)- These programs, mostly found in Florida's postsecondary institutions, are designed for aspiring assistant principals and practicing assistant principals wishing to earn a master's degree in the area of educational leadership.
2. Level 2 School Principal (district-based principal leadership professional development programs): These programs, offered through district professional development programs, the state's own online repository of professional development (William Cecil Golden Professional Development Program for School Leaders), and third-party providers, are designed for aspiring principals or current principals wishing to earn certification as School Principal (pursuant to the State Board of Education Rule 6A-4.0083).

Both levels of professional development should provide participants with experiences that are aligned to the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (State Board of Education Rule 6A-5.081). With this formal articulation between Level 1 and 2 programs, Florida has set up a systematic method for preparing and supporting future school leaders in both universities and districts.

Research Questions

The broad research question that guided the study was: To what degree does a sample of future and novice principals in an approved Florida Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation program perceive they can competently demonstrate the behavioral indicators of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards, and are these perceptions related to these principals' perception of their leadership style?

Four specific research questions guided the analysis of the data, including:

Research question 1.: Which behavioral indicators identified with high-performing principals in the FPLS do participants perceive they are most ready to demonstrate?

Research question 2.: Which behavioral indicators identified with high-performing principals in the FPLS do participants perceive they are least ready to demonstrate?

Research question 3.: To what extent do participants in an approved Level 1 educational leadership program perceive their leadership style to be transactional, transformational, and/or laissez-faire?

Research question 4.: To what extent can variation in participants' ratings on the dependent variable set of perceived readiness to perform in the FPLS domains be explained by their perceived leadership style as measured by the MLQ domains?

Definitions of Terms

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)- This term is usually associated with the standardized test scores of students equal to the measures set by each state in accordance with the No

Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001.

Behavioral indicators- This term refers to the actions included within leadership standards that convey observable actions or identifiable effects of a defined aspect of leadership.

Competency- The ability to do something effectively or successfully.

Full Range Leadership- The Full Range Leadership (FRL) Model is the Bass and Avolio (1996) leadership scale, which includes transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leaders styles. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is frequently used as operational measure of the FRL. The MLQ measures the degree of transformational leadership and the remaining leadership types included in the FRL model (and their subcomponents).

High-performing principals- High-performing principals, as defined by State Board of Education Rule 6A-5.080, is any individual who may competently demonstrate the standards and their behavioral indicators.

Instructional leadership- Instructional leadership, like transformational leadership, focuses "explicitly on the manner in which the educational leadership exercised by school administrators and teachers brings about improved educational outcomes" (Hallinger, 2003, pp. 329). For the purposes of the present study, the behaviors associated with the instructional leadership model (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985) were considered very similar to transformational school leadership behaviors and expectations (Hallinger, 2003).

Laissez-faire leadership- The laissez-faire leadership style is otherwise known as the absence of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Self-perceived readiness- Self-perceived readiness is used throughout the study as it is

used in the ISLLC 2008 standards. Essentially, self-perceived readiness is the point at which an individual's understanding of what is expected of him/her coincides with his/her belief in his/her ability to perform the task competently. This usage is echoed in a recent analysis of the standards published by the Council of Chief State School Officers (Canole & Young, 2013).

Self-perceived competency- In the present study, the term "self-perceived competence" reflects its usage in Self-Determination Theory. Harter defined this simply as a person's own beliefs or predictions concerning their abilities and performance (Harter, 1982).

Self-perceived leadership style- For the present study, self-perceived leadership style was defined and situated in the context of the self-rater survey of the MLQ and its output.

School leader- For the purposes of this study, the school leader was defined as the principal of a school or a principal-in-training. The population of interest for the study included any current participants of an approved Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation program in Florida. The sample of future school leaders selected originated from university-based Level 1 programs.

Transactional leadership- Leadership style typically associated with transactional behaviors. One example might include offering a tangible reward, such as money, for performance on a job or task (Burns, 1978).

Transformational leadership – Transformational leadership style is most associated with charismatic, visionary change. Leaders demonstrating transformational behaviors are usually respected and emulated by their followers. Their high expectations are welcomed, and they foster leadership in their followers (Bass, 1985).

Rationale

Through the examination of the Level 1 participants' perceptions of their own readiness to lead as defined by the Florida Principal Leadership Standards and their understanding of their degree of transformational leadership style, this study provides information regarding the perceptions of Florida's future principal leaders. This study also provided a framework for future inquiry into leadership development preparation activities and their impact on the perceptions of future leaders.

Furthermore, participants' perceptions of their own readiness to lead may help to identify what domains of leadership, leadership standards, and behaviors (identified by the Florida Principal Leadership Standards) may be highlighted in the Level 1 and Level 2 leadership preparation programs and experiences to better prepare potential leaders for a career as a school principal.

Assumptions

Several assumptions undergirded the present study, including:

1. Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation programs in Florida that are aligned to the Florida Principal Leadership Standards provide experiences aligned to the real work of principals.
2. The Florida Principal Leadership Standards clearly articulate behavioral expectations of principals and reflect the real work of principals.
3. Leadership *style* is influenced by innumerable models and circumstances that may vary widely for each individual. It develops over time, throughout one's life. By contrast, leadership *decision-making* (or actions and reactions to a given

scenario) may be taught and cultivated through principal preparation (Aspin, 1996).

4. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire provides adequate data to measure self-perceived leadership style.

5. Principals in training are, to some degree, aware of their own abilities and leadership style and can provide honest data for surveys if given complete anonymity and assurance that the data will not be collected for evaluative purposes.

Limitations

Some limitations of the proposed study include the following:

1. The present study was limited to self-perception data only. The phenomenological issue of self-perception may be contested. No attempt was made to objectively measure actual leadership competence of the participants. Because self-perception may present data collection issues such as halo effect in the responses, it was important to gather data in an anonymous manner.

2. Data were limited to participants' responses on two survey instruments. Self-perceptions of Level 1 participants were collected via the MLQ and Florida Principal Leadership Standards survey instruments. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire has been subjected to many psychometric integrity studies, and data supporting validity of MLQ scores have been gathered using many diverse samples. MLQ measures the degree of transformational leadership perceived by the participant on the Full Range Leadership model of Bass and Avolio (1992).

No other leadership theories or models are represented in the instrument or its scale scores. The FPLS survey emanated from the framework of leadership theory and empirical research on which the FPLS standards are founded.

3. The nature of the data collected for the present study precluded the ability to examine leadership effectiveness or competence in practice. The sample that provided data (Level 1 program participants) had limited to no experience with leading followers at their current workplace. Thus, self-perception was the form of the data collected for the study.

4. The data were limited to a Florida-specific sample, and therefore, results may not generalize outside of the state. The sample was representative of Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation program participants only. This sample included teachers and teachers-on-special-assignment wishing to become certified in educational leadership in Florida. Some participants may have never held a formal leadership role. Thus, their lack of leadership experience may have impacted their perception of their own abilities.

Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter one provides an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, descriptions of the variables, the research questions, and the definition of key terms. Chapter two provides a review of the related literature, including a discussion of the domains of leadership identified as important to schools, the application of the domains within principal leadership standards, and the importance of self-perception of leadership readiness. The

second chapter concludes with a discussion of methodological issues and a summary confirming the need for the study.

Chapter three describes the research methodology framework, design, and data collection. The chapter presents the primary research question, secondary research questions, and the hypotheses that guided the methodology, design, and data collection. Chapter four includes the study's findings, including statistical data analysis and answers to the four research questions. The fifth chapter provides discussion of the findings and recommendations for practice and future research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The role of today's school principal requires such a wide array of leadership skills that it is difficult for researchers to agree on a uniform set of leadership behaviors that may be related to school success. The role of the school leader is messy conceptually, constantly shifting and encompassing both observable and non-observable traits in order to build a common focus on performance goals for staff, students, and the school (Catano & Stronge, 2007). Effective principals who are leading their schools through difficult challenges will credit their growth and success to their teaching staff, but the principals of those schools play a vital role in how they lead and how their leadership is reflected in their behaviors (Chenowith, 2012). These behaviors and the overall leadership style of the individual school principal have been closely examined more in the last few decades than previously (e.g., Cotton, 2003; Cotton & Savard, 1980; Hallinger, 1983; Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Kirby, Paradise, & King, 1992; Larsen, 1984; Leithwood et al., 2010; Marzano et al., 2005) and have impacted national and state policy change and the increased standardization of school leadership standards (e.g., Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008). In a system impacted by the legislative requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and the standardized testing that has been implemented to monitor student academic growth and school performance, it is difficult to imagine the complexity required in the decision-making of school principals today. Although situational changes of the school environment either through policy or regional context

impact the leadership style of those in the principal seat (Hersey & Blanchard, 1977), it is assumed that school leaders who make extraordinary change happen and positively impact school culture are different from the rest of the pack (Leithwood et al., 2010). Gupton has posited “no one leadership model, style, trait profile, or set of skills works best in all schools” (2010). Although this is true, research has identified some common attributes of principals that are consistently correlated to high-performing schools. For example, a principal’s understanding of the expectations and accountability associated with the job has an impact on their leadership (Shipps & White, 2009). Although situational context and accountability affect principal decision-making (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008), it is clear that leadership style also impacts principals’ decisions and behaviors (Bentley, 2011; Hallinger, 2003; Martinez, 2009; Sheppard, 1996). The leadership style of a principal has an impact on the type of school reform and instructional vision needed by specific schools (Griffith, 2004; Ibarra, 2008; Klar & Brewer, 2013; Lanier, 2009; Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010).

The articulation of a common goal and the individualized support of followers to achieving that goal is a concept that is not exclusive to education. Although Burns (1978) described and compared this “transforming” leadership style to transactional and provided many historical examples and non-examples (i.e., “pseudo-transformational” leadership), Bass (1985) developed a more complete conceptual model of transformational and transactional leadership styles. Leveraging a wellspring of recent research in the areas of leadership style and behaviors, the model initially proposed by Bass has fully matured and is commonly used as a framework for understanding leadership in its many settings worldwide.

The research question and the conceptual frameworks of the present study guide the review of the literature. The review of the literature includes sections on (a) leadership style and schools, (b) the measurement of leadership style, (c) the impact of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors on school performance, (d) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards, (e) Florida principal leadership preparation, and (f) principals-in-training and principals' perceptions of readiness to lead. In this manner, the review of literature will provide the empirical research foundation for the research question, the instruments utilized in the data collection, and the study's participants.

Leadership Style and Schools

In Bass and Avolio's (2004) short description of transactional leadership, it is easy to imagine that many of the functions of a school principal, including logistical planning around standardized testing and teacher evaluations, may be appropriately identified as transactional in nature.

> In its more constructive form, transactional leadership is supplemented by working with individuals and/or groups, setting up and defining agreements or contracts to achieve specific work objectives, discovering individuals' capabilities, and specifying the compensation and rewards that can be expected upon successful completion of the tasks. (p. 3)

School principals must perform behaviors that include a system of goals or agreements that have tangible rewards, such as school grades and teacher performance pay. Although the current, accountability-driven environment of schools may depend on many of the behaviors associated with transactional leadership, it would be hard to ignore the fact that a growing body of research points to transformational leadership as one of the

contributing factors to school change and success. This may have a great deal to do with Burns's assertion that transformational leadership "does not coerce" or simply turn teachers into "instruments" to achieve success; transformational leaders value "joint seekers of truth and of mutual actualization" (1978, p. 448). Hence, Burns (1978) described transformational leadership as "elevating," "collective," "causative," and "morally purposeful" (pp. 451-455).

In schools mired in testing and meeting increasing measures of accountability, "school administrators must focus their attention to making second-order changes in their schools," such as collaborative decision making, building a shared vision for student achievement, and facilitating the professional development of staff. Transformational leadership provides the focus to make those types of changes that have a dramatic impact on everyone in the school and the school itself (Leithwood, 1992, p. 9). Leithwood noted that transformational leadership "provides the incentive for people to attempt improvements in their practice" (p. 9), and defined the main goals of the transformational school leader as co-creating and facilitating a collaborative and professional school culture, providing and facilitating opportunities for staff to professionally grow, and promoting shared problem solving (1992). Transformational leadership, although first defined by Burns (1978) for a very different organizational environment and structure than public schools, found a home in educational leadership theory through Bass (1985), who elaborated on the behavioral or functional components of the theory. Despite the mercurial changes happening nationally and the natural fluidity of leadership practice in the school setting, a large body of research has continued to develop regarding the leadership style and behaviors of effective principals. Building upon the initial work of

Bass, many researchers over the last 30 years have developed a strong case for behaviors aligned to transformational leadership and their impact on school performance, teacher support and efficacy, and student achievement. There have been many models of transformational leadership proposed and measured through a variety of means, including but not limited to Leithwood, Aitken, and Jantzi's Transformational School Leadership model (2001), Kouzes and Posner's model (1995), and the Bass and Avolio model (1995). Bass and Avolio conceptualized transformational and transactional leadership as two ends of a range of leadership style (Leithwood & Sun, 2012). The various transformational leadership models all contain similar components and associated behaviors, and are only differentiated superficially by "non-substantive distinctions in wording" (Leithwood & Sun, 2012, p. 398).

The difference between transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style is essentially this: "transformational leaders motivate others to do more than they originally intended and even more than they thought possible" (Bass & Avolio, 1994, p. 3) through high expectations and sensitivity to needs of followers while transactional leadership style is primarily concerned with the actual transactional aspects of leadership (e.g., an exchange of a reward upon completion of a task). Facets of transformational and transactional leadership work together in a principal's school leadership style to have a positive impact on school improvement (Silins, 1994). Although leaders may have to perform both types of behaviors, the transformational behaviors are the ones most often associated with change (Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 3).

Leithwood (1992), building on the work of Burns (1978) and Bass (1985), developed a model for transformational school leadership that included the skills that a

leader would need to meet the challenges of the 21st Century (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Further articulating his leadership model, Leithwood and Jantzi (1995) identified eight primary behaviors associated with transformational school leadership, including developing a shared vision, holding high expectations, co-creating a positive school culture, collaborating to set goals and priorities for the school, modeling behavior for staff, providing individualized support, building time and opportunities for collaboration, and providing intellectual stimulation. Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinback (1999) included the aligned behaviors of transformational leadership in three easily-identified leadership outcomes, including (a) setting directions, (b) developing people, and (c) redesigning the organization. Sheppard (1996) used the terms "framing school goals" and "promoting professional development" to describe leadership outcomes. Louis et al. (2010) later refered to these as "providing direction" (i.e., setting goals and outlining a path to achieve them) and "exercising influence" (i.e., creating opportunities for professional development and collaboration) (p. 9). Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) included behavioral outputs as one of their "seven strong claims about successful school leadership," referring to them as "building a vision and setting directions," "understanding and developing people," and "redesigning the organization" to provide for a culture that improves working conditions (p. 30). These similar versions of the same leadership behaviors all refer to focusing on setting the vision or goals of the school and empowering staff to accomplish them. The definition of transformational leadership that seems to exemplify this visionary leadership states:

> Transformational leadership theory claims that a relatively small number of leadership behaviors or practices are capable of increasing the commitment and

> effort of organizational members toward the achievement of organizational goals. The values and aspirations of both leader and follower are enhanced by these practices. Unlike traditional models of leadership that are "transactional" in nature, transformational leadership theory argues that, given adequate support, organizational members become highly engaged and motivated by goals that are inspirational because those goals are associated with values in which they strongly believe—or are persuaded to strongly believe. Transformational leadership theory, then, identifies which internal states of organizational members are critical to their performance and specifies a set of leaders [sic] practices most likely to have a positive influence on those internal states. (Leithwood & Sun, 2012, pp. 388-389)

Leithwood and Sun's (2012) identification of "internal states" of the staff speaks directly to major skill sets identified as transformational in nature (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Bass and Avolio's transformational model of school leadership includes four major skill sets, labeled as the four "I's": Individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence (1994). These components (or dimensions) of transformational leadership, along with those associated with transactional and laissez-faire leadership, were found to stand after great scrutiny and several content and construct validity studies of and with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Bass & Avolio, 2004; Bass, Avolio, & Jung, 1999; Bass & Riggio, 2006). More regarding this instrument will follow in a later section of this review.

Individual consideration (IC) is most often associated with the behaviors that a leader exhibits that are aligned to coaching or mentoring. The principal considers every individual of the organization and their needs. He or she respects the diversity of the staff and students. Their communication is personalized and authentic (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Providing feedback to followers sensitively and congruent to what they value in the work can result in intrinsic motivation to improve (Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006).

Intellectual stimulation (IS) refers to the leader's ability to reframe problems for collaborative problem solving activities. Ideas of others are respected and held as equal in value to those of the leader (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Inspirational motivation (IM) refers to leadership behaviors that motivate and inspire action from the staff. A leader with a clearly communicated vision and goals can influence their followers through shared leadership opportunities (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Idealized influence (II) includes leadership behaviors that exhibit a strong dedication to the organization and the staff. Individuals exhibiting idealized influence are often thought of as moral and ethically sound. These leadership behaviors may include modeling of desired actions for the staff. In fact, school staff members often admit to emulating transformational leaders who possess idealized influence (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

The Full Range of Leadership (FRL) model (Bass & Riggio, 2006) includes dimensions of transactional leadership and laissez-faire behavior. Transactional leadership is based on contingent reinforcement of followers, including tangible rewards and/or punitive actions for performance, and laissez-faire (or passive-avoidant) leadership is essentially the absence of leadership. Leaders may display behaviors from all of the

leadership components. However, the optimal behaviors for effective leadership are more aligned with transformational leadership. The Full Range of Leadership model also includes the following behavioral dimensions:

1. *Contingent reward* (CR)- The leader establishes and clearly communicates the value of performance as a material form of reward. This transactional behavioral dimension can be more transformational if the rewards promised at the successful completion of a goal are "psychological, such as praise" (Bass & Riggio, 2006). This dimension has been found to correlate positively with ethical leadership as determined by comparison of Brown and Trevino's Ethical Leadership Survey (2002) results and the results of Bass and Avolio's Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Toor & Ofori, 2009). A form of the transactional version of this component can be found in the teacher performance pay programs used throughout the state of Florida.
2. *Management-by-exception* (MBE)- The leadership behaviors associated with MBE are punitive and meant to be corrective in nature. These behaviors can be passive (MBE-P), wherein the leader does not act until something is not performed successfully. However, the MBE behaviors can be more active (MBE-A) wherein the leader actively looks for and openly identifies examples of followers failing to meet performance standards (Bass & Riggio, 2006).
3. *Laissez-faire leadership* (LF)- The primary leadership behavior associated with LF leadership is the avoidance of leadership. This component of the Full Range of Leadership model is embodied by the leader has decided to not act at

all. A laissez-faire leader is, in effect, divorced from the process of school leadership (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Measuring Leadership Style

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was developed to assess transformational leadership variables in overall leadership style (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The MLQ survey instrument (most recently the short form 5X), comprised of 45 attitudinal item prompts, helps to create a personal leadership profile for respondents that includes behaviors associated with all three leadership domains: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire (or passive avoidance). The MLQ factor scale scores are often used for assessing the leadership styles and potential of candidates for leadership programs, for promoting self-perceived leadership style analysis, and for understanding and matching leaders with leadership areas best suited to their individual leadership style as shown in their MLQ profiles. The profiles consist of scale scores representative of a participant's leadership choices and their raters' choices on the survey. In many cases, a candidate completing the survey using the "self-rater" form will also be rated by a sample of their followers. Some profiles are optimal to effective leadership for change and display a strong lean to choices associated with transformational leadership. On the opposite end of the range of FRL, an individual could display more of a transactional leadership style or even passive avoidance of leadership actions altogether (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

According to Bass and Avolio, the optimal profile of a leader includes examples from every component of the Full Range of Leadership (FRL) model. Specifically, in the optimal leadership style profile the emphasis is on the four components, or four *I*'s, most

closely linked to transformational behaviors. Although these behaviors may be shared through the entire continuum of leadership style, transformational leadership is the style most closely associated to the four I's (4 I's). Leadership behaviors known as contingent-reward (CR) are associated with transformational and transactional leadership. Individuals who display more choices associated with CR or 4 I's lean more toward transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2004). In contrast, the suboptimal profile places an emphasis on transactional leadership behaviors, such as management-by-exception (passive and active).

Relationship between Leadership Style and Schools

Initial studies identifying a relationship between transformational leadership and school culture and teacher attitudes (Leithwood, 1992) have led to further empirical research expounding on theories regarding the positive impact of transformational leadership on teacher efficacy, job satisfaction, and the overall school culture. In fact, it has been determined that effective principal behaviors can be described in the terms of the components of transformational leadership (Griffith, 2003). There are many studies that support the theory that transformational leadership behaviors are more aligned to effective school leadership for staff, culture, and school improvement. Griffith (2003) contended:

> The proposition that principal behaviors have stronger relations to outcomes associated with staff, such as job satisfaction, than to student outcomes has intuitive appeal. The work of staff, classroom instruction, is more directly related to student learning and achievement than the work of principals. School staff spend more time with students. By comparison, principals spend more time with

> school staff – providing direction and guidance, assessing and providing needed resources, and observing and evaluating job performance – than with students. Thus, principal behaviors more directly affect school staff, specifically, their satisfaction and commitment to work and working relations with one another. The principal's relationship with school staff likely influences job satisfaction, which in turn relates to staff job performance. (pp. 334-335)

Martinez (2009) found that transformational leadership was exhibited more often by the principals of schools meeting Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) than by principals of schools not meeting the standards of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The conclusions of the studies examined for this review of the literature identified at least one common theme that is aligned to the definition of transformational leadership- school leaders foster a collaborative approach to improving student achievement. However, transactional leadership should not be discounted as an important component of school leadership considering that principals must articulate accountability goals and assign teacher performance rewards (or contingency rewards). In fact, in some studies, like Gulbin's (2008) administration of the MLQ to Pennsylvania-based principals and their staffs, there was no evidence of a relationship between student achievement and transformational leadership. In fact, when six participants of the quantitative sample were interviewed, they reported that transactional leadership (as well as its components--contingent reward, MBE-passive, and MBE-active) was more aligned with their own leadership behavior.

Schools labeled as low performing and subjected to punitive sanctions in accordance with NCLB have been found to benefit from transformational leadership. In a

recent study that included 695 California-based principals, it was concluded that the behaviors associated with transformational leadership were those found most often in principals that led schools out of a low performing status. It was found that the principals who successfully led their schools out of a status of low performance tended to engage in more transformational behaviors than those principals of schools still labeled as low performing (Ibarra, 2008).

Hardman (2012) conducted a study utilizing the MLQ to help determine the relationship between leadership style on the Full Range of Leadership model and student and school improvement. The schools in the sample all participated in standardized testing for at least a three-year period. This study was smaller in scope (only one Florida district) and examined test results over a three-year period in order to possibly predict school improvement or non-improvement. Although there was no statistically significant relationship between leadership style and school status as improving or non-improving over the three-year period, there was a statistically significant relationship found between leadership style and the predictability of student achievement. Specifically, transformational and Laissez-faire leadership styles had a positive relationship with student achievement. Furthermore, the intellectual stimulation (IS) subscale of transformational leadership was a statistically significant predictor of school improvement status. Hardman also found that the management-by-exception-active (MBE-A) variable actually had a negative influence on student achievement. The transactional subscale of contingent reward had a statistically non-significant relationship with improving schools.

In their recent study of leadership practices of principals in high-need middle schools, Klar and Brewer (2013) found that core practices of transformational leadership, including building a shared vision for change and fostering leadership development in staff, were exhibited in each middle school principal's behavior and were instrumental in the implementation of instructional reform efforts. In each case, principals adapted their leadership behaviors for the context of the school, its staff, and the needs of the students. This purposeful adaptation for setting the instructional direction of the school while respecting the staff through shared planning and leadership development activities (Leithwood et al., 2008) reflected the deep commitment of the principals. The commitment of the school leader to the work of communicating a vision and creating opportunities for shared ownership of the vision has not always been what was expected of the principal; however, within current accountability-driven system, this expression of commitment has become an essential skill of the school leader.

For many years, principals were viewed as managers of schools (Louis, Leithwood, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). However, with the sweeping scale of policy changes such as the No Child Left Behind Act (2001) and measures of accountability reflected in local evaluation systems, the atmosphere of the modern school is thick with challenge. School principals must possess idealized influence, always being aware of how their behaviors may impact teacher motivation and intellectual stimulation (Bass & Riggio, 1996). School principals must be cheerleaders for change and encourage their staff to participate in authentic discussions regarding their ownership in that change. Sheppard's (1996) study of leadership found the same critical themes of defining a goal,

setting the direction, and facilitating shared ownership of the goal with, among other activities, providing opportunity for professional development.

Self-efficacy, as defined by Bandura (1977), is a set of beliefs or expectations one may have of one's own behavior and ability to successfully "execute the behavior required to produce" a defined outcome (p. 195). Current research applied to education supports the theory that teachers' self-efficacy directly impacts student learning and school improvement (Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The defined outcome or goal associated with self-efficacy is valued and may be defined by one's self or by an influential other, such as leader. In this way, principal leadership has an impact on teacher self-efficacy, therefore indirectly linking school leadership and behaviors associated with transformational leadership (such as modeling and idealized influence) to student learning (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008).

This indirect influence of transformational school leadership on teacher efficacy is corroborated by other findings. In Nelson's (2012) study of transformational leadership domains exhibited by principals and their impact on teacher efficacy and student achievement, descriptive and statistical analysis of 256 teacher surveys from 17 middle schools identified that teachers perceived high performance expectations as the most important factor in the students' achievement. In Nelson's correlation analysis, it was discovered that all six transformational leadership domains showed statistically significant positive relationships with the teachers' sense of efficacy. In an effort to connect this sense of teacher efficacy with student test results, Nelson conducted a multiple regression analysis. The results substantiated positive correlations between predicted variables and outcomes variables, with developing a sense of vision being the

transformational leadership domain serving as the best predictor for the state-mandated mathematics Criterion Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT) scores. Hipp's (1996) study, focused on correlating Wisconsin-based middle school teachers' sense of efficacy with their 10 principals' leadership style, yielded similar findings. Three leadership behaviors associated with transformational leadership were positively and statistically significantly related to the teacher efficacy.

Another recent study of teacher-perceived transformational leadership and its impact on teacher efficacy, teacher satisfaction, and teacher commitment was conducted with the participation of 121 special education teachers in Virginia (Horn-Turpin, 2009). Through factor analysis, it was determined that the transformational leadership behavior, administrative support, was the most often recognized by participants when surveyed regarding their principal's leadership style. Although there was no statistically significant relationship between administrative support and teacher efficacy, Pearson correlation analysis indicated that administrative support was positively and statistically significantly related to teachers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Horn-Turpin, 2009).

Hallinger and Heck (1996) concluded that the "principal leadership that makes a difference is aimed toward influencing internal school processes that are directly linked to student learning. These internal processes range from school policies and norms (e.g., academic expectations, school mission, student opportunity to learn, instructional organization, academic learning time) to the practices of teachers" (p. 38). Furthermore, the statistically significant indirect effects of school leadership on student learning have been frequently found to have a relationship with the variables listed above (Hallinger &

Heck, 1996). This strong focus on factors that impact student achievement and school improvement has been shown to influence overall school climate.

Utilizing an organizational climate description questionnaire and the MLQ with a sample that included 17 principals and 404 staff members, Eshbach (2008) found through a correlation analysis a statistically significant positive relationship between the perceived transformational leadership style of the principal and school climates that were considered open and engaging. Staff members rated those principals of open and engaging climates as higher in transformational than transactional or passive-avoidance leadership style.

Although several studies support the idea of transformational leadership's impact on teacher efficacy and job satisfaction (e.g., Geijsel, Sleegers, Leithwood, & Jantzi, 2003; Moshavl, Brown, & Dodd, 2003; Nelson, 2012), transformational leaders are not always aware of the degree to which they are transformational in behavior. There seems to be incongruence, at least in some cases, between the leader's self-awareness and followers' perception of the leader's impact on others. The transformational leader may actually contradict their followers' responses, underestimating their own degree of transformational leadership even when they impact followers' performance, efficacy, and satisfaction positively (Moshavl, Brown, & Dodd, 2003). In fact, leaders who make change happen in challenging school settings usually credit the work to their teaching staff (Lambert, 1998).

Although there are empirical studies that hinge on transformational leadership behaviors, such as personalized communication or staff development, there are cases

where the principals themselves believe their strongest, most impactful leadership behaviors are those typically associated with transactional leadership (e.g., Ibarra, 2008).

Even though researchers have found data that support the importance of transformational leadership on schools and teaching and learning, there are data that contradict these claims. For example, in a recent correlational study, Estapa (2009) examined the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership behaviors and student achievement as measured on standardized tests. Estapa sought to establish whether or not a principal's cumulative transformational leadership behavior could be a predictor of standardized test scores. In every case, for each research question, Estapa failed to reject the null hypothesis and concluded that there were no statistically significant correlations between the teachers' perceptions of the transformational leadership behaviors of the principals and students' standardized test scores.

Moreover, some recent studies reflect the apparent incongruence between principals' self-perception of their leadership style and its impact on schools. Gulbin (2008) identified that even though there was no statistically significant relationship found between leadership style and student achievement or graduation rates in a selection of high-poverty secondary schools in Pennsylvania, the principals included in the sample and interviewed expressed the belief that their use of transformational leadership behaviors most impacted school improvement. The complexity of the school environment and its many variables contribute to the lack of clarity as to whether transformational leadership or transactional leadership would be more appropriate for today's schools (Gulbin, 2008).

However, despite some evidence to the contrary, there is a growing body of evidence suggesting that a transformational leadership style may be more appropriate to leading today's accountability-driven schools. In Ibarra's (2008) examination of exhibited and self-perceived leadership style and its relationship to schools that have successfully exited NCLB–related accountability penalties associated with low performance, it was found that some successful principals did have a higher mean score for the transactional behavior of contingent reward than those principals of schools who were not labeled as low-performing or were still labeled as low-performing (p. 62). In fact, principals with 11 or more years experience (Mean = 3.17, Standard Deviation = .54) practiced more contingent reward behaviors than those principals with only 2 years experience (*M* = 2.78, *SD* = .87) Those principals of schools that were labeled as low performing for at least five years engaged in transactional and transformational leadership behaviors almost equally.

In Onorato's (2012) recent study utilizing the MLQ as an instrument to help determine the relationship between principals' self-reported degree of transformational leadership and standardized test results, principal leadership style was statistically significantly related to mathematics scores on standardized tests. However, post hoc tests to determine which leadership styles were most related to the statistically significant mean differences in mathematics test scores indicated that the statistically significant differences were related to the laissez-faire and transactional leadership styles. There was no statistically significant relationship found between transformational leadership with regard to their relationship with standardized test scores.

Like the ISLLC 2008 Standards that helped inform their revision, the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards include behavioral indicators that are associated with models of instructional and transformational leadership (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Leithwood et al., 2004; Leithwood & Sun, 2012) and reflect a balance of operational functions and transformational leadership practices, all in support of leading student achievement. Thus, impactful principal leadership behaviors included in most models, such as setting instructional direction, are included in the newest Florida standards and are included in all state-approved program and personnel evaluations. In a recently completed longitudinal observation study of 100 Florida school principals, it was found that a principal's time spent on coaching, evaluating and developing the school's instructional programs were predictors of student achievement gains (Grissom, Loeb, & Master, 2013). These behaviors include transformational and transactional behaviors and reflect three of the four leadership domains identified by the Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

Florida Principal Leadership Standards

A document cross-referencing the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards to contemporary empirical research and key writings in leadership was drafted and distributed by the Florida Department of Education to school districts, postsecondary institutions, and third-party professional development providers in 2011 (Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development, & Retention. 2011). Although this document does not review the relationship of the literature to the standard explicitly, there is an expressed alignment through citations and the annotated

bibliography appended. The document included the purpose and structure of the standards as the following:

> Purpose: The Standards are set forth in rule as Florida's core expectations for effective school administrators. The Standards are based on contemporary research on multidimensional school leadership, and represent skills sets and knowledge bases needed in effective schools. The Standards form the foundation for school leader personnel appraisal and professional development systems, school leadership preparation programs, and educator certification requirements.
>
> Structure: There are 10 standards grouped into four leadership categories or domains of effective leadership. Each Standard has a title and includes, as necessary, descriptors that further clarify or define the standard, so that the Standards may be developed further into leadership curricula and proficiency assessments in fulfillment of their purposes. (p. 1)

FPLS Categories or Domains

The standards fall within four domains of leadership expected from Florida principals and other educational leaders.

Domain 1: Student Achievement

(Standard 1- Student Learning Results, Standard 2- Student Learning as a Priority)

Domain 1 mirrors the student academic improvement found in each of the ISLCC 2008 Standards. However, this domain is clearly set apart as the first order for the leadership of Florida's schools. With school grade formulas and teacher and leader evaluations, the ultimate goal is student achievement. This core responsibility of school leaders encompasses all of the behaviors associated with building a collaborative culture

in relentless pursuit of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for all students. This domain may be perceived as the direction setting or goal setting of the leader and the achieving of that goal. Although much has been published regarding the correlation between leadership behaviors and student achievement, including recent dissertations included in this literature review (Hardman, 2011; Keys, 2010), it has generally been accepted that the relationship is indirect (Hallinger & Heck, 1996) and set into motion through establishing the vision and the methods by which the vision will be attained (Leithwood et al., 2004).

Domain 2: Instructional Leadership

(Standard 3- Instructional Plan Implementation, Standard 4- Faculty Development, Standard 5- Learning Environment)

Although the label, instructional leader, has often been defined and interpreted in many ways in the literature (Gupton, 2010), the behaviors most often associated with instructional leadership are shared with transformational leadership (Hallinger, 2003) and the defined leadership needed for school improvement and student achievement (Klar & Brewer, 2013; Louis et al., 2010). Murphy (1990) defined instructional leadership behaviors as functions directly related to teaching and learning. The behaviors associated with both theories of instructional leadership and transformational leadership are described similarly and/or shared between both theories often (Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood & Sun, 2012).

Smith and Andrews (1989) asserted that the visibility and the communication skills of the principal should also be counted among the foundational elements to an effective instructional leader’s toolkit. It is no great mystery that principals in highly

successful schools spend a great deal of their time visiting classrooms and discussing instructional strategies with faculty (Johnson & Uline, 2005). Larson's (1984) dissertation study regarding the instructional behaviors of effective school administrators was one of the first to confirm the power of classroom observations and the importance of principal visibility. Blase and Blase (1999) added that visibility and communication must extend beyond the classroom, to parents, students and the rest of the community. This creates opportunities for the instructional leader to engage in conversations that may help collective understanding and stakeholder support for the educational goals of the school. In Domain 3, communication is explicit addressed as Standard 9. In this context, communication extends to other functions of leadership as an addition to expressing the student achievement and school improvement plans of the organization.

Staff development is included in this domain as a standard for Florida's school leaders. The importance of the behaviors that a leader exhibits to promote staff development is a theme in most research on leadership behavior in schools (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Instructional leaders must motivate and establish opportunities for their staff to develop the skills they need to promote student learning. Additionally, opportunities for staff to discuss instructional issues without the principal being present have been linked to school and student performance (Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010).

Domain 3: Organizational Leadership

(Standard 6- Decision Making, Standard 7- Leadership Development, Standard 8- School Management, Standard 9- Communication)

Although Domain 3 is labeled as organizational leadership, it includes the development of staff as leaders through shared leadership responsibilities and professional development opportunities; the operational management of structures to promote student learning and teacher effort; and the clear communication associated with all effective leaders. Marzano et al. found that second order change, or change that is a "dramatic departure from the expected" daily work of leading a school, may strain the behaviors that are associated with developing internal staff leaders and shared decision-making, such as communication, culture, order, and input (2005, p. 66). Thus, these behaviors must be expected in principals' routine leadership of the school. Building a culture based on continuous improvement in student learning may require careful planning and attentiveness to the processes needed to achieve the academic goals of the school (Johnson & Uline, 2005). Facilitating opportunities for staff to grow, to share in decision making, and to foster deep collaboration in a today's school context may hinge on the situational awareness of leaders and their ability to understand the needs of all stakeholders and the needs of the school itself (Marzano et al., 2005, p. 63).

Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior

(Standard 10- Professional and Ethical Behaviors)

The idealized influence of transformational leadership falls within this domain and includes all the behaviors that a school leader would exhibit to model to external and internal stakeholders. Trust of the leader was discovered to be the second statistically significant factor related to school improvement behind professional learning communities (Louis et al., 2010). Trust has been examined to a greater degree in the work of Daly and Crispeels (2008), who surveyed 292 school and district-based administrators

and teachers to determine the perception of trust and whether aspects of trust could be considered predictors of adaptive leadership. The professional and ethical leadership provided by a principal can be observed through their ability to build collaboration among the members of a school staff and build greater communication through distributed leadership and learning teams (Abbott & McKnight, 2010).

Ethical leadership, as defined and discussed in Dufresne and McKenzie's case study of one high school, begins with the leader's awareness and modeling of their core values (2009). Moreover, the authors explain that tools are needed by leaders to create spaces for ethical leadership to become an important aspect of the school culture. Based on the behavioral indicators and the research supporting it, Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Leadership can be viewed as an important set of behaviors that can be used in all three previous domains.

Leadership Preparation

Although there has been some effort to connect principal preparation to student achievement and school improvement progress, there is no definitive link (Orr & Orphanos, 2011). Nevertheless, many principal preparation programs have been reorganized to focus more heavily on teaching strategies, content knowledge, and field experiences (Orr, 2006). The primary purpose of leader preparation programs is to produce leaders who are ready to take on the challenge of leading schools (Milstein, 1992). It is known that educational leadership preparation must reflect current challenges of schooling, and key features of effective preparation programs have been identified from the research (Pounder, 2010). It is also generally accepted that effective leader preparation programs provide multiple opportunities for leader candidates to have

extended field experiences and real-world problem solving (Perez et al., 2010). Moreover, if "authentic" field-based experiences are not found in the university setting, they must be provided in the district setting. Principals-in-training, such as assistant principals, need to be exposed to authentic tasks that reflect the complexity of the job of the principal (Culross, 2011). There are indicators that leadership preparation programs are preparing leaders capable of performing expected leadership for today's schools. In one study, experienced Virginia principals that had led a school for five years or longer and their supervisors were administered a survey to determine if there was a connection between leaders' ratings on the ISLLC Standards and student achievement (Kaplan & Nunnery, 2005). The researchers found that highly rated principals were more likely to be leaders of schools with higher student achievement over time than those principals rated lower.

In his critique of leadership preparation programs, Levine (2005) asserted that there was no link between the coursework or learning experiences found in postsecondary educational leadership preparation programs and the actual work required of leaders today. Although Levine's report was refuted by some (e.g., NCPEA, 2007; Young et al., 2005), it proved to be a catalyst for discussions centered on the best practices of leadership programs (Harris, 2006). In the time since Levine's 2005 critique, there have been many changes in both leadership standards and the experiences provided in many educational leadership preparation programs. The ISLCC 2008 Standards have been adopted by 36 states and provide a guide for those states to use in preparing their leaders (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008).

Although much has been done to improve educational leadership preparation, it is important to note that there are some studies that have reflected a continuing divide between the program experiences and requirements and the real work of the principal. Catano and Stronge (2007) found that there were some incongruities between what was expected of principals and what they learned in their programs of study. In pointing out these inconsistencies, the authors included references to the state and national standards and how those principals were evaluated. Likewise, in the qualitative piece of her mixed-methodology study, Ellis (2012) interviewed a sample of novice principals (identified as principals within their first three years of experience on the job) regarding their readiness to perform the expected behaviors of the school leader as described in the 2008 ISLCC Standards. Data supported the conclusion that novice principals felt that there should be a "tighter connection between coursework and field experiences," there should be "greater accountability for mentor-principals," and there should be opportunities for "ongoing professional support" (pp. 104-106).

In an effort to align Level 1 Educational Leadership Programs and Level 2 Principal Programs to better prepare Florida's future educational leaders, the Florida Department of Education created a program approval and evaluation process for all educational leadership preparation providers in the state (Appendix A and B- State Board Rules 6A-5.081 and 6A-5.080). This includes the postsecondary providers of Level 1 experiences as well as the district-based principal programs and third party providers of Level 2 experiences. The approval process is followed by an evaluation of the Level 1 and Level 2 programs based on time and the program curriculum alignment itself. Florida's guidelines and continuous evaluation of approved Level 1 and Level 2

programs has created a transparent process by which potential leaders are prepared for the role of school principal now. Nevertheless, the state has not yet implemented its process for on-site review of programs under these new approval standards.

Perception of Readiness to Lead

The standardization of behavioral expectations for the role of the school principal brings the burden of providing adequate leadership preparation and building a sense of readiness to lead. Although principals cite key learning experiences, such as opportunities to shadow other leaders of to practice in the field, as the most influential to their own leadership development (Gruber, 2010), it is generally accepted that the actual work of the principal and the standardized expectations regarding the work of principals must be reflected in the preparation programs that produce future school leaders (Ferrigno-Browne, 2003; Jackson & Kelley, 2000; Pounder, 2010).

The principal's ability to meet the expected standards is vital in leading school improvement and student achievement (Ibarra, 2008). Thus, the conclusion is that school principals must be prepared and understand what to do in school-based situations to get the most out of staff and students. Elmore (2004) explained that the "job of administrative leaders is primarily about enhancing the skills and knowledge of people in the organization, creating a common culture of expectations around the use of those skills and knowledge, holding the various pieces of the organization together in a productive relationship with each other, and holding individuals accountable for their contributions to the collective result" (p. 15). Recent studies (e.g., Hannigan, 2008; Perez, Uline, Johnson, James-Ward, & Basom, 2011) have shown that principals are being prepared to understand the importance of the expected behaviors. For example, in Hannigan's (2008)

study of principals' perceptions of their key leadership behaviors, only one out of the seven principals interviewed at length explicitly stated the importance of the standards used to guide their work in the field. However, George's (2008) survey research study yielded results that indicated that principals (at least 102 of them in Georgia) felt that all six of the nationally recognized ISLLC Standards and their associated indicators were critical to a principal's job performance and should be used to guide preparation programs. Similarly, Huff (2011), utilizing an instrument in part based on the 2008 ISLCC Standards, surveyed a sample of principals regarding their readiness to perform their expected job duties. The respondents felt prepared to perform the duties, which included facilitating discussions around pedagogy and leading the faculty in discussions about student achievement data. However, the respondents who had doctoral degrees felt generally more prepared to perform these functions. Novice principals, included in a similar study, believed that their preparation was adequate for leading data-driven instruction, providing focused support for staff development, and inspiring a shared vision for the school (Ellis, 2012).

In a recent study of 558 Virginia-based principals' self-perception of their leadership capabilities (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2005), it was determined that belief in one's capabilities to perform expected leadership functions was strongly related to their perception of their preparation and support. However, demographics and school context were not strong predictors of school leaders' belief in their own leadership abilities (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004, 2005). Self-efficacy is the belief in one's own abilities to successfully complete a defined goal or task (Bandura, 1977). Leaders'

self-perception of ability to perform tasks related to their role as a school principal may influence their behavior.

The present study will not administer an instrument to measure school leaders' efficacy, such as the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) or Bandura's *Guide for Constructing Self-Efficacy Scales* (2005), because the present study is delimited to perceived ability and perceived inability to perform the expected behaviors of the school principal. As Bandura has explained,

> It should be noted that the construct of self-efficacy differs from the colloquial term "confidence." Confidence is a nondescript term that refers to strength of belief but does not necessarily specify what the certainty is about. I can be supremely confident that I will fail at an endeavor. Perceived self-efficacy refers to belief in one's agentive capabilities, that one can produce given levels of attainment. A self -efficacy assessment, therefore, includes both an affirmation of a capability level and the strength of that belief. (1997, p. 382)

Instead, the present study will use the 10 Florida Principal Leadership Standards as the dependent variables. The standards and their 45 indicators will be arranged in a Likert-type survey and participants will indicate whether or not they perceive themselves as ready to competently demonstrate the behaviors and to what degree of confidence. Huff's (2011) research instrument study is similar in conception to the FPLS survey tool that will be implemented in this study. Huff used the 2008 ISLLC Standards in the form of a constructed survey with a Likert-type scale. Thus, Huff's instrumentation will serve as an instrumentation model that will be used in the present study to collect perceptions of

readiness of principals-in-training to perform the expected behaviors standardized with the FPLS.

Perceptions of Leadership Style

The research literature on the self-perceptions of leadership style and its relationship to the organization and to staff are numerous (e.g., Bentley, 2011; Espinoza, 2013; Geijsel, Sleegers, Leithwood, & Jantzi, 2003; Keys, 2010) and there have been some, but few overall, compelling studies of self-perception of leadership style by participants of educational leadership programs (e.g., Murgel, 2011).

Murgel's (2011) used the MLQ to study the perceptions of 106 newly graduated participants of the Daly Leadership Program and their new followers. The Daly Leadership Program claimed to have a curriculum that provided experiences to practice transformational behaviors and allowed for individualized instruction. Although most of the graduates perceived their leadership as more transformational than their followers' perceptions of their style, the conclusion was that the program did prepare leaders to be more transformational.

Brackins's (2012) dissertation included a research question regarding the possible relationship between transformational leadership actions and principals' beliefs regarding their leadership. The leadership beliefs were the independent variable, whereas the possible transformational actions or behaviors were the dependent variables. In this study of Alabama-based principals, the results indicated a moderately positive relationship between principals' beliefs and their transformational behaviors or actions. The researcher interpreted this data to mean that principals perceive transformational leadership behaviors are necessary for effective leadership (p. 99).

In a Texas-based educational leadership preparation program designed for superintendents of school districts, according to a study conducted by Fenn and Mixon (2011), the participants are taught leadership behaviors that are aligned with transformational leadership style. In their survey of participants of the program from 2000-2010, they found that in superintendents from school districts across the state perceived their leadership style as measured on the MLQ to be transformational. The authors concluded that transformational leadership could be taught and measured through the self-rater form of the MLQ (2011).

Yeldell (2012) found that in one school district in the Western United States even though most of the sampled principals perceived their own leadership style as transformational leadership, they rated themselves much higher in general (e.g., transformational leadership $M = 3.25$, $SD = 0.29$ and transactional leadership $M = 2.71$, $SD = 0.50$) when compared with Bass and Avolio's sample *t*-test for independent means (e.g., transformational $M = 3.02$, $SD = 0.55$ and transactional $M = 2.29$, $SD = 0.66$) included with the MLQ Sample Set (2004).

Although there have been studies wherein the principal participants' responses regarding their perceived degree of transformational leadership were not congruent with their teachers' perceptions (Avolio & Bass, 2004; Xu, 2010), the present study will not collect data from followers, because the participants included will be principals-in-training or Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation program participants and may not yet have served in a formalized leadership position. This study reflects an assumption that principals-in-training will provide honest perceptions of their abilities based on the standardized expectations of them. In order to provide some level of assurance of

participant honesty, several methodological considerations will be detailed in the third chapter.

Conceptual Frameworks

The conceptual frameworks of the present study include leadership style as defined by Bass and Avolio's Full Range of Leadership Model (1994) and standardized leadership expectations and behaviors as defined by the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards (Florida Department of Education, 2011).

Leadership style has been defined many ways, ranging from the early theories that were founded on personality traits of effective leaders (e.g., Bird, 1940) to more contingency and situational-based theories (e.g., Fielder, 1973; Hersey & Blanchard, 1977). Due to the complex nature of defining leadership (e.g., Bass, 1990; Doh, 2003), it might be impossible to point to a set of uniform characteristics that all great leaders posses or situational similarities of the contexts in which they lead. The theory of leadership style that informed the conceptual framing of the present study is Bass and Avolio's (1994) Full Range of Leadership Model. Bass (1985) began to build this current model of leadership style as an expansion of the "transforming" leadership described in James Burns' work (1978). This model, which defines a generally accepted continuum of leadership style (from the most effective attributes of transformational leadership to the more operationally-focused attributes of transactional leadership to the avoidance of leadership known as laissez-faire), serves to define an individualized leadership style.

The behavioral indicators and decisions of leadership have been standardized for Florida and adopted as the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards. These 10 standards and 4 leadership domains outline the behavioral expectations for principals.

Summary

The purposes of this review of the literature were (a) to provide an understanding of and linkages between the constructs of transformational leadership and behaviors of school principals thought to be more associated with a positive impact in the school setting; and (b) to explore the ways in which research-based leadership styles and behaviors (specifically those associated with transformational leadership) have been incorporated into national and state principal leadership standards which serve as a guide for evaluation and postsecondary preparation activities. The literature review has also served to substantiate the need for the present study. As described in the review, the leadership behaviors associated with the work of Florida's principals are similar to behaviors traditionally associated with descriptions of transformational and transactional leadership.

The present study will be guided by the hypothesis that the degree to which new leaders perceive that they are ready to perform the expected behaviors (as indicated by the FPLS leadership domains) of the principal in Florida can be explained by the degree to which they define their leadership style.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter revisits the context of the present study and the purpose, review the research questions, and provide a detailed description of the methodology. The population and sample, instrumentation, data collection, treatment of the data, and data analysis procedures are described.

Introduction to Methodology

In a comprehensive review of 65 principal leadership assessment practices being implemented throughout the country, a lack of congruency was found between the evaluations themselves and the research-based expected leadership behaviors associated with school performance (Goldring, Cravens, Murphy, Elliott, & Carson, 2008). The assumption that may be drawn is that in the quick response to preparing leaders for the culture of accountability found in schools of today, evaluative instruments are not always adequately aligned to the standards or the realities of the job. This finding underscores the perception that educational leadership preparation programs at postsecondary institutions are not necessarily well aligned with the current work of school leaders (Levine, 2005). Nevertheless, per NCLB all teachers and leaders are supposed to be "highly qualified" or working toward that designation by 2014.

The Florida Principal Leadership Standards (2011) are the approved principal standards in the state of Florida. The standards are based on over 25 years of effective leadership behavior research (Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development, & Retention, 2011) and were originally based on the ISLLC Standards. The ISLLC 2008 Standards, which were likewise developed from research

findings, were revised by Florida policy makers prior to state adoption and modified based on local educational leadership needs. Since 2011, the Florida Department of Education has reviewed Level 1 Educational Leadership and Level 2 Principal programs for alignment of content and evaluations to the FPLS.

The FPLS includes items based on leadership behaviors identified in the research literature (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1992, 1994; Hallinger, 1983; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Leithwood, 1992; Marzano, 2005) and reflect some of the subcomponents of the Full Range Leadership Model (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Principal performance on the FPLS is assessed via a state-created survey-type leadership evaluation tool based on a Likert-type response form.

An evaluation tool that includes the 4 leadership domains, 10 standards, and all 45 behavioral indicators is used by the Florida Department of Education for the purpose of formally approving the alignment of Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation program and Level 2 Principal preparation program plans to the FPLS. The approval process was created to ensure that leadership preparation and certification produced school leaders who could be labeled “highly qualified” as outlined in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). According to NCLB, all students will be proficient in mathematics and reading as measured on state standardized tests by 2014. This monumental task requires visionary leadership that builds teaching efficacy and a culture of high expectations for all. The preparation of highly qualified, effective leaders who will most likely positively impact student performance via their demonstration of standardized, research-based effective leadership behaviors is an important task that cannot happen spontaneously (Elmore, 2000).

Purpose

The purpose of the present study is to determine the degree to which the self-perceived leadership style of participants in educational leadership preparation programs correlates with their perceived ability to competently demonstrate expected leadership behaviors as indicated by the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. The independent variables include the participants' perceptions of their own leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire) as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The questionnaire also measures responses on the domain subcomponents, which include intellectual stimulation, idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individual consideration, and management-by-exception passive and active, and contingent reward.

The dependent variables of the present study include participants' perceptions of their ability to competently demonstrate the four leadership domains as indicated by their responses to the 10 FPLS-aligned 45 behavioral indicators. The focus on a sample of Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation program participants is driven by the need to better understand the self-perceived strengths and weaknesses of the leader as a learner.

Research Questions

The broad research question that guided the study was: To what degree does a sample of future principals in an approved Florida Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation program perceive they can competently demonstrate the behavioral indicators of the four domains of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards, and are these perceptions correlated positively or negatively with their self-perceived leadership style?

Four specific research questions guided the analysis of the data, including:

Research question 1.: Which behavioral indicators identified with high-performing principals in the FPLS do participants perceive they are most ready to demonstrate?

Research question 2.: Which behavioral indicators identified with high-performing principals in the FPLS do participants perceive they are least ready to demonstrate?

Research question 3.: To what extent do participants in an approved Level 1 educational leadership program perceive their leadership style to be transactional, transformational, and/or laissez-faire?

Research question 4.: To what extent can variation in participants' ratings on the dependent variable set of perceived readiness to perform in the FPLS domains be explained by their perceived leadership style as measured by the MLQ domains?

Population and Sample

The study sample included participants who were then currently enrolled in three state university-based, approved Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation programs. The state university approved Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation programs included the University of Florida, the University of North Florida, and Florida Atlantic University. The institutions were included as sources for the population and sample due to proximity and ease of data collection, sometimes referred to as convenience sampling.

A population of approximately 200 participants enrolled in Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation programs at three postsecondary institutions was invited to

participate in the study and complete both the Florida Principal Leadership Standards survey and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. In an effort to attain a greater response rate (at least 140 individual responses on both instruments), the size of the invited participants was targeted at 200 to allow for adequate actual participation. The response rate for some survey instrument-based research has been identified as fewer than 50% of the total number of a targeted sample (Leece et al., 2004). The number of variables being addressed in the study (four dependent and three independent) helped to determine ideal sample size of 140. This sample size determination was made based on research recommendations regarding correlation analysis in general and canonical correlation analysis in particular (e.g., Pugh & Hugh, 1991; Tofallis, 1999). All participants were asked to electronically consent to participation through an informed consent email with an embedded link to the surveys. The participation in this study was strictly voluntary. All responses were kept confidential, and every participant was anonymous. No identifiable information appeared in the email invitation to the survey, nor were there any IP or device analytics collected through the instruments or their electronic administration. The sample letter of consent for the study is included as Appendix H. Approval for the study will be requested from the Institutional Review Board at the University of North Florida prior to any collection of the data and will be included as Appendix F. Additionally, letters of support from participating institutions were collected and included in the University of North Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB) package. In the case of the University of Florida, this researcher was also asked to complete an additional University of Florida- specific Institutional Review

Board package. All IRB information, including approval letters for UF and UNF, and letters of support are all included as Appendices F-H.

Instrumentation

Two instruments were used to survey the sample: (a) the Florida Principal Leadership Standards questionnaire of readiness, and (b) the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5X short form). Both forms were included as one link for participants through the Mind Garden, LLC. Transform survey administration software. Mind Garden, LLC is currently the only approved entity with the authority and license to distribute and allow permission to administer the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 2003). Additionally, this entity can add additional instruments to their generated anonymous distribution link for participation and data collection.

Research Instrument 1: Florida Principal Leadership Standards Readiness Survey

The 45 behavioral indicators aligned to the four domains of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards will be organized in a web-based, simple questionnaire form using Qualtrix as the software solution for design. The survey was administered via anonymous web link (URL) generated by Mind Garden, LLC.

The perception of degree of readiness to competently demonstrate the 45 behaviors were collected in a five-point Likert-type rating scale, ranging from 0 = Not ready to demonstrate to 4 = Very confident of readiness to demonstrate. Each leadership domain was categorized as a subscale for the purpose of creating dependent variables of which a degree of correlation was measured when compared with leadership style. The FPLS domains then will be aggregated scales derived from summing the ratings provided

by the respondents on the associated behavioral indicators. These four scores will serve as the dependent variables the correlation analysis.

As indicated superficially in Table 2, the 45 behaviors associated with the 10 standards and four leadership domains are not equally distributed. As stated previously, this distinction justified the "weighting" or establishing canonical function coefficients to enable a confident analysis of the data. The behavioral indicators are arranged under the four FPLS leadership domains as follows:

Domain 1: Student Achievement (5 total behavioral indicators)

Standard 1- Student Learning Results (2 behavioral indicators)

a. The school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula.

b. Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under section 1012.22(8), international assessments, and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state.

Standard 2- Student Learning as a Priority (3 behavioral indicators)

The leader: a. Enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning; b. Maintains a school climate that supports student engagement in learning; c. Generates high expectations for learning growth by all students.

Domain 2: Instructional Leadership (14 total behavioral indicators)

Standard 3- Instructional Plan Implementation (5 behavioral indicators)

The leader: a. Implements the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices as described in Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C. through a common language of instruction; b. Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement; c. Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance; d. Implements the district's adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school; e. Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula.

Standard 4- Faculty Development (5 behavioral indicators)

The leader: a. Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan; b. Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction; c. Employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served; d. Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology; e. Delivers, facilitates resources and time for, and ensures faculty engagement in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.

Standard 5- Learning Environment (4 behavioral indicators)

The leader: a. Maintains a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment; b. Recognizes diversity as an asset upon which to build culturally-responsive effective teaching practices; c. Promotes school and classroom practices that maximize the diversity and complexity of student learning processes and student learning needs; d. Engages faculty in recognizing and understanding equity issues in classroom activities and identifying and addressing causes of unequal achievement;

Domain 3: Organizational Leadership (20 total behavioral indicators)

Standard 6- Decision Making (5 behavioral indicators)

The leader: a. Gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency; b. Uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions; c. Evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; and implements follow-up actions, and revisions as needed; d. Empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate; e. Effectively uses technology integration to enhance decision-making throughout the school.

Standard 7- Leadership Development (5 behavioral indicators)

The leader: a. Identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders; b. Provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders; c. Plans for succession management in key positions; d. Promotes teacher–leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student

learning; e. Develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders and parents, community, higher education, and business leaders;

Standard 8- School Management (4 behavioral indicators)

The leader: a. Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans; b. Establishes appropriate deadlines for themselves and the entire organization; c. Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development; d. Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.

Standard 9- Communication (6 behavioral indicators)

The leader: a. Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders; b. Recognizes individuals for effective performance; c. Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community. d. Maintains high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engages stakeholders in the work of the school; e. Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration; f. Ensures faculty receives timely information on student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions.

Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior (6 total behavioral indicators)

Standard 10- Professional and Ethical Behaviors (6 behavioral indicators)

The leader: a. Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of

> Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, b. Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership; c. Demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community; d. Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system; and e. Demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it; f. Demonstrates explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.

Research Instrument 2: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was created to measure the degree to which a leader is transformational, transactional or laissez-faire on the Full Range Leadership model. Several components or scales, which have been refined through scrupulous testing and analysis of multiple administrations over several years (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999), of the leadership styles are represented in the output, providing specific detail regarding perceived strengths and weaknesses (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Although most leaders would exhibit some degree of both transformational and transactional styles of leadership (Bass & Avolio, 2004), it has been recognized that the situational context may require a greater degree of one leadership style and associated behaviors over the other (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003). The latest form of the MLQ had been used in “nearly 300 research programs, doctoral dissertations,

and masters theses around the globe" by 2004 (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 36). In a meta-analytic examination of the validity of scores on the MLQ (short form 5X), it was determined that the evaluation itself and the psychometric properties of the instrument could be affected by the context in which the evaluations took place (Antonakis et al., 2003). In Table 2, more studies examining validity and reliability of the instruments are presented.

Table 2

Selected Studies of the Psychometric Properties of the MLQ

Study	Validity Findings	Reliability Findings
Kirby, King, & Paradise (1992)	Verified the factor structure using data from 130 subordinates (teachers) and 58 school administrators (principals).	
Koh, Steers, & Terborg (1990)	Verified the structure using data from Singapore-based principals and teachers (n = 903).	
Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, (2003)	Verified several models, including the 3-factor structure (construct validity) using data from 18 independently gathered samples (n = 6,525). The Root Mean Standard Error Approximation = .039. Confirmatory Fit Index = .89. The	

Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, (2003)	Verified several models, including the 3-factor structure (construct validity) using data from 18 independently gathered samples (*n* = 6,525). The Root Mean Standard Error Approximation = .039. Confirmatory Fit Index = .89. The GFI = .86.	
Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam (1996)	Verified the 5-factor model included in the MLQ leadership styles in a meta-analysis.	Reliability (internal consistency) TR (Charisma)- .92 TR (Individualized Consideration)- .88 TR (Intellectual Stimulation)- .86 TA (Contingent Reward)- .82 Management-by-Exception- .65
Avolio, Bass, &	Validated the 3-factor model for n =	

Although there has been some disagreement regarding the validity of the nine-factor model represented by the version of the MLQ (short form 5X), and commonly referred to as the Full Range Leadership Model, the results of a recent structural validity analysis has demonstrated that the nine-factor model is the most appropriate instrument for measuring leadership style. The MLQ Form 5X, that will be used to collect data in

this current study, “is successful in adequately capturing the full leadership factor constructs of transformational leadership theory” (Muenjohn & Armstrong, 2008, p. 10).

The major components of transformational leadership include the ability of the leader to facilitate discussions regarding practice and provide opportunities for professional growth (i.e., intellectual stimulation); to offer personalized, targeted feedback and considered as a trusted ear for problems and solutions (i.e., individual consideration); to model effective practice and leadership and high expectations of everyone, including themselves (i.e., idealized influence); and provide a vision or set a direction for improvement or change (i.e., inspirational motivation). One other component, defined as transactional or transformational based on the context and tangibility of the reward, is contingent reward (Bass & Avolio, 2004; Lowe et al., 1996). The contingent reward in a school setting may easily start out as a transactional motivator for teachers (e.g., teacher performance pay or half-day off certificates for teacher planning) but actually become more transformational as the school year continues. In their review of past findings, Lowe et al. explained that the scales associated with transformational leadership had generally been reported as having more statistically significant relationships with effective leadership, but there has been evidence that contingent reward (associated with transactional leadership) has been related to leader effectiveness as well (Lowe, Kroek, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996).

Research Design and Procedures

This non-experimental, correlational study utilizes two instruments for data collection: (a) an FPLS web-based survey, constructed to measure respondents' perceptions of their readiness to display behaviors consistent with the four leadership domains (including all 10 standards and 45 associated behavioral indicators), and (b) the web-based (5X short form) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The seven variables that will be examined in the study include participants' self-perceived readiness to perform relative to the four leadership domains of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards and the three leadership style scale scores of the MLQ. The FPLS questionnaire will include all 45 behavioral indicators. The 45 FPLS behaviors are aligned to the 10 standards and 4 leadership domains. Although the fourth leadership domain, Professional and Ethical Behavior, has only one associated standard, it has six behavioral indicators. Thus, the behavioral indicators were used to achieve a greater consistency among the domain sum scores. Prior to the correlation analysis, these scores will be weighted to increase measurement equity. The weighting will include the total number of items in the survey divided by the scores. The responses on the behavioral indicators will be grouped and summed to create aggregate scores or averaged totals (i.e., sum of items divided by *n* of items for each of the four FPLS domains) as shown in Table 3.

Table 3

2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards (Florida Administrative Code- Rule 6A-5.080)

Leadership Domains	Leadership Standards	Behavioral Indicators
Domain 1: Student Achievement	Standard 1- Student Learning Results Standard 2- Student Learning as a Priority	5 total behavioral indicators
Domain 2: Instructional Leadership	Standard 3- Instructional Plan Implementation Standard 4- Faculty Development Standard 5- Learning Environment	14 total behavioral indicators
Domain 3: Organizational Leadership	Standard 6- Decision Making Standard 7- Leadership Development Standard 8- School Management Standard 9- Communication	20 total behavioral indicators
Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior	Standard 10- Professional and Ethical Behaviors	6 total behavioral indicators

The MLQ 5X short form that was used in the present study is the classic, 45-question survey form that includes all nine leadership characteristics measured and three main leadership styles.

Essentially, the present study examined the degree to which the dependent variables or criterion set (FPLS leadership domains) are related to or explained by the independent variables or predictor set (MLQ Leadership Style scale scores). The variable sets are shown in Table 4. Thompson (1984) explained that canonical correlation analysis can be "employed to study relationships between two variable sets when each variable set consists of at least two variables" (p. 10). Canonical correlation analysis was appropriate for the present study, because it allowed for an examination of the degree to which one set of variables is related to another set.

Table 4

Variable Sets to be Weighted and Summed for Calculation of Two Composite Scores

Criterion/Dependent Variables Examined	Predictor/Independent Variables Examined
Student Achievement	Transformational Leadership Style
Instructional Leadership	Transactional Leadership Style
Organizational Leadership	Laissez-faire Leadership Style
Professional and Ethical Behavior	

The variable sets of the FPLS and the MLQ produced two "composite" scores (i.e., canonical variates) for each respondent. These composite scores were created to "maximize the relationship between the two variable sets they represent" (Thompson, 1984, p. 14). Each composite score was created through the summing of "optimized" or weighted scores for each variable set, producing variate scores.

The number of variables examined in the present study is limited to four dependent and three independent to allow for greater confidence and reliability in the resulting data (Mertens, 2005). Reliability coefficients were determined for scores on each variable. To avoid restricted variance or poor reliability, it has been recommended that an appropriate sample size should include at least 20 participants per variable (Cohen, 1992; Pugh & Hu, 1991; Thompson, 1984). Although the FPLS could be further unpacked into either 10 standards or 45 behavioral indicators that could be considered variables and yield potential scores, the present study utilized only the broad FPLS leadership domains to prevent the issues related to poor sampling (Thompson, 1984, pp. 14-15). The information that could be found in a study utilizing 19 possible variables (i.e., all 10 standards as dependent variables and all 9 variables of the sub-components of the MLQ) can be more parsimoniously summarized using only 7 total variables (Cohen, 1992).

Based on the recommendation described above, the number of 140 participants in the sample was the targeted response number for the current number of variables (7). The invitation to participate was sent to approximately 200 individuals who were currently enrolled in a state university-based Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation program.

Data Collection

The MLQ and the Florida Principal Leadership Standards web-based, Likert-type questionnaire was administered through email invitation and informed consent containing links to both instruments. This electronic questionnaire format was implemented for the advantages of rapid-response, anonymity, and the ease of data collection and analysis.

Some disadvantages to the web-based questionnaire invitation and online format might include a lower response rate than if administered in-person, in a course in which they are attending. However, the web format was chosen ultimately to help prevent a “halo effect” in the survey responses.

The MLQ helped to measure participants’ perceptions of leadership style and the extent to which they felt they embodied or exhibited the 12 dimensions of leadership. The data collected by the MLQ were used to answer research questions 3 and 4. The data were also used to indicate whether there is a correlation between the degree of transformational leadership perceived and the self-perceived ability of participants to competently demonstrate the behaviors indicated by the FPLS.

The FPLS survey yielded descriptive, non-parametric data that were analyzed to help answer research questions 1, 2, and 3.

The web-based MLQ (short form 5X) and the FPLS survey instrument were administered via web-link, created and administered through Mind Garden, LLC (Appendix E: MLQ Sample Set- Leader form). Both surveys were included in a single, anonymous link that was embedded in the email invitation. The email invitation included the research purpose and a brief synopsis of the study, a statement of how the information would be used and how participation anonymity would be protected, and the option to participate or not to participate in the study (Leece et al., 2004).

The open surveys were sent (within an email invitation, including the IRB acknowledgement) to potential participants via web links the second week of March, 2014. Two reminders followed the initial invitation email to the survey approximately a week apart. Additionally, there were no name/password or personal identification

numbers (PINs) associated with the user to protect anonymity. Finally, the length of the two instruments was almost identical and was estimated to take no longer than a total 20-30 minutes maximum, or 10-15 minutes for the MLQ and 10-15 minutes for the FPLS survey. These precautions were put in place to help generate a greater response rate in a web-based survey administration than is typical (Leece et al., 2004). It was assumed that the participants represented the populations of Level 1 Educational Leadership programs in Florida.

Treatment of the Data

After the survey responses were collected, I accessed the datathrough a time-limited, password-protected administrator dashboard available via the Mind Garden, LLC. Transform system. I downloaded the data to a password-protected external hard-drive that remained available until the conclusion of the data analysis procedure.

The data were uploaded into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 22) to begin the analysis. The data analysis involved a series of analyses resulting in descriptive statistical output. Then, the data were used in a factor analysis to ensure the validity of the responses within the context of educational leadership preparation (Antonakis et al., 2003).

Data Analysis

The data analysis began by revisiting the research questions. Each research question helped determine the method of analysis. In the present study, research questions 1 through 3 referred to demographic data and required analysis of descriptive statistics only. No parametric analyses were required to address these three research

questions, because they are basic aggregations of item responses. Essentially, these questions were answered through the aggregation of survey responses.

Research question 1.: Which behavioral indicators identified with high-performing principals in the FPLS do participants perceive they are most ready to demonstrate?

Research question 2.: Which behavioral indicators identified with high-performing principals in the FPLS do participants perceive they are least ready to demonstrate?

For the analysis of the first two research questions, scores were compared across the domains and rank ordered from high to low in order to determine participants' perceptions of the level of readiness to competently perform the expected leadership behaviors that make up the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. Due to the complex nature of leadership practice in the field, these perceptions may have been based completely on participants' varied learning experiences and contexts.

Research question 3.: To what extent do participants in an approved Level 1 educational leadership program perceive their leadership style to be transactional, transformational, and/or laizzes-faire?

To answer research question 3, MLQ scale scores (transactional, transformational, and laizzes-faire) were examined for each participant. Although participants received scores that are representative of more than one leadership style, participants' leadership styles were categorized based on the MLQ domain on which they received the highest score.

Research question 4 was addressed using parametric canonical correlation analysis.

Research question 4.: To what extent can variation in participants' ratings on the dependent variable set of perceived readiness to perform in the FPLS domains be explained by their perceived leadership style as measured by the MLQ domains?

The fourth research question was the most substantive research question of the present study. It examined the degree to which one set of variables was related to another set. The seven variables examined in the study included the perceived readiness to perform the behaviors identified in the four leadership domains of the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards and the three leadership style subscale scores of the MLQ.

Canonical correlation was the most appropriate statistical procedure for this research question. Canonical correlation analysis is a general parametric significance testing procedure used to determine degree of shared variance in two data sets (i.e., predictor and dependent sets) (Knapp, 1978). Although it might be interesting to use a simpler statistical model (e.g., multiple regression analysis) to determine the degree one leadership style is related to perceived competence on the FPLS, this strategy would be limiting (Thompson, 1984). This type of analysis would be counterproductive, because the leadership styles of the participants would most likely have been aggregates of all three interrelated leadership styles measured by the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 2004). Further, due to possible Type 1 error escalation, independent variables would not appropriately be isolated in the analysis. Thompson warned that the more the predictor variables are interrelated, the higher probability of Type 1 error, or the inflation of

variance due to the lack of measurement of other influencing variables. Hence, use of canonical correlation analysis would more accurately measure the complexity of leadership style and its relationship to perceived degree of confidence in the performance of leadership behaviors.

In the present canonical correlation analysis, the two sets of variables (dependent and independent) included participants' self-perceived readiness to competently perform the four leadership domains of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) and the three leadership styles measured on the MLQ. Responses provided on all 45 behavioral indicators of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards were summed for each domain to create variables. Participants responded to each behavioral indicator on a Likert-type scale. The responses indicated participants' perceived confidence in performing the expected leadership behaviors in the future. The FPLS domains or variables were represented by "scores" generated from the summing of these responses associated with the behavioral indicators. The FPLS domains were considered the dependent variables for the purposes of this data collection and analysis.

The independent variables included the three leadership styles measured by the MLQ. The transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire leadership styles are the main components of leadership style, with each further comprised of subcomponents of each leadership style. The MLQ measures and produces data for subcomponents and aggregated component scores. These aggregated scores were used as the independent variables for the analysis.

Using the dependent variables represented by the four domains of the FPLS and the independent or predictor variables represented by the three dimensions of leadership

provided by the MLQ, the data were analyzed using a canonical correlation analysis (CCA) to maximize the correlation between the linear combination of the dependent variables and the linear combination of the independent variables (Knapp, 1978; Tofallis, 1997).

Ethical Considerations

The research design and data collection did not pose any physical or psychological risk to participants. The data collection included a routine task of providing survey responses to the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and the Principal Leadership Standards Survey. No personal identification data were collected, and survey responses were stored in a secure location, and encrypted, only accessible by the researcher. All hard copies of the data were destroyed upon completion of the research to protect the confidentiality of the participants.

All participants were asked to participate in the study, and they were provided an email with the approved informed consent language. In the body of the email, the participants had the option to voluntarily participate in the study by clicking on the embedded link to complete the surveys. The participation in the study was completely voluntary, and no form of coercion was used to ensure participation. Additionally, any participant had the opportunity to elect to withdraw their consent at any time during the data collection process.

Any participant could request a summary of findings once the analysis is completed.

Conclusion

The present study examined correlations between Level 1 Educational Leadership participants' leadership style (as measured with the MLQ 5X short form) and their perceived readiness to perform the expected behavioral indicators of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. The possible variance of perceived readiness to perform FPLS behavioral indicators were explained by the participants' perceived leadership style on the Full Range of Leadership model (Bass & Avolio, 2004). The data were collected from selected participants of state-approved Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation programs via two web-based survey instruments. The treatment and analysis of the data were completed according to IRB guidelines for research studies labeled as exempt. The potential findings could set the stage for future inquiry into leadership development preparation activities and their impact on the perceptions of future leaders.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction to Results

The purpose of the present study was to determine whether participants' perceptions of their leadership style were related to their perceptions of their ability to competently perform the effective leadership behaviors contained in the four domains of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. In this chapter, the research questions posed in Chapter 1 and the methodology described in Chapter 3 are reviewed, and the results of the study are provided.

Demographics

The participants of the study including currently enrolled students in Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation programs at three state universities in Florida. Demographic information requested of participants included their gender, their ethnicity, the school at which they were enrolled in the Level 1 Educational Leadership program, and their years of experience. The final sample size, based on the number of respondents who elected to start the surveys was $n = 60$. Of the 60 respondents who began the surveys, only 48 were completed them. The number of completed surveys was only 24% of the total number of potential participants or the total original sample. The response rate was not uncommonly low for electronic surveys (Leece, 2004).

From the three institutions, 10 respondents identified their institution as the University of Florida, 28 identified their institution as the University of North Florida,

and 10 identified their institution as Florida Atlantic University. Of the total number of respondents, 29 or 60% self-identified as female and 18 or 38% self-identified as male. 2% of respondents chose not to identify their gender. Of the total number of respondents, 25 or 52% self-identified as Caucasian, 8 or 17 % of respondents chose to identify themselves as African-American or black, and 3 or approximately 1% self-identified as Hispanic. 12 respondents or 25% chose to not identify their ethnicity. The average years of experience in education was 5 years (range of 1 to 25 years). 23% of respondents indicated 5 years of experience in education.

Review of the Methodology

The primary research question that guided the current study was: To what degree does a sample of future principals in an approved Florida Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation program perceive they can competently demonstrate the behavioral indicators of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (2011), and do these perceptions have a relationship to their self-perceived leadership style as defined by the three-factor model of Bass and Avolio's Full Range of Leadership Model (1994)?

To measure this relationship, two data collection instruments were chosen. The respondents provided responses to Bass and Avolio's (2004) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x short form) and the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) questionnaire. The online surveys were combined and made available via one anonymous link, created by Mind Garden, LLC, for the purpose of embedding in an electronic informed consent email. The combined survey instruments included 4 demographic questions, 45 Likert-type MLQ items, 45 Likert-type FPLS behavioral indicator items, and 4 lie scale items (embedded in the four domains of the FPLS

instrument). The MLQ and FPLS instruments, lie scale items, and the demographic items are included, respectively, as Appendices C, D, and E. The lie scale items were included to identify the possibility of responses being linked to social desirability or unsocial desirability, sometimes referred to as “faking good” or “faking bad” (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The data analysis was completed using the 23rd edition of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software.

Presentation of the Findings

The data analysis for the present study is divided into two sections. The first section includes the descriptive statistics and addresses research questions 1-3. The second section includes the results of the canonical correlation analysis, conducted to examine the degree of possible relationship between the predictor set of variables (represented by the leadership styles as measured on the MLQ) and the dependent set of variables (as measured by the FPLS questionnaire) and addresses the final research question.

Descriptive Statistics

The means and standard deviations for the four criterion (dependent) variables (i.e., the Student Achievement, Instructional Leadership, Organizational Leadership, and Professional and Ethical Leadership domains of the FPLS), the three predictor (independent) variables (i.e., MLQ Transformational, MLQ Transactional, and MLQ Passive/Avoidant or Laissez-faire), and the lie scale are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
MLQ Transformational	3.271	.375	48
MLQ Transactional	1.471	.478	48
MLQ Pass/Avoid/laizzes-faire	.448	.480	48
FPLS Student Achieve.	4.458	.449	48
FPLS Instructional Lead.	4.412	.486	48
FPLS Organizational Lead.	4.443	.459	48
FPLS Prof. & Ethical Lead.	4.576	.447	48
Lie Scale	2.224	1.097	48

Answers to Research Questions 1-3

The first three research questions can be answered by the descriptive statistics run, analyzed, and displayed in Table 5. These three questions were addressed by examining the means of each of the variables. The first two research questions were focused on the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS). These standards are used as a guide to inform the preparation of future principals enrolled in a Level 1 Educational Leadership program, and these standards provided the framework for the revised Florida Educational Leadership Exam (FELE), which is usually taken at the end of the coursework included in a Level 1 Educational Leadership program. Thus, determining whether or not participants of this type of program felt ready to perform the standardized expectations on the FELE and in their future leadership role was important.

The leadership behaviors and their associated domains that make up the FPLS were all included in the Likert-type survey. The variable scales scores were derived from summing all of the behavioral-indicator level ratings for each domain and dividing the result by the total number of behavioral indicators associated. These four variable scale scores for every case represent the dependent variable set.

Research question 1.: Which domain of behavioral indicators identified with high-performing principals in the FPLS do participants perceive that they are most ready to competently demonstrate? All four of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards domains had similar means. Nevertheless, respondents rated their readiness slightly higher in competently demonstrating the behaviors aligned to the Professional and Ethical Leadership domain (M = 4.576). The leadership domain with which participants felt second most ready to competently demonstrate was Student Achievement (M = 4.458).

Research question 2.: Which domain of behavioral indicators identified with high-performing principals in the FPLS do participants perceive that they are least ready to demonstrate? As stated above, the self-perception of readiness to perform competently in all four leadership domains was generally high statistically. However, the behavioral indicators as identified by FPLS domain that respondents felt the least ready to competently perform was identified as Instructional Leadership (M = 4.412). These results are not surprising, but they do seem to suggest that the sample may generally perceive themselves ready to perform at an equally competent level in all four leadership domains considering that the difference between the highest and lowest means of the

several subscales were less than one-third of a standard deviation. The various rationale for why this may be the case is discussed further in Chapter 5.

The third research question can be answered by the results of the descriptive statistics provided by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The three independent variables provided by the MLQ include transformational leadership (TF), transactional leadership (TA), and Passive/Avoidant or Laissez-Faire (PA).

Research question 3.: To what extent do participants in an approved Level 1 educational leadership program perceive their leadership style to be transactional, transformational, and/or laissez-faire? On the whole, respondents rated themselves highest in transformational leadership (M = 3.271). Transactional leadership had a mean of 1.471, and laissez-faire, or passive/avoidant, had a near-zero mean of .448.

Bivariate correlations between each pair of the variables are presented in Table 6. The lie scale items were summed together to create a single variable, which was included in the correlations within this table to gauge whether the data set contained evidence of deviance in responses (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). The resulting mean (2.224) for the lie scale variable was low and seems to indicate a small tendency toward lying. There was a negative relationship between lying and transformational leadership (-.421) and a larger positive relationship between lying and transactional leadership (.587). The relationship between the lie scale variable and any of the other variables did not yield anything above |.3| in the bivariate correlations. It is important to note that the lie scale variable yielded a relationship large enough to warrant some attention. Although the mean was low in Table 5 (M = 2.2224), the positive relationship with transactional leadership (.587) is similar in degree to that of the transformational leadership variable and FPLS Domains 2 (.583) and

4 (.552). The phenomenological nature of the instruments (i.e., perception of self and ability) provides some degree of expectation of "social desirability bias" in the findings (Nederhof, 1985). Additionally, the lie scale constructed for the survey consisted of only 4 items, fewer items than those associated with any of the four dependent variables. A 2004 study (Strike, Skovholt, & Hummel) included a focus on university-based mental health professionals' perceived knowledge and a research question regarding the impact of social desirability on participants' responses. The study is similar to the present study in that it included a sample that was generally more female than male and consisting of aspiring professionals being trained. The social desirability bias in that study was measured using an established instrument (The Paulhus Deception Scales) created for this specific purpose, and was found to have only minimal effect on the results. The researchers expressed the limitations associated with self-report measures that are shared by the present study.

All four of the dependent variables, the FPLS domains or D1-D4 respectively, were found to be positively and moderately related ($r > .5$) to the independent variable, transformational leadership (TF). Conversely, all four of the dependent variables were found to be negatively related ($r < -.3$) to the independent variable, laissez-faire or passive/avoidance (PA).

Table 6

*Bivariate Correlations for MLQ and FPLS Subscales**

	TF	TA	PA	D1	D2	D3	D4	Lie
MLQ Transformational (TF)		-.234	-.353	.604	.583	.615	.552	-.421
MLQ Transactional (TA)	-.234		.419	-.173	-.150	-.282	-.117	.587
MLQ Passive/Avoidant (PA)	-.353	.419		-.338	-.351	-.408	-.396	.258
FPLS Student Ach. (D1)	.604	-.173	-.338		.854	.786	.604	-.242
FPLS Instructional Lead. (D2)	.583	-.150	-.351	.854		.901	.739	-.165
FPLS Org. Lead. (D3)	.615	-.282	-.408	.786	.901		.781	-.297
FPLS Prof. & Ethical Lead. (D4)	.552	-.117	-.396	.608	.739	.781		-.211
Lie Scale (Lie)	-.421	.587	.258	-.242	-.165	-.297	-.211	

Note: *n = 48.

Canonical Correlation Analysis

In the present study, canonical correlation analysis was used to investigate the degree to which the two sets of variables (dependent and independent) were related to one another. Canonical correlation analysis is a multivariate extension of multiple regression analysis wherein there may be multiple intercorrelated outcome variables. The

dependent (criterion) set of variables included participants' self-perceived readiness to competently perform the four leadership domains of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and the independent (predictor) set included participants' self-perceived leadership styles measured on the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 2004).

The first step of the canonical correlation analysis included deriving the canonical roots, which indicate the degree of relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The number of canonical roots mirrors that of the smallest variable set (in this case, the independent set of three leadership styles). The canonical roots are identified in Table 7. The first canonical root exhibits the maximum relationship or correlation between the two sets of variables. Root 1 indicates a high degree of relationship (as indicated by the canonical correlation—R_c^2 = .48) between transformational leadership (TF) and the four leadership domains of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards. The successive roots have smaller degrees of relationship or correlation, as is seen in the second and third roots listed in Table 7. These roots are based on "residual" variance, which means that they are derived as independent from the first root even though they originate from the same set of data once the variance accounted for by the first root is removed. Root 2 accounts for a moderate amount of shared variance between the two sets (R_c^2 = .12). The final root accounted for only a negligible amount of shared variation across the variable sets (R_c^2 = .01) and therefore was not interpreted.

In Table 8, the dimension reduction analysis includes tests for statistical significance of the three roots. Root 1 (R_c^2 = .48; $p < .001$), identified in Table 7 as indicative of a strong relationship, was confirmed as statistically significant and accounts for .476 (48%) of the shared variance between the two variable sets. Root 2 (R_c^2 = .117)

accounted for a moderate amount of the shared variance between the two sets (i.e., 12%) and was not statistically significant ($p > .05$). This root was interpreted despite the fact that it was not statistically significant considering that the small sample size was a major factor in failure to achieve statistical significance. Finally, as previously noted, Root 3 ($R_c^2 = .014$) accounted for a negligible amount of the shared variance (i.e., 1%) and was not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Table 7

Eigenvalues and Canonical Correlations

Root No.	Eigenvalue	Canonical Correlation	Squared Correlations
1	.90846	.68994	.47602
2	.13367	.34338	.11791
3	.01406	.11774	.01386

Table 8

Dimension Reduction Analysis

Roots	Wilks' λ	*F*	Hypothesis Degrees of Freedom	Error Degrees of Freedom	Significance of *F*
1 to 2	.45579	3.13414	12.00	108.77	.001
2 to 3	.86986	1.01078	6.00	84.00	.424
3 to 3	.98614	.30222	2.00	43.00	.741

The second step of the canonical correlation analysis includes the interpretation of how individual variables contribute to the overall canonical results. Canonical function

coefficients and canonical structure coefficients were employed to help determine the individual variable contributions considering that a noteworthy relationship was identified between the two variable sets in the data (Thompson, 1984). Canonical function coefficients indicate the actual statistical weights applied to the original variables in both sets when the canonical variate was calculated. The unstandardized (raw score) and standardized canonical function coefficients for the dependent variables are presented in Tables 9 and 10, respectively.

Table 9

Raw Canonical Correlations for Dependent Variables (Function Coefficients)

Variable	Root 1	Root 2	Root 3
FPLS Student Ach.	1.20171	.09827	2.14500
FPLS Instructional Lead.	-.72873	3.15507	1.37393
FPLS Organizational Lead.	1.23923	-5.17679	-1.31608
FPLS Prof. & Ethical Lead.	.76712	2.25173	-2.29019

Table 10

Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Dependent Variables (Function Coefficients)

Variable	Root 1	Root 2	Root 3
FPLS Student Ach.	.53948	.04412	.96295
FPLS Instructional Lead.	-.35426	1.53378	.66791
FPLS Organizational Lead.	.56875	-2.37591	-0.60402
FPLS Prof. & Ethical Lead.	.34282	1.00628	-1.02347

Canonical function coefficients help to provide estimates of the degree to which each variable is weighted in creating a predictive equation. However, these "regression weights" should not be emphasized a great deal in the analysis (Thompson, 1984, p. 23). As shown in Table 10, the dependent variable FPLS Instructional Leadership is weighted heavily (coefficient = 1.53) in the predictive equation for Root 2 while the same variable is weighted to a much lesser degree in Roots 1 (coefficient = -.35) and 3 (coefficient = .67). e FPLS Student Achievement, it is weighted heavily in Root 3 (coefficient = .96) and relatively unimportant in Root 2 (coefficient = .04). One standout is the fact that the dependent variable, Professional and Ethical Leadership, is highly contributing to Root 2 (coefficient = 1.01). Although function coefficients have some importance in determining predictive equations, they do not address correlations of the original variables with the canonical variate. Further, function coefficients are affected by collinearity among multiple variables within a variable set, and therefore can be unreliable indictors of variable contribution. This problem can be minimized by consulting canonical structure coefficients (r_s), which show the actual correlations between the canonical variate for a variable set and each individual variable within the set. Thompson (1984) emphasized the importance of analyzing canonical structure coefficients and placing a lesser emphasis on function coefficients. Function coefficients will sometimes produce smaller weights or negative weights due to the fact that the shared variance may have been explained by other variables (Thompson, 1984, p. 23). Although canonical structure coefficients may not yield vastly different results from function coefficients, they are more desirable in interpretation due to their stability and the ability to examine "each variable's

contribution to the canonical solution" (Thompson, 1984, p. 24). The structure coefficients for the dependent variables are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Correlations Between Dependent and Canonical Variables (Canonical Structure Coefficients)

Variable	Root 1	Root 2	Root 3
FPLS Student Ach.	.89210	.10046	.43658
FPLS Instructional Lead.	.87247	.17538	.19001
FPLS Organizational Lead.	.94118	-.17385	-.04525
FPLS Prof. & Ethical Lead.	.85326	.31157	-.41560

As indicated in Table 11, all four dependent variables (FPLS leadership domains) are highly correlated with Root 1 (r_s values all exceed .850). However, upon examination of Root 2, only FPLS Professional and Ethical Behavior has a structure coefficient of any appreciable size (i.e., .31), indicating a moderate correlation with the canonical variate.

The unstandardized (raw score) and standardized function coefficients for the canonical predictor variables (MLQ subscale scores) are presented, respectively, in Tables 12 and 13. An analysis of the standardized coefficients for Root 1 indicates that the independent variable, transformational leadership subscale score, highly contributed to the predictive equation for defining the canonical variate (coefficient = .84). Transformational leadership seems to be moderately contributing to Root 3 (coefficient = .65) but is only negligibly contributing to Root 2. According to Table 13, the

transactional leadership subscale score is highly contributing to Root 2 (coefficient = .92).

Table 12

Raw Canonical Coefficients for Predictor Variables

Variable	Root 1	Root 2	Root 3
MLQ Transformational	2.23334	.47886	1.72469
MLQ Transactional	-.04429	2.30680	-.19418
MLQ Laissez-faire	-.65149	-.71777	2.19303

Table 13

Standardized Canonical Coefficients for Predictor Variables

Variable	Root 1	Root 2	Root 3
MLQ Transformational	.83837	.17976	.64743
MLQ Transactional	-.02117	1.10290	-.09284
MLQ Laissez-faire	-.31258	-.34439	1.05222

The structure coefficients for the independent variables are presented in Table 14. Echoing the finding above, the transformational leadership variable is highly and positively correlated with Root 1 or the canonical variate (coefficient = .95). The laissez-faire or passive/avoidant variable is moderately and negatively correlated to Root 1 (coefficient = -.62). The transactional leadership variable is highly and positively

correlated with Root 2 (coefficient = .92). Finally, laissez-faire or passive/avoidant leadership style is highly correlated with Root 3 (coefficient = .78).

Table 14

Correlations Between Predictor Variables and Canonical Variables (Structure Coefficients)

Variable	Root 1	Root 2	Root 3
MLQ Transformational	.95373	.04335	.29752
MLQ Transactional	-.34828	.91656	.19652
MLQ Laissez-faire	-.61756	.05419	.78465

Answer to Research Question 4

Research question 4.: To what extent can variation in participants' ratings on the dependent variable set of perceived readiness to perform in the FPLS domains be explained by their perceived leadership style as measured by the MLQ domains?

To answer the research question, a canonical correlation analysis was performed using the data sets yielded by the survey results of both the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards questionnaire and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The results of the canonical correlation analysis yielded one statistically significant ($p < .05$) canonical root that indicated a shared variance (R_c^2) of .476 (48%) between the variable sets. Root 2 indicated a shared variance (R_c^2) of .117 (12%) but was not statistically significant. Root 2 was interpreted, but with the understanding that the results were not statistically significant due to the small sample size. Root 3 indicated a negligible correlation ($R_c^2 = .011$ or 1%) that was not statistically significant, and

therefore was not interpreted. Based on the results of the analysis, all four dependent variables (represented by the Florida Principal Leadership Standards domains) and the independent variable of transformational leadership were highly and positively correlated with Root 1. The relationship was statistically significant. Therefore, it could be argued that respondents who perceived their readiness to perform competently the expected behaviors of the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards also perceived their leadership style to be transformational. Root 2 findings indicate that respondents more likely to view themselves as transactional scored higher on the professional and ethical domain of the FPLS.

Summary

Chapter 4 has presented the results of analyses of the data collected for the purposes of the present study. The analysis included an examination of the degree of relationship between the perceived leadership style and perceived ability to competently perform the leadership behaviors identified within the Florida Principal Leadership Behaviors (2011). Demographic data were provided about the study sample and descriptive statistics were presented for both instruments. Results of the data analysis were presented, including the canonical correlation analysis used to examine the relationship between the independent and dependent variables.

Chapter 5 presents a summary of the study and the procedures, a summary of the findings, a discussion of the findings with regard to the extant research literature, recommendations for future studies, and the conclusion.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction to Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to examine the possible relationship between self-perceptions of leadership style (as measured by the MLQ) and the self-perceived ability to competently perform the behaviors identified by the four domains of the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS). The sample that was recruited to participate in the study were students currently enrolled in a state-approved Level 1 Educational Leadership preparation program at three institutions.

In this final chapter, a summary of the study is presented (including a review of the conceptual frameworks, the research variables, the methodology, and the procedures), and the findings are summarized and discussed in relation to past research. Finally, conclusions and recommendations for future research will be presented. The chapter closes with discussion regarding the contribution this study may make to the field of educational leadership preparation.

Summary of the Study

Conceptual Framework and Research Variables

The two conceptual frameworks of the present study included (a) leadership styles as represented by Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Model (1994) and (b) perceived ability to perform standardized, effective principal leadership behaviors included in the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (2011).

The Full Range Leadership Model defines three distinct leadership styles, including transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire or

passive-avoidance. Although an individual may exhibit one of these forms of leadership more often, usually leaders have some distribution of more than one of the leadership styles (Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership style, first defined and described by James Burns (1978), includes leadership that is charismatic, inspirational, and sets goals for a group of followers (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). Leithwood (1992) has described transformational leadership as the style that is most aligned with facilitating change. Transactional leadership style includes leadership behaviors that are associated with a behavioral approach, including providing rewards for increased productivity or better test scores and punishments for diminished productivity for falling scores. Laissez-faire or passive-avoidant style is the absence of leadership in a certain area. Leadership style, as described in the Full Range Leadership Model, is measured through the administration of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The present study utilized the MLQ 5X Short Form, which is generally accepted as a valid measure of leadership style (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Bass & Avolio, 2004; Bass, Avolio, & Jung, 1999; Bass & Riggio, 2006). The three distinct leadership styles or subscales measured on the MLQ were used in the present study as the independent variables. Although the MLQ produces 9 subscale scores for the 45 items included in the 5X Short Form version of the instrument (Bass & Riggio, 2006), it was determined that the three overall scale scores were sufficient and appropriate for determining the dominant leadership style of an individual. The 3-factor structure has been tested and validated in the research literature (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999).

The 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards (Florida Administrative Code-Rule 6A-5.080) are comprised of 4 leadership domains, 10 leadership standards, and 45 behavioral indicators. The standards were informed by the ISLLC 2008 standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008) and empirical research of the behaviors of school principals (Florida Department of Education, 2011). The FPLS provide the foundation for the performance expectations and evaluation of Florida's principals (Florida Department of Education, 2011). The four leadership domains were employed in the present study as the dependent variables.

The MLQ and FPLS survey instruments yielded 7 variables (4 dependent and 3 independent), and the multivariate analysis of the correlations between the two variable sets yielded two interpretable canonical variates.

Review of the Methodology and Procedures

The surveys, demographic items, and lie scale were compiled, and an anonymous, no-login survey link (URL) was generated through Mind Garden, LLC. This was provided to the researcher to be embedded in the IRB-approved invitation/informed consent letter. The invitation/informed consent email language was distributed to participants via institutional recruitment contacts (Dr. Larry Daniel at UNF, Dr. Daniel Reyes-Guerra at FAU, and Dr. Tom Dana at UF, respectively). The embedded survey link (URL) provided access to both of the data collection instruments. The total time to complete the surveys was approximately 25-30 minutes. The data were collected completely online via anonymous response.

Due to the declining enrollment in educational leadership master's programs statewide and beyond, it was determined that the sample would come from at least three

institutions. Approximately 200 participants from three institutions were invited to participate in the online survey via email. The initial invitation to participate email was distributed on March 15, 2014. The first follow-up email containing the informed consent and link was distributed at all three institutions on March 24, 2014. A second and final follow-up email was distributed on March 30, 2014. The greatest response rate occurred after the initial invitation and the first reminder. The researcher's contact information and the contact information of the chairperson and that of the Institutional Review Board were all provided in each email distributed to potential participants.

To help increase the response rate, Brennan and Hoek (1992) recommended two reminders or follow-up emails to the potential participants. Responses rates increased substantially on the first follow-up email, but they did not continue to come in as quickly on the second follow-up. This could be attributed to a variety of circumstances affecting the specifically university-based target population of the sample. Dillman (1991) described some possibilities of why individuals may have not participated in the survey, including issues of noncoverage and nonresponse. Noncoverage can result from emails being "bounced" or marked as Spam. Nonresponse can occur if a particular security application is operating on a potential respondent's computer, causing the survey link (or URL) to be broken. This particular population, made up of working professionals that are most likely continuing their education at nights and on weekends, may have had many factors that impeded participation in the survey. Although some research indicates a higher response rate to email survey campaigns than to postal mail, many studies have shown to have as response rates as low as 6-8% (Sills & Song, 2002). The total number of returned and usable surveys after the initial invitation and two follow-up reminders

was 48 or 24% of the total. The data were analyzed using the software, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Summary of Findings

A summary of the findings for all four research questions is included below, followed by a discussion related to previous bodies research.

Research question 1.: Which behavioral indicators identified with high-performing principals in the FPLS do participants perceive they are most ready to demonstrate? Respondents perceived their readiness to competently perform the leadership behaviors of all four FPLS domains generally high (all $M > 4.00$). Nevertheless, the behavioral expectations associated with the FPLS domain, Professional and Ethical Leadership, were scored highest ($M = 4.576$).

Research Question 2.: Which behavioral indicators identified with high-performing principals in the FPLS do participants perceive that they are least ready to demonstrate? The respondents felt least ready to perform the behavioral expectations associated with the FPLS domain, Instructional Leadership ($M = 4.412$).

Research question 3.: To what extent do participants in an approved Level 1 educational leadership program perceive their leadership style to be transactional, transformational, and/or laissez-faire? Respondents rated themselves highest in transformational leadership ($M = 3.271$). Transactional leadership had a mean of 1.471, while laissez-faire or passive/avoidant produced a mean of .448. By and large, this small sample of future principals perceived their leadership style as considerably more transformational than transactional or laissez-faire.

Research question 4.: To what extent can variation in participants' ratings on the dependent variable set of perceived readiness to competently perform the expected leadership behaviors identified in the four FPLS domains be explained by their self-perceived leadership style as measured by the MLQ subscales?

The results of the canonical correlation analysis yielded one statistically significant ($p < .05$) canonical root that indicated a shared variance (R_c^2) of .476 (48%) between the variable sets. Based on analysis of the canonical structure coefficients, this large canonical root (Root 1) represented the shared variance of one independent variable (transformational leadership) and all four dependent variables (FPLS domains). Essentially this means that degree of respondents' self-perceived ability to competently perform the leadership behaviors as identified by the four 2011 FPLS domains can be explained to some degree by respondents' self-perceived transformational leadership style. The second canonical root accounted for 12% ($R_c^2 = 118$) of the variance and, based on canonical structure coefficients, identified a linkage between transactional leadership and perceived competence on the professional and ethical behavior domain of the FPLS.

Discussion of Relationship between Findings and Research Literature

The results of the analysis of the descriptive statistics were not surprising. The behaviors associated with effective leadership have been studied to a great degree. The body of research in the area of educational leadership and the behaviors associated with effective leadership is substantial, and the present study was built on that foundation of work. It has been widely acknowledged that school leadership is very important in

establishing a culture of change (Marzano et al., 2005), and it has been suspected that school leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all of the factors that influence student learning (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Knowing how vital it is to have effective leadership, it must be noted that principals who are leading schools today need to be prepared to lead the operational functions and human capital management, and they need to be prepared to lead the school-wide instructional improvement and academic achievement required to stay a competitive learning institution (Culross, 2011; Mulford, Silins, & Leithwood, 2004). The complex nature of the job of school leader demands adequate preparation that mirrors the expectations in the field (Orr, 2006).

The first and second research questions of the present study focused on the Florida Principal Leadership Standard domain (group of behaviors) with which the respondents perceived themselves most ready to competently perform, respectively. The FPLS domains all had means above 4.00 on a scale of 1.00-5.00. Thus, the respondents generally felt confident in their ability to competently perform the leadership behaviors identified in all four domains. The mean of the FPLS domain, Professional and Ethical Leadership, was slightly higher than the other three domains (M = 4.576), and the mean of Instructional Leadership was slightly lowers (M = 4.412). These differences in means were only about one-third of a standard deviation; hence, differences were interpreted cautiously.

The high mean in the area of Professional and Ethical Leadership reflects the commitment needed by school leaders, as described by Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008), to facilitate the type of change that today's schools require. The Professional and

Ethical Leadership domain includes only six standards, but they include vital leadership skills that are founded on the ability to be self-aware. For example, “demonstrating resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to barriers” and “demonstrating willingness to admit error and learn from it” are included as behavioral indicators to “demonstrate quality behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader” (Florida Department of Education, 2011). These behaviors reflect characteristics or personality traits and speak to a personal belief system. This does not seem so far afield from the “transforming” leader Burns (1978) identified as being able to induce “followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motivations” of the organization as a whole and to raise the group to “higher levels of motivation and morality” (pp. 18-19). The Professional and Ethical Leadership domain also describes the leader as being able to “engage in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system” (FLDOE, 2011). This personal commitment to individual and collective professional development in an effort to improve the school system complements Sheppard’s (1996) conclusion that two of the most influential behaviors of the school leader are “framing school goals” and promoting professional development. The articulation of a shared vision or goals and commitment to the systematic improvement of the organization as a whole (e.g., professional development plan) play an important part in all four FPLS domains, but they are essential to the professional and ethical effectiveness of the school leader, as can be found repeatedly in the literature (e.g., Hallinger, 1983; Harris & Sillane, 2008; Larsen, 1984; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

Respondents rating their own ability to competently perform the behavioral expectations identified in the Instructional Leadership domain as slightly lower than the other three domains may have something to do with the inability of the students to have occasion to engage in these behaviors inside the context of leading a school. Lack of prior experience in an instructional leadership role, including instructional coaching, may also be a contributing factor. “Instructional plan implementation” and “recruiting and developing a diverse faculty and staff” are both types of experiences that may have yet to be encountered by the sample (FLDOE, 2011). Although there are behavioral indicators in the Instructional Leadership domain that can be practiced by an individual who is not the principal, such as the promotion of “school and classroom practices that maximize the diversity and complexity of student learning processes and student learning needs,” the main focus of the domain is aligned to practicing principal contexts (FLDOE, 2011). Further, although the population was likely to have been generally high performing and self-aware, it was unlikely that many of them would have had the opportunity to serve in a formal leadership role.

The third research question was concerned with the dominant self-perceived leadership style of respondents. Respondents perceived their leadership style as more transformational (M = 3.271) than transactional (M = 1.471). This was not surprising. It is not out of the ordinary for leaders-in-preparation or newly graduated leaders to perceive themselves as highly transformational (Murgel, 2011).

In the fourth research question, the study examined the relationship between respondents’ self-perceived leadership style as defined by the MLQ and their self-

perceived ability to competently perform the behavioral expectations identified in the FPLS.

Transformational leadership had strong and significant correlational relationships across all four of the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standard domains. Canonical Root 1 (R_c^2 =.476) indicated 48% correlation between leadership style and perceived competence in the FPLS domains, with transformational leadership being the predictor variable most highly related to the FPLS scores. This could point to the possibility that state-approved Level 1 Educational Leadership programs are teaching behaviors that are associated not only with effective leadership as defined on the Florida Principal Leadership Standards, but also providing instruction that is aligned to transformational leadership. In Fenn and Mixon's (2011) study of a Texas-based leadership preparation program designed for superintendents, this seemed to be the case. Leadership programs have undergone a great deal of change and are generally preparing the leaders that today's schools need (e.g., NCPEA, 2007; Orr, 2006; Young et al., 2005). In Florida specifically, the Level 1 programs work collaboratively with many district-based Level 2 programs. This close connection to the work of the principal leader in the field and the expectations of principals may be a strength of the preparation of future leaders in the state. The correlation between transformational leadership and effective school leadership behaviors identified in the present study complements the relationships identified between these variables in the research literature.

Effective behaviors associated with high-performing school leadership and the attributes associated with an transformational leadership style as defined by Bass and Avolio's Full Range Leadership Model (1994) are closely aligned (Hallinger, 2003;

Leithwood & Sun, 2012). Hallinger's (2003) concise crosswalk of the behaviors associated with effective leadership identified in models of instructional leadership and those identified with the leadership of change (e.g., transformational and transactional leadership behaviors) as indicated in the Full Range Leadership Model (Bass & Avolio, 1994) leaves little doubt regarding the importance of the relationship between leadership for change and effective educational leadership. These finding are further underscored by Leithwood and Sun (2012). Further, the most recent national and state principal leadership standards reflect leadership behaviors that are consistent with the research literature (e.g., Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008; Florida Department of Education, 2011). The research literature focused on the relationship between identified effective leadership behaviors and principal standards has continued to reinforce these linkages (e.g., Hannigan, 2008).

Recommendations for Further Research

The practices or behaviors of high performing educational leadership have been widely addressed in the research literature, especially in the last decade (e.g., Ibarra, 2008; Klar & Brewer, 2013; Leithwood et al., 2004, 2008; Nettles & Herrington, 2007). Similarly, the body of research literature supporting identified attributes of effective leadership programs has grown and has helped define the learning experiences that enhance the effectiveness of future principals (e.g., Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Harris, 2006; Orr & Orphanos, 2011; Pounder, 2010). Although there has been an increase in studies focused on principal effectiveness and preparation for effectively leading schools, the body of research on the perceptions of future principal leaders of

their readiness to perform functions aligned to formal state leadership standards is less robust (e.g., Daresh & Playko, 1994; Huff, 2011). Moreover, the potential for research into the perceptions of Florida-specific principal preparation program participants seems untapped. The present study serves as a first step in the development of further investigation into the development of Florida's future principals.

The results of the present study have implications for individuals working to provide relevant learning experiences to Florida participants of a Level 1 educational leadership program or a district-based Level 2 program (or to individuals in similar programs in other states. Recruiting aspiring leaders has become a greater task, and enrollment in Level 1 Educational Leadership programs has decreased in most Florida universities. In a state with 67 counties and over 4,000 public schools (Florida Association of School Administrators, 2012), school leadership preparation should remain a vital asset for the future of education in Florida. For this reason, communication and collaboration between school districts and universities should continue to grow, allowing for greater alignment of goals and outcomes for both Level 1 and 2 programs. The close communication between these entities may help to provide better prepared school principals for the realities of the job in the varied areas of the state. As any school leader will attest, each school and district has its own contextualized needs specific to the population and the community. Level 1 programs that share a close proximity with several school districts may continue to offer relevant and differentiated learning experiences for aspiring principals.

The present study focused on potential future educational leaders and their perceptions of their own readiness to lead. An awareness of how students perceive their

own readiness may provide for more insight into student-aligned or truly differentiated learning experiences for participants of an educational leadership preparation program at any point in their education. The present study represented a small foray into this area of research that could be expanded in an effort to increase the ability to generalize the findings.

Future studies with larger sample sizes and more diverse populations would benefit this area of study. Increasing the sample size by opening the survey statewide and across many universities of different types, would provide a more accurate representation of the population of Florida's Level 1 Educational Leadership program participants. This increase in the scope of the sample may also affect the response rate for the surveys (Dillman, 2007; Sills & Song, 2002) and increase the diversity of the population.

The purpose of the present study precluded a need to examine the demographic items, and the final sample was not large enough to draw any reasonable conclusions related to the demographic items. Self-identification of gender and ethnicity was left blank in several cases, providing the researcher little data to interpret. The identity of the respondents' institution was asked to keep track of the recruitment of participants. The sample was culled from three state universities, and the respondents were asked to identify their institution, but the comparison of results across institutions was not included as part of the discussion.

Gender has been the most widely studied demographic variable in the body of research on leadership style and the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 2004). According to prior research, females have been generally "more transformational in their leadership style than their male counterparts" (Bass & Avolio, 2004, pp. 43-44). A meta-analysis of 45

studies of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles supported the claim of women demonstrating more behaviors aligned to transformational leadership than men (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). Additionally, Eagly et al. found that women demonstrated more contingent reward behaviors aligned to transactional leadership. These contingent reward behaviors have also been associated with effective instructional leadership or, as Hallinger and Murphy (1985) referred to it previously, “instructional management” (Hallinger, 2003). The contingent rewards associated with Hallinger and Murphy’s 1985 model of instructional management may include providing incentives for teaching and learning. Twenty-nine respondents or 60% of the total number of respondents self-identified as female, whereas only 18 respondents or 38% of the total number of respondents self-identified as male. It would be beneficial if, in a larger sample of a similar population, research of the possible correlations between gender and leadership style were investigated.

The present study design and methodology could also be expanded to include a qualitative investigation of self-perceptions prior to working as a principal in the field and after the leader has been a seated school principal for a year or longer (B. Dassler, Florida Department of Education Deputy Chancellor for Educator Quality, personal communication, March 6, 2014). These interviews could be conducted with a small segment of the overall sample population of respondents. This expansion of the current study to include this qualitative dimension would provide a powerful look into principal readiness and perception of leadership style.

Implications for Policy Adoption and Development

Although no leadership model can be identified as the best framework for developing aspiring school leaders, one may claim that behavioral attributes associated with both transformational leadership and instructionally focused school leadership must be included in any future standards for school leadership. There have been discussions in some Florida school districts of the possibility of the principal standards changing again in the next year (M. Bracewell, Director of Leadership Training, North East Florida Educational Consortium, personal communication, March 2, 2014). Change is inevitable, and it seems that the expectations for school principals are not immune. Nevertheless, the standards adopted by the state in 2005 are not so different from those adopted in 2011. The 2011 description of the practices of principals was the most revealing, defining how school leaders play an essential role in instructional improvement and student achievement. Brazer and Bauer (2013) argued that although it is happening in pockets around the nation, there also needs to be a greater coherence between what is being taught in principal preparation programs and the real work of the instructionally focused principal. The further defining of these leadership roles will no doubt occur as the state continues to examine and test performance evaluations and value-added models for teachers and principals.

The public rhetoric and literature seems to echo this sentiment in a positive way, including a recent book recommendation received from Florida Department of Education Deputy Chancellor for Educator Quality, Brian Dassler (Personal communication, March 12, 2014). Dassler recommended Fink and Markholt's Leading for Instructional Improvement (2011) as a resource for better understanding his understanding of how

principals should inform instructional improvement and facilitate professional growth with their teachers. Fink and Markholt explained in Chapter 8 that “principals need to understand their teachers as individual learners” much like teachers understand their students. In this way, principals can better differentiate the professional development needed by individual teachers, instead of providing workshops tailored to large groups. Additionally, this powerful commitment to teachers as individuals provides for greater trust to be shared between the teachers and the leader. The idea of trust and individualizing communication around a common goal harkens back to the original definition of “transforming” leaders provided by James Burns (1978). Perhaps national and state policies focused on school leadership development and standardized expectations for principals should include closer ties to the associated vocabulary found in the ever-increasing research literature of Bass and Avolio’s Full Range of Leadership Model (1994). Perhaps the school leadership development programs found in American universities are providing this deeper dive into exploring personal values, building trust, and other transformative activities. This may have been the reason why there was such a strong positive relationship between transformational leadership and the behavioral indicators associated with the Florida Principal Leadership Standards in the present study. The greater alignment of policy to practical application in this area is possibly needed.

Conclusion

The present study examined research questions regarding the relationship between self-perceived leadership styles and self-perceived ability to competently perform the behavioral expectations of principal leadership standards. The study adds to the growing

body of research literature on the preparation of future school leaders and provides a better understanding of the participants of educational leadership preparation programs. The findings of the study indicated that the respondents perceived their leadership style as more transformational than transactional or laissez-faire. It was also found that the population perceived their own ability to competently perform the behavioral expectations of the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards as high. Finally, a high, positive, and statistically significant relationship was identified between transformational leadership style and the behavioral indicators and four domains of the 2011 Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

The findings may point to the possibility that the population is being adequately prepared to be high-performing leaders in Florida's school system. Another possibility is the composition of the sample. The sample targeted for the study likely included a select group of individuals identified by district leaders for future school leadership roles considering that all three universities from which the study participants were selected work collaboratively with local school districts to select and recruit students. Although not all participants in these programs were likely to have entered programs due to this joint recruiting effort, it is highly likely that many were.

As stated above, the potential for future studies of the population of participants enrolled in Level 1 Educational Leadership programs is great. The sample for the present study could be replicated and expanded to include more state-approved Level 1 educational leadership programs. This change in sample size would possibly lead to a greater number of survey respondents and greater diversity, giving reason for increased generalizability of results. Furthermore, the study methodology could be augmented to

include a qualitative component of participant interviews during their participation in a Level 1 program and after they are placed in the role principal and have been working for one year. This mixed method approach might yield more information that could help program providers, school districts, and the state in planning future professional development for school leaders.

Appendix A

6A-5.081 Approval of School Leadership Programs

The Florida Legislature and State Board of Education recognize multiple pathways for demonstrating the standards required to qualify for a Professional Florida Educator's Certificate. To ensure capacity and quality of pre-service school leadership programs and the development of inservice school leaders required in Section 1012.986, F.S., this rule sets forth requirements for approval of two levels of school leadership programs. Level I programs lead to initial certification in educational leadership for the purpose of preparing individuals to serve as school leaders who may aspire to the school principalship. Level II programs build upon Level I training and lead to certification in School Principal. This bi-level certification and preparation process includes programs offered by Florida postsecondary institutions and public school districts as described herein.

(1) Level I: Educational Leadership.

(a) General Criteria.

1. An initial certification program in educational leadership approved pursuant to this section shall satisfy specialization requirements for certification in Educational Leadership pursuant to Rule 6A-4.0082, F.A.C. Each approval or extension shall be granted for a period of time determined by the Department of Education but shall not exceed seven (7) years based upon the institution or school district meeting the requirements of this section.

2. Each entity offering an approved program in accordance with this section shall report to the Department annually the number of participants admitted to and enrolled in the program and the number of program completers.

(b) Requirements for initial approval of programs offered by Florida postsecondary institutions. Each institution seeking approval of an initial certification program in educational leadership shall submit a request in writing from the chief executive officer to the Commissioner providing evidence of all of the following:

1. The institution is a Florida public or nonpublic postsecondary institution that requests approval of an initial certification program in educational leadership, has legal authority to grant appropriate master's degrees or higher in educational leadership or school administration, and meets accreditation requirements as prescribed in subsection 6A-4.003(1) or paragraph (2)(c), F.A.C.

2. The institution has incorporated into the program objectives which directly respond to needs assessed and projected for school leaders both in Florida school districts and the state as a whole.

3. The institution has established a comprehensive program that meets the following requirements:

a. Provides instruction in and assesses each candidate's level of knowledge and application of the competencies aligned to each of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards, pursuant to Rules 6A-5.080 and 6A-4.00821, F.A.C. The program description must include in which courses the competencies will be taught and assessed.

b. Incorporates appropriate elements of the William Cecil Golden Program for School Leaders to ensure a statewide foundation for leadership development in accordance with Section 1012.986, F.S.

c. Provides for field experiences in K-12 schools designed in collaboration with Florida public schools or school districts, during which program knowledge is applied and candidates are provided with opportunities to demonstrate required competencies.

d. Endorses as program completers only candidates who demonstrate all of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards at the initial certification level and earn passing scores on all portions of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination required in Section 1012.56, F.S.

4. The institution has employed faculty who are qualified to teach courses required in the program, and who document annual onsite participation or research in K-12 school settings. Activities must be related to the program course(s) they teach.

5. The institution has a means for collecting performance data on admitted candidates and program completers.

6. The institution publishes a description of the qualitative and quantitative requirements for program completion.

7. The institution may include a modified version of its approved program to be offered to individuals who hold a master's or higher degree, provided the institution has a means to document that the completer of the modified program has met all program requirements of this section. A modified program is not required to terminate in a degree.

(c) Requirements for initial approval of programs offered by Florida school districts. Each Florida school district seeking approval of an initial certification program in educational leadership shall submit a request in writing from the chief executive officer to the Commissioner providing evidence of all of the following:

1. The district shall offer the initial certification program in educational leadership only to its employees through its approved professional development system in accordance with Section 1012.98, F.S., and the requirements of this rule.

2. The district has incorporated into the program objectives which directly respond to needs assessed and projected for school leaders both in Florida and the district.

3. The district has established a comprehensive program that meets the following requirements:

a. Admits only candidates who hold a master's degree from an accredited or approved institution as described in Rule 6A-4.003, F.A.C. Programs may provide for admission of candidates without this degree, provided that the district's program documentation includes a process of formally notifying such candidates that they are not eligible to complete the program without official documentation of the master's degree.

b. Provides instruction in and assesses each candidate's level of knowledge and application of the competencies aligned to the Florida Principal Leadership Standards, pursuant to Rules 6A-5.080 and 6A-4.00821, F.A.C. The program description must indicate the professional development activities through which the competencies will be taught and assessed.

c. Incorporates appropriate elements of the William Cecil Golden Program for School Leaders to ensure a statewide foundation for leadership development in accordance with Section 1012.986, F.S.

d. Provides for field experiences in K-12 schools designed in collaboration with Florida public schools or school districts, during which program knowledge is applied and candidates are provided with opportunities to demonstrate required competencies.

e. Endorses as program completers only candidates who hold an acceptable master's degree, demonstrate all of the Florida Principal Leadership Standards at the initial certification level, and earn passing scores on all portions of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination required in Section 1012.56, F.S.

4. The district has employed instructors whom the district has documented are qualified to deliver the professional development required in the program, based upon degree level and practical experience in school leadership. Practical experience must be related to the program curriculum taught.

5. The district collaborates with one or more institutions of higher education in the development and/or delivery of the program.

6. The district has a means for collecting performance data on admitted and enrolled candidates and program completers.

7. The district publishes a description of the qualitative and quantitative requirements for program completion.

(d) Initial approval determination and notification. The Commissioner shall determine whether the institution or district has met the criteria for initial approval and shall provide notification in writing of the approval or denial of approval. A denial of approval shall include identification of specific areas of program weakness that must be corrected prior to reconsideration for approval. For programs receiving initial approval, the institution or district shall be apprised of the requirements for continued approval.

(e) Continued program approval.

1. Continued approval of each initial certification program in educational leadership shall be based upon the Department's review of the institution's or school district's description of its continuous improvement of the program throughout the approval period as submitted annually through a program evaluation plan. The program evaluation plan shall be based upon an internal analysis of data collected annually and published for the general public. The data must include, but are not limited to:

a. Candidate admission, enrollment, and completion data as described in paragraph (1)(a) of this rule;

b. Candidate pass rates on each portion of the Florida Educational Leadership Examination;

c. Candidates' performance during field experiences;

d. Program completers' satisfaction with their preparedness for serving in a school-based leadership position in the first year of such employment after completing the program; and

e. The satisfaction level of school district or public school employers of program completers with the level of preparedness for the first year of serving in a school leadership position. The description of the level of satisfaction shall be based on results of a survey of the employers that includes the candidate's performance related to the Florida Principal Leadership Standards, the placement rates of program completers, and the rehire rates of program completers.

2. In the final year of the review cycle the Department shall make a site visit to the district or institution. Prior to the site visit the institution or district shall provide a

summary report to the Department that synthesizes the data and actions taken as a result of the program evaluation plans issued during the cycle. The Commissioner will consider the summary report and report of the program approval site visit team to determine whether continued approval is granted and will notify the institution or district in writing of the decision. A denial of approval shall include identification of specific areas of program weakness.

(2) Level II: School Principal. Florida public school districts are authorized to seek approval for a program leading to certification in School Principal pursuant to Rule 6A-4.0083, F.A.C. For purposes of this rule a public school district is referred to as a "district."

(a) Initial Approval Requirements. The Department may approve a school district's School Principal certification program for a period of time determined by the Department not to exceed seven (7) years. Approval is based upon the district providing documentation of meeting the following requirements:

1. Admitting only candidates who hold a valid Florida Educator's Certificate in the area of educational leadership, education administration, or administration and supervision pursuant to requirements of Rule 6A-4.0083, F.A.C., and who are employed in a public school within the district in a leadership position through which the candidate can fully demonstrate the competencies associated with the Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

2. Delivery of a competency-based developmental program that:

a. Is based upon each individual's needs using data gathered from self-assessment, selection, and appraisal instruments aligned to the competencies to be demonstrated in the program to develop the customized learning plan;

b. Uses district-developed indicators of competency in all Florida Principal Leadership Standards and provides multiple, job-embedded opportunities for achievement;

c. Incorporates appropriate elements of the William Cecil Golden School Professional Development Program for School Leaders to ensure a statewide foundation for leadership development pursuant to Section 1012.986, F.S.;

d. Integrates on-going professional development and the district's annual appraisal system into program experiences;

3. A means of collecting continued approval data as described in subparagraph (2)(d) of this rule.

4. An endorsement of program completion by the superintendent for all program participants who fully demonstrate the Florida Principal Leadership Standards at a level commensurate with full responsibility as head of a school as described in Section 1012.01(3)(c)1., F.S., and as required by the district's program.

(b) Initial program approval determination and notification. The Commissioner shall determine whether the district has met the criteria for initial approval and shall reply with a notification in writing indicating approval or denial of approval. A denial of approval shall include identification of specific areas of program weakness that must be corrected prior to reconsideration for approval. For programs receiving initial approval, the district shall be apprised of the requirements for continued approval.

(c) Changes to an approved program prior to the end of the approval period. If a district seeks to make substantial revisions to its approved School Principal certification

program prior to the resubmission of the program for continued approval, the district should submit those revisions to the Commissioner with a letter requesting a review. The Commissioner will advise the district in writing whether the revised program remains in compliance with this rule and of any proposed changes that are not acceptable. This determination and subsequent program revisions will not affect the approval period previously established for the program.

(d) Continued program approval.

1. Annual reporting. Each district with an approved program in School Principal certification under this rule will report to the Department annually the individuals who are admitted and enrolled, and who complete the program. The district will include in the report to the Department the number and type of inservice hours completed by each participant in curriculum offerings provided by the state through the William Cecil Golden Professional Development Program for School Leaders.

2. Continued approval review.

a. During the last year of approval of the program, the Department will request of the district documentation for continued approval review. Documentation shall include results of an analysis of data collected by the district during each year of approval and a summary of program improvements made during the course of the approval period. The analysis and summary submitted by the district should include data on program participants as follows:

(I) Data elements listed in subparagraph (2)(d) of this rule;

(II) Level of satisfaction of the participants and their supervisors with the training received in the program with regard to their level of preparedness for their employment in a leadership position in the years immediately following completion of the program;

(III) Evaluation of the effectiveness of the professional development offered through the program in accordance with the protocol standards for professional development adopted by the state;

(IV) Longitudinal data on program participants including placement rates, rehire rates, retention rates, performance based on the achievement of their students and other indicators of the success of the school(s) where they are assigned during the years immediately following completion of the program.

b. After a review of the summary documents, the Commissioner will provide the district with written verification of the continued approval of the program or denial of approval. If a determination of denial is reached, the Commissioner must provide the reasons for the determination in accordance with requirements of this rule. A district whose program is denied continued approval may apply for a new initial approval in accordance with the requirements in paragraph (2)(a) of this rule.

c. The Department will publish a periodic reporting of the statewide status of programs approved under this rule.

Rulemaking Authority 1012.98, 1012.986 FS. Law Implemented 1012.986, 1012.56 FS. History–New 6-20-07.

Appendix B

6A-5.080 Florida Principal Leadership Standards

(1) Purpose and Structure of the Standards.

(a) Purpose. The Standards are set forth in rule as Florida's core expectations for effective school administrators. The Standards are based on contemporary research on multi-dimensional school leadership, and represent skill sets and knowledge bases needed in effective schools. The Standards form the foundation for school leader personnel evaluations and professional development systems, school leadership preparation programs, and educator certification requirements.

(b) Structure. There are ten (10) Standards grouped into categories, which can be considered domains of effective leadership. Each Standard has a title and includes, as necessary, descriptors that further clarify or define the Standard, so that the Standards may be developed further into leadership curricula and proficiency assessments in fulfillment of their purposes.

(2) The Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

(a) Domain 1: Student Achievement:

1. Standard 1: Student Learning Results. Effective school leaders achieve results on the school's student learning goals.

a. The school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula; and

b. Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under Section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state.

2. Standard 2: Student Learning as a Priority. Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success. The leader:

a. Enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning;

b. Maintains a school climate that supports student engagement in learning;

c. Generates high expectations for learning growth by all students; and

d. Engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school.

(b) Domain 2: Instructional Leadership:

1. Standard 3: Instructional Plan Implementation. Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum with state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments. The leader:

a. Implements the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices as described in Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C., through a common language of instruction;

b. Engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement;

c. Communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance;

d. Implements the district's adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school; and

e. Ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula.

2. Standard 4: Faculty Development. Effective school leaders recruit, retain and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff. The leader:

a. Generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan;

b. Evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction;

c. Employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served;

d. Identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology;

e. Implements professional learning that enables faculty to deliver culturally relevant and differentiated instruction; and

f. Provides resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year.

3. Standard 5: Learning Environment. Effective school leaders structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population. The leader:

a. Maintains a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy;

b. Recognizes and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning;

c. Promotes school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students;

d. Provides recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment;

e. Initiates and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being; and

f. Engages faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps.

(c) Domain 3: Organizational Leadership:

1. Standard 6: Decision Making. Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission and improvement priorities using facts and data. The leader:

a. Gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency;

b. Uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions;

c. Evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed;

d. Empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate; and

e. Uses effective technology integration to enhance decision making and efficiency throughout the school.

2. Standard 7: Leadership Development. Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization. The leader:

a. Identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders;

b. Provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders;

c. Plans for succession management in key positions;

d. Promotes teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning; and

e. Develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education and business leaders.

3. Standard 8: School Management. Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment. The leader:

a. Organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans;

b. Establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization;

c. Manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development; and

d. Is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities.

4. Standard 9: Communication. Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community. The leader:

a. Actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders;

b. Recognizes individuals for effective performance;

c. Communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community;

d. Maintains high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engages stakeholders in the work of the school;

e. Creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues.

f. Utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration; and

g. Ensures faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions.

(d) Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior:

1. Standard 10: Professional and Ethical Behaviors. Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader. The leader:

a. Adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C.;

b. Demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership;

c. Demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community;

d. Engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system;

e. Demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it; and

f. Demonstrates explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback.

Rulemaking Authority 1001.02, 1012.34, 1012.55(1), 1012.986(3) FS. Law Implemented 1012.55, 1012.986, 1012.34 FS. History–New 5-24-05, Formerly 6B-5.0012, Amended 12-20-11.

Appendix C

Florida Principal Leadership Standards Questionnaire

Florida Principal Leadership Standards Questionnaire This survey asks you to be honest in your perceptions of your ability to competently demonstrate behaviors identified by the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (2011). The behaviors listed below are representative of the ten standards and four leadership domains (i.e., Leading Student Achievement, Instructional Leadership, Organizational Leadership, and Professional and Ethical Behavior). The domain and the standards are identified above each associated group of behaviors. Please read each statement carefully, and respond with the degree to which you feel prepared to competently demonstrate the behavior identified.

Leadership Domain 1: Student Achievement- Please read each statement carefully, and respond with the degree to which you feel prepared to competently demonstrate the behavior identified.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The leader ensures school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader ensures that student-learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under Section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning; (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader maintains a school climate that supports student engagement in learning. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader generates high expectations for learning growth by all students. (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader engages faculty and staff in efforts to close learning performance gaps among student subgroups within the school. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Leadership Domain 2: Instructional Leadership- Please read each statement carefully, and respond with the degree to which you feel prepared to competently demonstrate the behavior identified.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The leader implements the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices as described in Rule 6A-5.065, F.A.C. through a common language of instruction. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader engages in data analysis for instructional planning and improvement. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader communicates the relationships among academic standards, effective instruction, and student performance. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader implements the district's adopted curricula and state's adopted academic standards in a manner that is rigorous and culturally relevant to the students and school. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader ensures the appropriate use of high quality formative and interim assessments aligned with the adopted standards and curricula. (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader generates a focus on student and professional learning in the school that is clearly linked to the system-wide strategic objectives and the school improvement plan. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader evaluates, monitors, and provides timely feedback to faculty on the effectiveness of instruction. (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader employs a faculty with the instructional proficiencies needed for the school population served. (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader identifies faculty instructional proficiency needs, including standards-based content, research-based pedagogy, data analysis for instructional planning and improvement, and the use of instructional technology. (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader implements professional learning that enables faculty to deliver	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

culturally relevant and differentiated instruction. (10)					
The leader provides resources and time and engages faculty in effective individual and collaborative professional learning throughout the school year. (11)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader maintains a safe, respectful and inclusive student-centered learning environment that is focused on equitable opportunities for learning and building a foundation for a fulfilling life in a democratic society and global economy. (12)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader recognizes and uses diversity as an asset in the development and implementation of procedures and practices that motivate all students and improve student learning. (13)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader promotes school and classroom practices that validate and value similarities and differences among students. (14)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader provides recurring monitoring and feedback on the quality of the learning environment. (15)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader initiates and supports continuous improvement processes focused on the students' opportunities for success and well-being. (16)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader engages faculty in recognizing and understanding cultural and developmental issues related to student learning by identifying and addressing strategies to minimize and/or eliminate achievement gaps. (17)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Leadership Domain 3: Organizational Leadership- Please read each statement carefully, and respond with the degree to which you feel prepared to competently demonstrate the behavior identified.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The leader gives priority attention to decisions that impact the quality of student learning and teacher proficiency. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader uses critical thinking and problem solving techniques to define problems and identify solutions. (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader evaluates decisions for effectiveness, equity, intended and actual outcome; implements follow-up actions; and revises as needed. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader empowers others and distributes leadership when appropriate. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader uses effective technology integration to enhance decision-making and efficiency throughout the school. (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader identifies and cultivates potential and emerging leaders. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader provides evidence of delegation and trust in subordinate leaders. (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader plans for succession management in key positions (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader promotes teacher-leadership functions focused on instructional proficiency and student learning. (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader develops sustainable and supportive relationships between school leaders, parents, community, higher education and business leaders. (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader organizes time, tasks and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans. (11)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader establishes appropriate deadlines for him/herself and the entire organization. (12)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

The leader manages schedules, delegates, and allocates resources to promote collegial efforts in school improvement and faculty development. (13)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader is fiscally responsible and maximizes the impact of fiscal resources on instructional priorities. (14)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader actively listens to and learns from students, staff, parents, and community stakeholders. (15)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader recognizes individuals for effective performance. (16)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader communicates student expectations and performance information to students, parents, and community. (17)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader maintains high visibility at school and in the community and regularly engages stakeholders in the work of the school. (18)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader creates opportunities within the school to engage students, faculty, parents, and community stakeholders in constructive conversations about important school issues. (19)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader utilizes appropriate technologies for communication and collaboration. (20)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader ensures faculty receives timely information about student learning requirements, academic standards, and all other local state and federal administrative requirements and decisions. (21)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Leadership Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior- Please read each statement carefully, and respond with the degree to which you feel prepared to competently demonstrate the behavior identified.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)
The leader adheres to the Code of Ethics and the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession in Florida, pursuant to Rules 6B-1.001 and 6B-1.006, F.A.C. (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader demonstrates resiliency by staying focused on the school vision and reacting constructively to the barriers to success that include disagreement and dissent with leadership (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader demonstrates a commitment to the success of all students, identifying barriers and their impact on the well-being of the school, families, and local community. (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader engages in professional learning that improves professional practice in alignment with the needs of the school system. (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader demonstrates willingness to admit error and learn from it. (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The leader demonstrates explicit improvement in specific performance areas based on previous evaluations and formative feedback. (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Questionnaire items are derived from: State Board of Education Rule 6A-5.081- Florida Principal Leadership Standards (2011).

Appendix D

Demographic Items and Lie Scale Items

Four Demographic items:

What is your gender?

What is your ethnicity?

What Level 1 Educational Leadership program do you attend?

How many years of experience do you have in education? (Please provide the approximate number of years only.)

Lie Scale Items included within the FPLS Questionnaire (four leadership domains):

1st section- last item

The expectations of the school are completely developed by and dependent on the leader.

2nd section- 1st item:

The leader controls all communication with all stakeholders, internally and externally.

3rd section- last item

The leader develops a plan for school improvement with minimal help from staff.

4th section- 1st item

The leader makes professional and ethical decisions based on experience without reliance on formalized codes of ethics.

Appendix E

MLQ 3rd Edition Sample Set- Leader Form

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Leader Form

My Name: _____ Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____ Leader ID #: _____

This questionnaire is to describe your leadership style as you perceive it. Please answer all items on this answer sheet. **If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.**

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/or all of these individuals.

Use the following rating scale:

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

1.	I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts	0	1	2	3	4
2.	I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate	0	1	2	3	4
3.	I fail to interfere until problems become serious	0	1	2	3	4
4.	I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards	0	1	2	3	4
5.	I avoid getting involved when important issues arise	0	1	2	3	4
6.	I talk about my most important values and beliefs	0	1	2	3	4
7.	I am absent when needed	0	1	2	3	4
8.	I seek differing perspectives when solving problems	0	1	2	3	4
9.	I talk optimistically about the future	0	1	2	3	4
10.	I instill pride in others for being associated with me	0	1	2	3	4
11.	I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	0	1	2	3	4
12.	I wait for things to go wrong before taking action	0	1	2	3	4
13.	I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished	0	1	2	3	4
14.	I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose	0	1	2	3	4
15.	I spend time teaching and coaching	0	1	2	3	4

Continued ➔

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, If not always
0	1	2	3	4

16. I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved	0	1	2	3	4
17. I show that I am a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."	0	1	2	3	4
18. I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group	0	1	2	3	4
19. I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group	0	1	2	3	4
20. I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action	0	1	2	3	4
21. I act in ways that build others' respect for me	0	1	2	3	4
22. I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures	0	1	2	3	4
23. I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions	0	1	2	3	4
24. I keep track of all mistakes	0	1	2	3	4
25. I display a sense of power and confidence	0	1	2	3	4
26. I articulate a compelling vision of the future	0	1	2	3	4
27. I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards	0	1	2	3	4
28. I avoid making decisions	0	1	2	3	4
29. I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others	0	1	2	3	4
30. I get others to look at problems from many different angles	0	1	2	3	4
31. I help others to develop their strengths	0	1	2	3	4
32. I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments	0	1	2	3	4
33. I delay responding to urgent questions	0	1	2	3	4
34. I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission	0	1	2	3	4
35. I express satisfaction when others meet expectations	0	1	2	3	4
36. I express confidence that goals will be achieved	0	1	2	3	4
37. I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs	0	1	2	3	4
38. I use methods of leadership that are satisfying	0	1	2	3	4
39. I get others to do more than they expected to do	0	1	2	3	4
40. I am effective in representing others to higher authority	0	1	2	3	4
41. I work with others in a satisfactory way	0	1	2	3	4
42. I heighten others' desire to succeed	0	1	2	3	4
43. I am effective in meeting organizational requirements	0	1	2	3	4
44. I increase others' willingness to try harder	0	1	2	3	4
45. I lead a group that is effective	0	1	2	3	4

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Rater Form

Name of Leader: _____Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____Leader ID #: _____

This questionnaire is used to describe the leadership style of the above-mentioned individual as you perceive it. Answer all items on this answer sheet. **If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank.** Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

Important (necessary for processing): Which best describes you?

___ I am at a higher organizational level than the person I am rating.
___ The person I am rating is at my organizational level.
___ I am at a lower organizational level than the person I am rating.
___ Other than the above.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing. Use the following rating scale:

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

The Person I Am Rating. . .

1.	Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts	0	1	2	3	4
2.	*Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate	0	1	2	3	4
3.	Fails to interfere until problems become serious	0	1	2	3	4
4.	Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards	0	1	2	3	4
5.	Avoids getting involved when important issues arise	0	1	2	3	4
6.	*Talks about his/her most important values and beliefs	0	1	2	3	4
7.	Is absent when needed	0	1	2	3	4
8.	*Seeks differing perspectives when solving problems	0	1	2	3	4
9.	*Talks optimistically about the future	0	1	2	3	4
10.	*Instills pride in me for being associated with him/her	0	1	2	3	4
11.	Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets	0	1	2	3	4
12.	Waits for things to go wrong before taking action	0	1	2	3	4
13.	*Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished	0	1	2	3	4
14.	*Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose	0	1	2	3	4
15.	*Spends time teaching and coaching	0	1	2	3	4

Continued ➔

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

16. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved 0 1 2 3 4
17. Shows that he/she is a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." 0 1 2 3 4
18. *Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group 0 1 2 3 4
19. *Treats me as an individual rather than just as a member of a group 0 1 2 3 4
20. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action 0 1 2 3 4
21. *Acts in ways that builds my respect 0 1 2 3 4
22. Concentrates his/her full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures 0 1 2 3 4
23. *Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions 0 1 2 3 4
24. Keeps track of all mistakes 0 1 2 3 4
25. *Displays a sense of power and confidence 0 1 2 3 4
26. *Articulates a compelling vision of the future 0 1 2 3 4
27. Directs my attention toward failures to meet standards 0 1 2 3 4
28. Avoids making decisions 0 1 2 3 4
29. *Considers me as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others 0 1 2 3 4
30. *Gets me to look at problems from many different angles 0 1 2 3 4
31. *Helps me to develop my strengths 0 1 2 3 4
32. *Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments 0 1 2 3 4
33. Delays responding to urgent questions 0 1 2 3 4
34. *Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission 0 1 2 3 4
35. Expresses satisfaction when I meet expectations 0 1 2 3 4
36. *Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved 0 1 2 3 4
37. Is effective in meeting my job-related needs 0 1 2 3 4
38. Uses methods of leadership that are satisfying 0 1 2 3 4
39. Gets me to do more than I expected to do 0 1 2 3 4
40. Is effective in representing me to higher authority 0 1 2 3 4
41. Works with me in a satisfactory way 0 1 2 3 4
42. Heightens my desire to succeed 0 1 2 3 4
43. Is effective in meeting organizational requirements 0 1 2 3 4
44. Increases my willingness to try harder 0 1 2 3 4
45. Leads a group that is effective 0 1 2 3 4

MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Scoring Key (5x) Short

My Name: _____Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____Leader ID #: _____

Scoring: The MLQ scale scores are average scores for the items on the scale. The score can be derived by summing the items and dividing by the number of items that make up the scale. **If an item is left blank, divide the total for that scale by the number of items answered.** All of the leadership style scales have four items, Extra Effort has three items, Effectiveness has four items, and Satisfaction has two items.

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

***Idealized Influence (Attributed) total/4 =**
***Idealized Influence (Behavior) total/4 =**
***Inspirational Motivation total/4 =**
***Intellectual Stimulation total/4 =**
***Individual Consideration total/4 =**
 # Contingent Reward total/4 =
 # Management-by-Exception (Active) total/4 =
+Management-by-Exception (Passive) total/4 =
+Laissez-faire Leadership total/4 =
Extra Effort total/3 =
Effectiveness total/4 =
Satisfaction total/2 =

1. Contingent Reward.....0 1 2 3 4
2. Intellectual Stimulation.....0 1 2 3 4
3. Management-by-Exception (Passive).....0 1 2 3 4
4. Management-by-Exception (Active).....0 1 2 3 4
5. Laissez-faire Leadership.....0 1 2 3 4
6. Idealized Influence (Behavior).....0 1 2 3 4
7. Laissez-faire Leadership.....0 1 2 3 4
8. Intellectual Stimulation.....0 1 2 3 4
9. Inspirational Motivation.....0 1 2 3 4
10. Idealized Influence (Attributed).....0 1 2 3 4
11. Contingent Reward.....0 1 2 3 4
12. Management-by-Exception (Passive).....0 1 2 3 4
13. Inspirational Motivation.....0 1 2 3 4
14. Idealized Influence (Behavior).....0 1 2 3 4
15. Individual Consideration.....0 1 2 3 4

Continued ➔

Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently, if not always
0	1	2	3	4

16. Contingent Reward	0	1	2	3	4
17. Management-by-Exception (Passive)	0	1	2	3	4
18. Idealized Influence (Attributed)	0	1	2	3	4
19. Individual Consideration	0	1	2	3	4
20. Management-by-Exception (Passive)	0	1	2	3	4
21. Idealized Influence (Attributed)	0	1	2	3	4
22. Management-by-Exception (Active)	0	1	2	3	4
23. Idealized Influence (Behavior)	0	1	2	3	4
24. Management-by-Exception (Active)	0	1	2	3	4
25. Idealized Influence (Attributed)	0	1	2	3	4
26. Inspirational Motivation	0	1	2	3	4
27. Management-by-Exception (Active)	0	1	2	3	4
28. Laissez-faire Leadership	0	1	2	3	4
29. Individual Consideration	0	1	2	3	4
30. Intellectual Stimulation	0	1	2	3	4
31. Individual Consideration	0	1	2	3	4
32. Intellectual Stimulation	0	1	2	3	4
33. Laissez-faire Leadership	0	1	2	3	4
34. Idealized Influence (Behavior)	0	1	2	3	4
35. Contingent Reward	0	1	2	3	4
36. Inspirational Motivation	0	1	2	3	4
37. Effectiveness	0	1	2	3	4
38. Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4
39. Extra Effort	0	1	2	3	4
40. Effectiveness	0	1	2	3	4
41. Satisfaction	0	1	2	3	4
42. Extra Effort	0	1	2	3	4
43. Effectiveness	0	1	2	3	4
44. Extra Effort	0	1	2	3	4
45. Effectiveness	0	1	2	3	4

Appendix F

UNF IRB Approval

UNF
UNIVERSITY of NORTH FLORIDA.

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
1 UNF Drive
Jacksonville, FL 32224-2665
904-620-2455 FAX 904-620-2457
Equal Opportunity/Equal Access/Affirmative Action Institution

MEMORANDUM

UNF IRB Number: 515111-2
Approval Date: 03-14-2014
Expiration Date: Exempt - None
Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB KLC

DATE: March 14, 2014

TO: Mr. Jason Arnold

VIA: Dr. Larry Daniel
Education and Human Services

FROM: Dr. Jennifer Wesely, Chairperson
On behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board

RE: Review of Revisions for New Project by the UNF Institutional Review Board IRB#515111-2: "The Self-perceived Leadership Style and Readiness to Lead of Level 1 Educational Leadership Preparation Program Participants (Dissertation Proposal)"

This is to advise you that your project, "The Self-perceived Leadership Style and Readiness to Lead of Level 1 Educational Leadership Preparation Program Participants (Dissertation Proposal)" was reviewed on behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board and has been approved as "Exempt" Category 2. Therefore, this project requires no further IRB oversight unless substantive changes are made.

This approval applies to your project in the form and content as submitted to the IRB for review. All participants must receive a stamped and dated copy of the approved informed consent document when possible. Any variations or modifications to the approved protocol and/or informed consent forms that are substantive or might increase risk to human participants must be submitted to the IRB prior to implementing the changes. Please see the UNF Standard Operating Procedures for additional information about what types of changes might require an amendment. Any unanticipated problems involving risk and any occurrence of serious harm to subjects and others shall be reported promptly to the IRB within 3 business days.

Your study has been approved as of 3/14/2014. Because your project was approved as exempt, no further IRB oversight is required for this project unless you intend to make a change that is considered substantive or might elevate risk to participants. As an exempt study, continuing review will be unnecessary. When you are ready to close your project, please complete a Closing Report Form which can also be found in the documents library called "Forms and Templates" in IRBNet. This closing report will need to be submitted as a new package in IRBNet.

As you may know, **CITI Course Completion Reports are valid for 3 years**. Your completion report is valid through 9/13/2016 and Dr. Daniel's completion report is valid through 6/05/2014. Please note that Dr. Daniel's CITI completion report will expire this year. He can access the CITI refresher course by following this link when it becomes available 90 days prior to the expiration of the current training: http://www.citiprogram.org/. Please ask him renew his CITI training before the current training expires. Should you have questions regarding your project or any other IRB issues, please contact the research integrity unit of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs by emailing IRB@unf.edu or calling (904) 620-2455.

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within UNF's records. All records shall be accessible for inspection and copying by authorized representatives of the department or agency at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner. A copy of this approval may also be sent to the dean and/or chair of your department.

UNF IRB Number: 515111-2
Approval Date: 03-14-2014
Expiration Date: Exempt - None
Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB KLC

Appendix G

UF IRB Approval and Letter of Support

UF | Institutional Review Board
UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA

PO Box 112250
Gainesville, FL 32611-2250
352-392-0433 (Phone)
352-392-9234 (Fax)
irb2@ufl.edu

DATE: February 10, 2014

TO: Jason Dean Arnold
1521 Stonebriar Rd
Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

Signature Deleted

FROM: Ira S. Fischler, PhD, Chair
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board 02

SUBJECT: **Approval of Protocol #2014-U-0129**
The Self-Perceived Leadership Style and Readiness to Lead of Level 1 Educational Leadership Preparation Program Participants (Dissertation Proposal)

SPONSOR: None

I am pleased to advise you that the University of Florida Institutional Review Board has recommended approval of this protocol. Based on its review, the UFIRB determined that this research presents no more than minimal risk to participants, and based on 45 CFR 46.117(c), An IRB may waive the requirement for the investigator to obtain a signed consent form for some or all subjects if it finds either: *(1) That the only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality. Each subject will be asked whether the subject wants documentation linking the subject with the research, and the subject's wishes will govern; or (2) That the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.*

The IRB authorizes you to administer the informed consent process as specified in the protocol. If you wish to make any changes to this protocol, ***including the need to increase the number of participants authorized***, you must disclose your plans before you implement them so that the Board can assess their impact on your protocol. In addition, you must report to the Board any unexpected complications that affect your participants.

This approval is valid through **February 4, 2015**. If you have not completed the study prior to this date, please telephone our office (392-0433), and we will discuss the renewal process with you. **Additionally, should you complete the study on or before the expiration date, please submit the study closure report to our office. The form can be located at** http://ib.ufl.edu/irb02/Continuing_Review.html It is important that you keep your Department Chair informed about the status of this research protocol.

ISF:dl

UNF IRB Number: 515111-2
Approval Date: 03-14-2014
Expiration Date: Exempt - None
Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB KLC

UF UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA

College of Education
Office of the Dean

PO Box 117040
Gainesville, FL 32611-7040
352-273-4134
352-392-6930 Fax

February 20, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

The University of Florida's College of Education supports Jason Dean Arnold's doctoral research project, The Self-perceived Leadership Style and Readiness to Lead of Level 1 Educational Leadership Preparation Program Participants, and would like to assist in the recruitment effort of participants. Recruitment can begin when the informed consent and instrumentation have been approved by the University of North Florida's IRB and shared with our department.

Sincerely,

Signature Deleted

Dr. Tom Dana
Professor & Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

UNF IRB Number: 515111-2
Approval Date: 03-14-2014
Expiration Date: Exempt - None
Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB KLC

Appendix H

FAU Letter of Support

FAU
FLORIDA ATLANTIC UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
College of Education
2912 College Avenue
Davie, FL 33314

February 11, 2014

To Whom It May Concern:

As a member of Florida Atlantic University's Educational Leadership and Research Methodology Department, this letter is in support of Jason Dean Arnold's doctoral research project, *The Self-perceived Leadership Style and Readiness to Lead of Level 1 Educational Leadership Preparation Program Participants.* I am confirming that I would like to assist in the recruitment effort of participants for this study.

I look forward to reading the dissertation when completed, and seeing the findings and conclusions of this study.

If you have any questions regarding this letter of reference, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Signature Deleted

Daniel Reyes-Guerra, PhD
Assistant Professor, *Educational Leadership and Research Methodology*
Principal Investigator and Director, *FAU-BCPS PROPEL Program*
Florida Atlantic University, 3200 College Avenue, ES 230 - Davie, FL 33314

UNF IRB Number: 515111-2
Approval Date: 03-14-2014
Expiration Date: Exempt - None
Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB KLC

Appendix I

Recruitment and Informed Consent Email

Informed Consent Document*

Please read the following and **click on the button at the bottom** of the document to indicate your voluntary agreement to participate in the study and to move on to two short survey instruments. All transmissions over the Internet will be encrypted and secure and no sensitive personal data will be collected. Data will be reported in an aggregated fashion.

Hi my name is Jason Dean Arnold and I am a doctoral student at the University of North Florida. We are conducting a research study on leadership style and readiness to lead in order to better understand Level 1 Educational Leadership students' perceptions of their readiness.

If you take part in the study, you will be asked to participate in two web-based questionnaires. We expect that participation in this study will take about 30 minutes of your time. Each questionnaire will take 10-15 minutes. Your responses will be completely anonymous. We will not be asking for your name or email. Only authorized personnel will have access to your responses.

Although there are no direct benefits to or compensation for taking part in this study, others may benefit from the information we learn from the results of this study. Additionally, there are no foreseeable risks for taking part in this project. Participation is voluntary and there are no penalties for deciding not to participate, skipping questions, or withdrawing your participation. You may choose not to participate in this research without negatively impacting your relationship with your university or leadership program.

If you have any questions or concern about this project, please contact my supervising chair, Dr. L.G. Daniel or me . Please keep a print copy of the consent form for your records.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the chair of the UNF Institutional Review board by calling or emailing

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jason Dean Arnold
Email:

Dr. Larry G. Daniel
Email:

By clicking the link or button below, I acknowledge that I have read the information and agree to participate in this survey or interview. If you do not wish to participate, please close your browser at this time.

UNF IRB Number: 515111-2
Approval Date: 03-14-2014
Expiration Date: Exempt - None
Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB KLC

References

Abbate, F. J. (2010). Education leadership in a culture of compliance. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *91*(6), 35-37.

Abbott, C. J., & McKnight, K. (2010). Developing instructional leadership through collaborative learning. *AASA Journal of Scholarship & Practice, 7*(2), 20-26

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003) Context and leadership: An examination of the nine factor full range leadership theory using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*, 261-295. DOI:10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00030-4

Aspin, D. N. (1996). Education and the concept of knowledge: Implications for the curriculum and leadership. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 91-134). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *The multifactor leadership questionnaire: Third edition manual and sampler set.* Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *72*(4), 441-463.

Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. (1996). *Construct validation of the multifactor leadership questionnaire MLQ-Form 5X (CLS Report 96-1).* Binghamton: State University of New York, Center for Leadership Studies.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, *84*, 191-215.

Barnett, D. (2004). School leadership preparation programs: Are they preparing tomorrow's leaders?. *Education*, *125*, 121-129.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bass, B. M., Avolio, B. J., Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *72*, 441-462.

Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bentley, K. (2011). *An investigation of the self-perceived principal leadership styles in an era of accountability*. (Doctoral dissertation) Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3482394)

Bird, C. (1940). Social psychology. New York: Appleton-Century.

Blase, J. (1987). Dimensions of effective school leadership: The teacher's perspective. *American Educational Research Journal*, *24*(4), 589-610.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *35*(3), 349–378. doi: 10.1177/0013161X99353003

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (2004). *Handbook of instructional leadership.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Brackins, L. (2012). Examining principals espoused beliefs and actions. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3532343)

Brazer, D. & Bauer, S. C. (2013). Preparing instructional leaders: A model. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 49*(4), 645-684.

Brennan, M. S., & Hoek, J. (1992). The behavior of respondents, nonrespondents, and refusers across mail surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 56*, 530-535.

Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2003). Becoming a principal: Role conception, initial socialization, role-identity transformation, and purposeful engagement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *39*(4), 468–503.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership* [Kindle Edition]. Open Road Media. Retrieved from http://www.amazon.com/Leadership ebook/dp/B007MFECFU/ref=tmm_kin_title_0

Canole, M., & Young, M. (2013) *Standards for educational leaders: An analysis*. Council of Chief State School Officers. Washington, D.C.

Catano, N., & Stronge, J. H. (2007). What do we expect of school principals? congruence between principal evaluation and performance standards. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 10*(4), 379-399.

Childers, G. L. (2013). *Principals' perceptions of successful leadership*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. (1205)

Chenowith, K., & Theokas, C. (2012). Leading for learning. *American Educator, 36*(3), 24-33.

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155-159.

Corcoran, S. P., Schwartz, A. E., & Weinstein, M. (2012). Training your own: The impact of New York City's Aspiring Principals Program on student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 34*(2), 232–253.

Cotton, K., & Savard, W. (1980). *The principal as instructional leader: Research on school effectiveness project topic summary report.* Paper prepared for the Alaska State Department of Education, Office of Planning and Research, by the Northwest Regional Laboratory, Portland, OR.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders.* Retrieved from http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/isllcstd.pdf.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2008). *Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium 2008: Standards for School Leaders.* Washington, DC: Author.

Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods designs* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*(4), 349-354.

Culross, R. (2011). *Preparation for principalship: The perception of principals on their own preparation for the position*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3473861)

Daly, A. J., & Chrispeels, J. (2008). A question of trust: Predictive conditions for adaptive and technical leadership in educational contexts. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 7*(1), 30-63.

Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1994). Aspiring and practicing principals' perceptions of critical skills for beginning leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration, 32*(3), 33-45.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., Orr. M. T., & Cohen, C. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dillman, D. A. (1991). The design and administration of mail surveys. *Annual Review of Sociology, 17,* 225-249

Doh, J. P. (2003). Can leadership be taught? Perspectives of management educators. *Academy of Management Learning and Education, 2*(1), 54-67. doi: 10.5465/AMLE.2003.9324025

Donmoyer, R., Yennie-Donmoyer, J., & Galloway, F. (2012). The search for connections across principal preparation, principal performance, and student achievement in

an exemplary principal preparation program. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 7*(1), 5-43. doi: 10.1177/1942775112440631

Dufresne, P., McKenzie, A. S. (2009). A culture of ethical leadership. *Principal Leadership, 10*(2), 36-39.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*, 569-591.

Ellis, M. Y. (2012). *Novice principals' perceptions of effective leadership practices and their principal preparation programs*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3529200)

Elmore, R. F. (2004). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice, and performance.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Retrieved from http://www.shankerinstitute.org/.

Eshbach, E. C. (2008). *The symbiotic relationship between new principals and the climate of the schools in which they lead*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3303016)

Espinoza, S. (2013). *The effects of principal's transformational leadership behaviors on teacher leadership development and teacher self efficacy*. (Doctoral dissertation), Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3565648)

Estapa, A. L. (2009). *The relationship between the transformational leadership characteristics of principals, as perceived by teachers, and student achievement*

on standardized tests. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3378413)

Florida Association of School Administrators. (2012). *2012-2013 FASA Florida Education Directory*. Retrieved from website: http://www.fasa.net/ on November 15, 2013.

Fenn, W. L., & Mixon, J. (2011). An examination of self-perceived transformational leadership behaviors of Texas superintendents. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 6*(2). Retrieved from www.ncpeapublications.org on January 17, 2014.

Fielder, F. E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fink, S. & Markholt, A. (2011). *Leading for instructional improvement: How successful leaders develop teaching and learning expertise*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. DOI: Kindle Edition

Florida Department of Education, Bureau of Educator Recruitment, Development, & Retention. (2011). *2011 Florida principal leadership standards cross-referenced to contemporary research and key leadership writing*. Retrieved from website: http://www.fldoe.org/profdev/resources-TA.asp

Geijsel, F., Sleegers, P., Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2003). Transformational leadership effects on teacher commitment and effort toward school reform. *Journal of* Educational Administration, *41*(3), 228-256.

Goldring, E., Cravens, X. C., Murphy, J., Elliott, S. N., & Carson, B. (2008, March). *The evaluation of principals: What and how do states and districts assess leadership?*

Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York. Retrieved from http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/

Griffith, J. (2004). Relation of principal transformational leadership to school staff job satisfaction, staff turnover, and school performance. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*(3), 333-356.

Grissom, J. A., Loeb, S., & Master, B. (2013). Effective instructional time use for school leaders: Longitudinal evidence from observations of principals. *Educational Researcher, 42*(8), 433-444.

Gupton, S. L. (2010). *The instructional leadership toolbox: A handbook for improving practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. DOI: Kindle Edition

Gulbin, K. M. (2008). *Transformational leadership: Is it a factor for improving student achievement in high poverty secondary schools in Pennsylvania?* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3303551)

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329-351.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *32*(1), 5–44. doi: 10.1177/0013161X96032001002

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the Instructional Management Behavior of Principals. *The Elementary School Journal, 86*(2), 217-247.

Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., Well, M., Mesa, R. P., & Mitman, A. (1983). Identifying the specific practices, behaviors for principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 67(463), 83–91.

doi: 10.1177/019263658306746314

Hannigan, P. W. (2008). *A study of the principalship: Performance indicators of leadership standards and the work of principals.* (Doctoral dissertation), Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3324332)

Hardman, B. K. (2011). *Teacher's perceptions of their principal's leadership style and the effects on student achievement in improving and non-improving schools.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3482829)

Harter, S. (1982). The perceived competence scale for children. *Child Development, 53*(1), 87-97.

Harris, S. (2006). Best practices of award-winning public school principals: Implications for university preparation programs. *AASA, Journal of Scholarship & Practice, 3*(2). Retrieved from http://www.aasa.org/uploadedFiles/Publications/Journals/AASA_Journal_of_Scholarship_and_Practice/Summer06JSP_final.pdf on January 19, 2014.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1977). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hipp, K. A. (1996, April). *Teacher efficacy: Influence of principal leadership behavior*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED396409)

Huff, A. E. (2011). *Principals' perceptions of readiness for their evolving roles in high-stakes environments.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3491833)

Horn-Turpin, F. (2009). *A study examining the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on the factors of teaching efficacy, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as perceived by special education teachers.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Ibarra, L. A. (2008). *Transforming a school culture: Examining the leadership behaviors of successful principals.* (Doctoral dissertation), Available from Proquest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3315044)

Kaplan, L., & Nunnery, J. (2005). *Principal quality: A Virginia study connecting Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards with student achievement*. NASSP Bulletin, *89*(643), 28-44.

Kirby, P., Paradise, L. V., & King, M. (1992). Extraordinary leaders in education: Understanding transformational leadership. *Journal of Educational Research, 85*(5), 303-311.

Keys, M. R. (2010). *The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of middle school principals, the development of learning communities, and student achievement in rural middle schools in the Mississippi Delta*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3407427)

Klar, H. W., & Brewer, C. (2013). Successful leadership in high-needs schools: An examination of core leadership practices enacted in challenging contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *49*(5), 768-808. doi: 10.1177/0013161X13482577

Knapp, T. R. (1978) Canonical correlation analysis: A general parametric significance-testing system. *Psychological Bulletin*, *85*(2), 410-416.

Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (2000). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *38*(2), 192-212.

Johnson, Jr., J. F., & Uline, C. L. (2005). Preparing educational leaders to close achievement gaps. *Theory into Practice*, *44*, 45-52.

Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lanier, K. (2009). Principal instructional leadership: How does it influence an elementary science program amidst contradictory messages of reform and change? (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3374010)

Lapointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). *School leadership study developing successful principals preparing and supporting principals for effective leadership : Early findings from Stanford' s school leadership study*. Retrieved from http://seli.stanford.edu/research/documents/sls_early_findings.pdf

Larsen, T. J. (1984). *Identification of instructional leadership behaviors and the impact of their implementation on academic achievement*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (8508956)

Leece P., Bhandari M., Sprague S., Swiontkowski, M .F., Schemitsch, E. H.,Tornetta, P.,

III, Devereaux, P. J., & Guyatt, G. H. (2004). Internet versus mailed questionnaires: A randomized comparison (2). *Journal of Medical Internet Research, 6*(3), e38.

Leithwood, K. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 8-12.

Leithwood, K., & Sun, J. (2012). The nature and effects of transformational school leadership: A meta-analytic review of unpublished research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *48*(3), 387-423. doi: 10.1177/0013161X11436268

Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York, NY: Learning From Leadership Project, The Wallace Foundation.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, *28*(1), 27–42.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *44*(4), 496–528. doi: 10.1177/0013161X08321501

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times.* Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1997). Explaining variation in teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership: A replication. *Journal of Educational Administration*. *35*(4), 312-324.

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. The Education Schools Project, March 2005. Retrieved from http://www.edschools.org/index.htm

Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K. L., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Investigating the links to improved student learning*. Alexandria, VA: Educational Research Service.

Louis, K. S., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *21*(3), 315-336. doi: 10.1080/09243453.2010.486586

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, G., & Silvasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A metaanalytic review. *Leadership Quarterly*, *1*, 385-426.

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. (3391608)

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McGough, D. J. (2003). Leaders as learners: an inquiry into the formation and transformation of principals' professional perspectives. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *25*(4), 449-471.

Mertens, D. M. (2005). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Morris, M. B. (2011). *Teacher and principal beliefs about principal leadership behavior.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing.(3477176)

Moshavl, D., Brown, F. W., & Dodd, N. G. (2003). Leader self-awareness and its relationship to subordinate attitudes and performance. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *24*(7/8), 407-419.

Muenjohn, N., & Armstrong, A. (2008). Evaluating the structural validity of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ): Capturing the leadership factors of transformational-transactional leadership. *Contemporary Management Review*, *4*(1), 3-14.

Mulford, W., Silins, H., & Leithwood, K. (2004). *Educational leadership for organizational learning and improved student outcomes.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Murgel, J. C. (2011). *Preparing transformational school leaders: An investigation into leadership style* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3478338)

Murphy, J., & Shipman, N. (1998, April). *The interstate school leaders licensure consortium: A standards-based approach to strengthening educational leadership*. Paper presented at the annual meeting American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. (2007). *The good news about the preparation of school leaders: A professor's view.* Retrieved from the Connexions website at http://cnx.org/content/m14496/1.1/

Nederhof, A. 1985. Methods of coping with social desirability bias: a review. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 15*(3), 263-280.

Nelson, A. L. (2012). *The relationship between middle school teachers' perceptions of principals' transformational leadership practices, teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3530736)

Nettles, S. M., & Herrington, C. (2007). Revisiting the importance of the direct effects of school leadership on student achievement: The implications for school improvement policy. *Peabody Journal of Education, 82*(4), 724–736. doi: 10.1080/01619560701603239

Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *The Academy of Management Journal, 49*(2), 327-340.

Onorato, M. (2011) *A study of the relationship between principals' self-reported degree of transformational leadership and students' mathematics and reading achievement* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertation Publishing. (3510865)

Orr, M. T., & Orphanos, S. (2011). How graduate-level preparation influences the effectiveness of school leaders: A comparison of the outcomes of exemplary and conventional leadership preparation programs for principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*, 18-70. doi: 10.1177/0011000010378610

Perez, L. G., Uline, C. L., Johnson, J. F., James-Ward, C., & Basom, M. R. (2011). Foregrounding fieldwork in leadership preparation: The transformative

capacity of authentic inquiry. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *47*(1), 217–257. doi: 10.1177/0011000010378614

Pounder, D. G. (1995). Theory to practice in administrator preparation: An evaluation study. *Journal of School Leadership, 5,* 151-162.

Pounder, D. G. (2010). Leader preparation special issue: Implications for policy, practice, and research. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *47*(1), 258–267. doi: 10.1177/0011000010378615

Pugh, R. C., & Hu, Y. (1991). Use and interpretation of canonical correlation analyses in *Journal of Educational Research* articles: 1978-1989. *Journal of Educational Research, 84*(3), 147-152.

Robinson, D. L. (2007). *An evaluation of the preparation of assistant principals for instructional leadership*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3361411)

Sebring, P. B., & Bryk, A. S. (2000). School leadership and the bottom line in Chicago. *Phi Delta Kappan, 81*(6), 440-443.

Shipps, D., & White, M. (2009). A new politics of the principalship? Accountability driven change in New York City. *Peabody Journal of Education, 84*(3), 350–373.

Silins, H. (1994). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership and school improvement outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 5*(3), 272-298.

Sills, S. J., & Song, C. (2002). Innovations in survey research: An application of web-based surveys. *Social Science Computer Review, 20*(1), 22-30. doi: 10.1177/089443930202000103

Strike, D. L., Skovholt, T. M., Hummel, T. J. (2004). Mental health professionals' disability competence: Measuring self-awareness, perceived knowledge, and perceived skills. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 49*(4), 321-327. doi: 10.1037/0090-5550.49.4.321

Harris, A., & Spillane, J. (2008). Distributed leadership through the looking glass. *Management in Education, 22*(1), 31-34.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Barr, M. (2004). Fostering student achievement: The relationship between collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3*, 187-207.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42,* 573-585.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. (2005, November). *Cultivating principals' sense of efficacy: Supports that matter.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 783-805.

Thomas, J. L. J. (2005). *The impact of aspiring leaders programs on school culture, student achievement, and teacher professional development*. Unpublished dissertation. Morgan State University, Maryland.

Thompson, B. (1984). *Canonical correlation analysis: Uses and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tofallis, C. (1999). Model building with multiple dependent variables and constraints. *The Statistician, 48*(3), 371-378.

Toor, S., & Ofori, G. (2009). Ethical leadership: Examining the relationships with full range leadership model, employee outcomes, and organizational culture. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *90*(4), 533-547. doi: 10.1007/s10551-009-0059-3

Tucker, B., & Russell, R. F. (2004). The influence of the transformational leader. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *10*(4), 103-111.

Unruh, A. L. (2011). *The readiness of middle school assistant principals to become principals*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (DP19518)

Wahlstrom, K. L., Louis, K. S., Leithwood, K., & Anderson, S. E. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning. The informed educator series*. Alexandria, VA: Educational Research Service. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/870283098?accountid=10920

Werner, P. M. (2007). *Elementary school principals' perceptions of factors that should be included in principal preparation programs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3290010)

West, M. R., & Peterson, P. E. (2003). The politics and practice of accountability. In M. West & P. Peterson (Eds.), *No child left behind? The politics and practice of accountability* (1st ed, pp.1-22). New York, NY: Brookings Institution Press.

Xu, Z. X. (2010). *The relationship between principal's perceived leadership behaviors and teachers' perceptions* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3468993)

Yeldell, P. A. (2012). *The relationship between principals' perception of their leadership style and teachers' perception of their job satisfaction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing. (3547204)

Young, M. D., Crow, G. M., Orr, M. T., Ogawa, R., & Crieghton, T. (2005). An educative look at "Educating school leaders". *UCEA Review, 46*(2). Retrieved from www.ucea.org.