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In this paper, the research on the perceptions of gender differences in leadership styles is explored. The study also attempts to determine whether there are differences in overall school performance for male versus female school principals. The methodology involved a mixed-model ANOVA analysis of findings from 31 principals and 236 teachers across elementary, middle, and high school. This study revealed no significant differences in overall school performance or in the relationship between gender and leadership style for male versus female principals. The paper culminates in a series of recommendations for future research and policies and procedures.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Chapter I provides an introduction to this research study. Included in Chapter I are background information, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions and hypotheses, definitions of terms, assumptions, delimitations, and justifications for the study. Chapter II includes a review of related literature and the theoretical foundation for the study. Chapter III explains the methodology; Chapter IV reports the results; and Chapter V discusses the results, limitations, impact on policy and practice, and recommendations for further related studies.

Background

Does gender play a role in being an effective school leader? Determining gender differences in leadership styles and perceptions of teachers and the impact of this relation on school performance continues to be an intriguing matter to researchers in the field of leadership. The research regarding gender differences in leadership styles has proven to be inconsistent. However, according to Harris (2005), there is a wealth of information to support the quality of leadership positively improves teaching and learning.

Schools are major organizations whose daily operational smoothness and academic performance are all influenced to some degree by the principal, teachers, and the students. According to Barth (1989), the principal is the instructional leader who sets and establishes the school climate and the mission and vision for the school. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) conducted two meta-analyses on school-level leadership and its effects on student achievement. The results showed that 21 leadership responsibilities including 66 specific leadership behaviors had significant and direct
impact on student achievement. Johnson (1990) reported that teachers’ views of the principal also had a significant effect on student performance at school and their attitudes towards the workplace. Charters and Jovick (1981) added that the principal’s gender could affect teachers’ attitudes and their behaviors in the workplace. Powell (1993) noted that women and men do not differ in their effectiveness as leaders, although some situations favor women and others favor men. Bass (1990) acknowledged some evidence that male leaders were evaluated more favorable than female leaders but attributed this to observers’ biases and stereotyped expectations.

Eagly and Johnson (1990) indicated that there are several factors in organizational make-ups that guide the direction of gender differences in leadership styles. They reported that the sex composition of the organization significantly impacts the leadership styles displayed by males and females.

Statement of the Problem

As women achieve more in school leadership and managerial positions, it becomes increasingly important to understand the nature and extent of the similarities and differences between female and male leaders. How do these differences impact student achievement and overall school performance? As stated earlier by Powell (1993), there are situations that favor men and others favor women, so does this make a difference in school settings and how do we determine if the gender makes a difference in overall school performance? The research has provided no conclusive evidence to support whether or not gender makes a difference in the expectations for teacher performance or school performance. It is hoped that this study can determine if gender makes a difference in leadership and school performance.
Women administrators are often confronted with challenges regarding the impact of gender stereotyping pertaining to the ability of a female to lead. Much of the literature written attempts to portray the male as more independent, objective, competitive, and better able to handle positions of leadership than what is described as the typical gentle, sensitive, and passive female (Infante, Rancer, & Jordan 1996; Scarlette, 1979; Shakeshaft, 1987). According to Shakeshaft (1987), teachers prefer male to female principals. Whereas Hoff and Mitchell (2008) contended that gender still plays a role in how the leadership abilities of women principals are perceived. Book (2000) stated that the leadership styles of women and men are different, mainly along the lines of women being less hierarchical, more cooperative and collaborative, and more oriented to enhancing others’ self-worth than men.

Some researchers state that women typically bring to administrative positions an approach to leadership that is consistent with developmental, collaborative, and relationship-oriented behaviors (Wallin & Crippen, 2007). These behaviors are seen as more compatible than traditional male behaviors with the idealized view of leadership. This leads one to question whether these leadership behaviors are specific to gender and have a direct impact in student achievement. This study seeks to examine the gender-related leadership behaviors of male versus female principals and the influence, or lack of influence, on student achievement.

Purpose of Study

The primary purpose of this study is to determine if there are gender differences in leadership styles for male versus female principals and the impact of the gender of the school leader on school performance. This study will also attempt to determine if male
versus female teachers perceive the leadership styles of their leaders differently. Additionally, this study will attempt to determine if male versus female teachers perceive the leadership styles of male versus female school leaders differently. Finally, the study will determine if there are differences in overall school performance for male versus female school leaders.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Questions

The following research questions will guide this study:

1. Are there gender differences in leadership style for male versus female school administrators?
2. Do male versus female teachers perceive the leadership styles of their leaders differently?
3. Do male versus female teachers perceive the leadership styles of male versus female school leaders differently?
4. Are there differences in overall school performance for male versus female school leaders?
5. Is school performance related to teacher perceptions of their leader’s styles?

Hypotheses

$H_1$. There will be no gender differences in leadership styles for male versus female principals.

$H_2$. There will be no difference in male versus female teacher perceptions of leadership styles of their leader.
$H_3$. There will be no differences in male versus female teacher perceptions of the leadership style of male versus female leaders.

$H_4$. There will be no difference in overall school performance for male versus female school leaders.

$H_5$. There will be no relation between school performance and teacher perceptions of their leader’s leadership styles.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms need to be defined:

*Gender* - Gender refers to the culturally created qualities of men and women separate from their biological differences (Brandser, 1996).

*Leadership styles* - A comprehensive definition of leadership is a process in which an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Northouse, 2004). Leadership styles are described as those behaviors associated with leaders and it can be divided into two clearly independent dimensions: the task dimension that includes goal setting, organization, direction, and control; and the relationship dimension involving support, communication, interaction, and active listening (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

*Middle School* - A school in the U.S. for students between the ages of 11 and 14. Middle schools in Georgia are commonly recognized as schools with grades six through eight (American Heritage Dictionary).

*Principal* - The principal is someone who is in charge of a school. (American Heritage Dictionary).
School performance - Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is one of the cornerstones of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. School performance is defined by the AYP status of a school, meeting or not meeting AYP (NCLB Act, 2001).

Assumptions

This study is based on the following assumptions:

1. All participants will honestly answer all questions on the survey.
2. It is assumed that all teacher participants are representatives of the entire school.
3. All teachers are voluntarily participating and they have no negative feelings towards current or previous principals.
4. There is some concern about the number of principals and teacher participants and the personal perceptions and bias towards male or female principals.
5. The survey will be easy to understand and completion will consume very little time.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to 110 elementary, middle, and high school principals who randomly selected a sample of teachers at their schools to determine the principal leadership style and the expectations for teacher performance. Ten teachers were randomly selected from each school, five male teachers, and five female teachers. The teachers’ email addresses, names, gender were secured for each of the schools. The principal sample included 69 elementary principals, 25 middle school principals, and 16 high schools of which 80 are female principals and 30 are male principals. The study was delimited to one large school district in the Southeastern region of the United States.
responsible for educating over 106,000 students in a diverse, constantly changing suburban area in the Southeastern region of the United States.

Justification

The completion of this study is necessary to further explore the impact of gender differences in expectations for teachers and the impact of these expectations on overall school performance. Do male versus female principals have different expectations for teacher performance and if they do how does this impact student achievement? The literature reviews how leadership styles impact student outcomes, but when looking at another variable of gender and expectations, it is hoped that this study will add to the existing body of knowledge and provide some insight that will assist school districts in identifying the most appropriate leadership style based upon the characteristics and climate of individual schools. If we are able to identify a relationship between gender and leadership, it could also provide some insight for future school leaders and/or college preparation programs.

This female leader finds this study to be important because there are so many stereotypical perceptions associated with male and female principals. It is hoped that the results of this study may help readers to better understand the differences between male and female principals. The research on gender differences in leadership styles has thus far shown a tendency towards being very similar rather than different. The inconsistencies in the findings, suggest that additional research in the area may provide an insight and assist in clarifying these inconsistencies. As well, it is anticipated that the results of this study can serve as a measuring tool for future gender-related studies in educational leadership research.
Summary

In summary, the research on gender differences in leadership styles has revealed a tendency towards similarity rather than difference. The inconsistencies in the findings suggest that there is a need to take a closer examination at why the findings are so diverse. Gollnick and Chinn (2002) reported that stereotypes of women in leadership roles produce obstacles for women, evidenced by gender differences in expectations, job prestige and salary, and opportunities in schools. The results from this study can help determine if gender makes a difference in leadership and overall school performance and if there are differences between the school levels, as well. The real issue in leadership differences lies in the equity in selecting the right person with the appropriate skills and qualities to ensure the effectiveness and success of the organization (Barker 2000; Bass & Avolio, 1994). According to Shakeshaft (1987):

The point of examining these differences is not to say one approach is right and one is wrong, but rather to help us understand that males and females may be coming from very different perspectives, and that unless we understand these differences, we are not likely to work well together (p. 205).

Chapter I provided an overview of the research study. Chapter II will include a literature review and theoretical foundation for the study, Chapter III will provide the methodology of the study, Chapter IV will present the results of the study, and Chapter V will discuss the conclusions and implications for policy and practice and for future research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Not only does leadership capacity dictate current performance, but it is also a crucial factor in the readiness of organizations to face the future (DTI, 2003). Day (2004) emphasized that leadership can be found at all levels of an organization: “Leadership processes are those that generally enable groups of people to work together in meaningful ways, whereas management processes are considered to be position-and organization-specific” (p. 582).

Some studies have reported that the leadership behavior of a principal and his or her role as an instructional leader has a significant impact on creating more effective schools thereby leading to higher levels of student achievement (Cotton, 2003; Gold et al., 2003; Quinn, 2002). Cotton (2003) has asserted that the following types of behaviors by a principal have a significant impact on student achievement:

1. The establishment of a clear focus on student learning by having a vision, clear learning goals, and high expectations for learning for all students;

2. Developing a school culture conducive to teaching and learning through shared leadership and decision-making, collaboration, risk taking leading to continuous improvement;

3. Providing instructional leadership through discussions of instructional issues, observing classroom teaching and giving feedback, supporting teacher autonomy and protecting instructing time; and
4. Being accountable for affecting and supporting continuous improvements through monitoring progress and using student progress data for program improvements (Cotton, 2003).

Cotton (2003) conducted a narrative review of the literature in her book *Principals and Student Achievement: What the Research Says*. Cotton’s work was a meta-analysis of 81 reports. Forty-six of those reports dealt with the influence of principal leadership on student achievement, 10 dealt with the effect of principal leadership on student attitudes, eight with student behavior, 15 with teacher attitudes, four with teacher behavior, and three with dropout rates. Cotton (2003) identified 25 categories of principal behavior that positively affected student achievement, student attitude, student behavior, teacher attitudes, teacher behaviors, and dropout rates. The twenty-five categories include:

1. Safe and orderly environment;
2. Vision and goals focused on high levels of student learning;
3. High expectations for student learning;
4. Self-confidence, responsibility, and perseverance;
5. Visibility and accessibility;
6. Positive and supportive climate;
7. Communication and interaction;
8. Emotional and interpersonal support;
9. Parent and community outreach and involvement;
10. Rituals, ceremonies, and other symbolic actions;
11. Shared leadership, decision making, and staff empowerment;
12. Collaboration;
13. Instructional leadership;
14. Ongoing pursuit of high levels of student learning;
15. Norm of continuous improvement;
16. Discussion of instructional issues;
17. Classroom observation and feedback to teachers;
18. Support of teachers’ autonomy;
19. Support of risk taking;
20. Professional development opportunities and resources;
21. Protecting instructional time;
22. Monitoring student progress for program improvement;
23. Use of student progress for program improvement;
24. Recognition of student and staff achievement; and
25. Role modeling.

Extensive studies demonstrate that particular leadership styles of school leaders could have positive impacts on teaching and learning environments and processes leading to improvements in student performance and academic achievements (Day, 2004; Hale & Rollins, 2006; Harris, 2004; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). From this information, one can conclude that the school leadership provided and/or shared by a school administrator is one of the key factors in enhancing school performances and student achievement. Harris (2004) completed two studies of successful school leadership in the United Kingdom, involving parents, pupils, teachers, governors, senior managers, and head teachers. He asserted that successful leadership in schools has resulted in higher levels of both student
attainment and achievements, emphasizing the importance of distributed leadership. He also shared that these findings have identified the limitation of a singular leadership approach in securing school improvements (Harris 2004).

Several research studies have shown that high quality leadership has a significant impact on both pupil academic and non-academic outcomes. Leithwood, Louis, Andersen, and Wahlstorm (2004) shared leadership not only matters, but it is also second only to teaching among school-related factors in its impact on student learning—the impact of leadership tends to be greatest in schools where the learning needs of students are most acute. There is a wealth of evidence to suggest that the quality of leadership positively enhances teaching and learning (Harris, 2005; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

School-level factors such as leadership, organizational learning, and teachers’ work have a significant impact on non-academic student outcomes such as participation in school, academic self-concept, and engagement with the school (Hargreaves & Fink, 2006). According to Leithwood, Day, Sammonss, Harris, and Hopkins (2006), there is not a single documented case of a school successfully turning around its pupil achievement trajectory in the absence of talented leadership. One explanation for this is that leadership serves as a catalyst for unleashing the potential capacities that already exist in the organization (Leithwood et al, 2006).

According to Hallinger (1992), two primary images of school principalship have prevailed in recent decades—instructional and transformational leadership. In a review of literature on instructional leadership, Murphy (1990) noted that principals in productive schools, schools in which quality of teaching and learning were strong,
demonstrated instructional leadership both directly and indirectly. Investigating three domains of principal instructional leadership, Heck, Larsen, and Marcoulides (1990) demonstrated both direct and indirect effects on student achievement for their measures of principal influence operating through school governance, instructional organization, and school climate. Marzano (2003) identified three major categories that impact student achievement: school practices, classroom practices, and student characteristics. The school practices showed the profound impact that school leadership had on student achievement. The 61 leadership practices identified in Marzano’s (2003) metaanalysis were later studied, analyzed, and categorized into 21 leadership practices that impact student achievement (Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005)

Leithwood et al., (2006) conducted a review of literature on effective school leadership. This study suggested the following elements represent successful school leadership:

1. School leadership is second only to classroom teaching as an influence on pupil learning.

2. Almost all successful leaders draw on the same basic repertoire of leadership practices.

3. The ways in which leaders apply these basic leadership practices, not the practices themselves, demonstrate responsiveness to the contexts in which they work.

4. School leaders improve teaching and learning indirectly through their influence on staff motivation, commitment and working conditions.
5. School leadership has a greater influence on schools and students when it is widely distributed.

6. Some patterns if distribution are more effective than others.

7. A small handful of personal traits explain a high proportion of the variation in leadership effectiveness.

As the body of knowledge on leadership grows in management, business, and marketing research, debate about leadership styles, skills, and effectiveness also expands (Thompson, 2000). Traditionally, management scholars developed and investigated authoritarian versus participative styles of leadership and distinctions between styles (McWhinney, 1997; Thompson, 2000). Much of the research in leadership has fueled a debate about whether to measure leadership in terms of inherent ability, skills, or style. Some scholars have asserted that all these aspects are integral to understanding leadership (Aldoory & Toth, 2004). McWhinney (1997) explained that skills are a complex matter of heritage and training. Effectiveness is a question of match to a situation, while styles define the normal behaviors that follow from the world-view that one maintains (McWhinney, 1997). Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) contended leadership is the demonstration of research-based responsibilities and specific practices or behaviors implemented by the school leader.

Theories of Leadership

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership, which is also called authoritative leadership, serves to articulate and establish positions held by the leader (McWhinney, 1997). Primary characteristics of this leadership style include certainty, clear direction, personal
oversight, and perceptions of *just treatment* (Cruz, Henningsen, & Smith, 1999). *Just treatment* is defined as the idea that if the leader receives a benefit such as quality work performance or productivity, he or she will give a benefit such as pay or advantages. This denotes the transactional nature of this style of leadership (Cruz et al., 1999; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). Burns (1978) reported transactional leaders are more task-oriented using a system of rewards and punishment. Transactional leadership has also been associated more with masculine leadership styles (Guido-DiBrito, Noteboom, Nathan, & Fenty, 1996). Helgeson (1990) stated that female leaders are more likely to be transformational and men are more transactional.

**Transformational Leadership**

Transformational leadership, also called *charismatic leadership*, is one of the most studied style of leadership (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1990; Gastil, 1994; Lowe et al., 1996; Pawar & Eastman, 1997; Shamir, Zakay, Breinin, & Popper, 1998; Yammarino, Dubinsky, Comer, & Jolson, 1997; Yukl, 1994). Transformational leadership is marked by the unique qualities surrounding charisma or the power to captivate and energize a following (McWhinney, 1997). Kouzes and Posner (1995) actually defined leadership in terms of transformational leadership as the “the art of mobilizing others to want to struggle for shared aspirations” (n.d.). Transformational leaders are distinguished by their risk taking, goal articulation, high expectations, and emphasis on collective identity, self-assertion, and vision (Ehrhart & Klein, 2001; McWhinney, 1997). The central role of the charismatic leader is to use his or her vision to create meaning and symbols for followers, in order for them to change (Fairhurst, 2001).
Bass’ (1985) theory of transformational leadership suggests that leadership goes beyond exchanging rewards for desired performance by developing intellectually, stimulating, and inspiring followers to transcend their own self-interests for a higher purpose, mission, or vision. Bass and Avolio (1990) suggested that transformational leaders stimulate and develop followers. The leaders try to help followers work toward the common vision and to be involved in the decisions of the organization.

Transformational leadership is more democratic in style and involves others in decision-making, empowers others, encourages collaboration. (Guido-DiBrito et al., 1996).

Full-Range Leadership Model

Bass and Avolio (1994) later proposed the Full-Range Leadership Model. This model suggested that transformational and transactional leadership behaviors can optimize organizational effectiveness when demonstrated appropriately and at the desired frequency, resulting in transformation through higher-order change. Transactional leadership is focused on motivating followers by exchanging rewards for performance of job expectations. It is a fundamental leadership practice in which a leader identifies roles, expectations, and performance parameters. This practice guides followers to desired results. In contrast, a transformational leader interacts with followers in ways that stimulate thinking, inspire their performance, and result in performances beyond expectations. Transformational leaders attempt to radically influence the viewpoint of followers about their perception of what is important about their jobs. Followers of this model are encouraged to rethink the context in which work is accomplished and their role as contributors to the organization’s accomplishments. As a result, transformational leadership can result in performance and development beyond expectations, and can help
organizations achieve fundamental or higher-order change (Smith, Matkin, & Fritz, 2004).

*Pluralistic Leadership*

Pluralistic leadership is characterized by participative decision-making, the recognition of other people, and placing value on others’ opinions. (Aldoory & Toth, 2004). This style is other centered, emphasizing the development of followers to accomplish system goals (McWhinney, 1997). These democratic leaders facilitate discussion and involve followers in goal setting and task completion (Cruz et al., 1999).

Edward Deming (1986) is known as the founder of total quality management (TQM). Although it was created for the world of business, it has had a strong influence on leadership practices in education (Marzano et al., 2005). Deming defined 14 principles that pertain to organizations of all types. Waldman (1994) proposed that Deming’s 14 points can be organized into five basic factors that define the actions of an effective leader: change agency, team work, continuous improvement, trust building, and eradication of short-term goals.

Sosik and Dionne (1997) defined change agency as the leader’s ability to stimulate change in an organization. According to their research the leader creates this change by analyzing the organizations’ need for change, isolating and eliminating structures and routines that work against change, creating a shared vision and sense of urgency, implanting plans and structures that enable change, and fostering open communication. One of the distinguishing features of TQM is the importance of teams within an organization. Sosik and Dionne (1997) defined teams as
…consist(ing) of two or more individuals with complementary skills who interact with each other toward a common task-oriented purpose. Team members consider themselves to be collectively accountable for the attainment of their goals. Teams are formed to serve organizational interests within departments, and across departments and divisions (p. 449).

Sosik and Dionne (1997) described trust building as “the process of establishing respect and instilling faith into followers based on leader integrity, honesty, and openness” (p. 452). Leaders establish an atmosphere of trust by their daily actions. Sosik and Dionne (1997) further explained specific actions leaders must exhibit including knowing the concerns of employees, knowing what motivates employees, and knowing the necessary conditions for employees to operate at levels of maximum effectiveness.

The last factor of TQM is the eradication of short-term goals. According to Sosik and Dionne (1997), Deming had a dislike for such goals and their emphasis on short-term quantitative results. The goals that he advocated were focused more on process and the long-term perspective. They suggested that the effective leader not only helps with establishing the criteria around which goals are established, but also participates in the goals’ design and implementation.

Greenleaf (1970, 1977) believed that effective leadership emerges from a desire to help others. This perspective stands in sharp contrast to those theories that emphasize control or overseeing those within the organization (Marzano et al., 2005). Marzano et al. (2005) points out that servant leadership has a unique perspective on the position of the leader within the organization. Instead of occupying a position at the top of a hierarchy, the servant leader is at the center of the organization. Marzano et al. (2005)
further explains that this implies that the servant leader is in contact with all aspects of the organization and the individuals within it as opposed to interacting with a few high-level managers. Critical skills of servant leadership include the following:

1. Understanding the personal needs of those within the organization;
2. Healing wounds caused by conflict within the organization;
3. Being a steward of the resources of the organization;
4. Developing the skills of those within the organization; and
5. Being an effective listener.

Situational Leadership

Hersey and Blanchard are associated with the work of situational leadership (Blanchard, Carew, & Parisi-Carew, 1991). The basic principle underlying situational leadership is that the leader adapts leadership behavior to followers’ maturity, based on their willingness and ability to perform a specific task. Marzano et al. (2005) described the four leadership styles:

1. When followers are unable and unwilling to perform a given task, the leader directs the followers’ actions without much concern for personal relationships. This leadership style is referred to as high task-low relationship focus, or the *telling style*;
2. When followers are unable but willing to perform the task, the leader interacts with followers in a friendly manner but still provides concrete direction and guidance. This style is referred to as high task-high relationship focus, or the *participating style*; and
3. When followers are able but unwilling to perform the task, the leader does not have to provide much direction or guidance but must persuade followers to engage in the task. This style is referred to as low task-low relationship focus, or the *selling* style.

*Instructional Leadership*

Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinback (1999) noted instructional leadership was one of the most frequently mentioned educational leadership concepts in North America and despite its popularity, it was not well defined. The definition of instructional leadership that has gained the highest level of recognition over the years is that by Wilma Smith and Richard Andrews (1989). They identified four roles or dimensions of an instructional leader: as a resource provider the principal ensures that teachers have the materials, facilities, and budget necessary to adequately perform their duties. As an instructional resource the principal actively supports day-to-day instructional activities and programs by modeling desired behaviors, participating in in-service training, and consistently giving priority to instructional concerns. As a communicator the principal has clear goals for the school and articulates those goals to faculty and staff. As a visible presence the principal engages in frequent classroom observations and is highly accessible to faculty and staff.

*Other Leadership Principles/Influences*

There are a number of other prominent theorists who have also greatly influenced leadership practice in K-12 education, but perhaps did not have a specific style associated with them. The following paragraphs will summarize a few of them. In his book *On Becoming a Leader*, Bennis (2003) forecasted the behaviors necessary for leadership in
the 21st century. He focused on the future and emphasizes that modern leaders must not rely on their personal skills or charisma to produce change. Bennis (2003) identified four characteristics of effective leadership. He indicated that leaders must be able to engage others through creation of a shared vision. According to Bennis (2003), leaders must have a clear voice that is distinctive to constituents. Leaders’ voices should be characterized by a sense of purpose, a sense of self, and self-confidence. Third, leaders must operate from a strong moral code and a belief in a higher good that fuels their efforts. Finally, Bennis stated that leaders must have the ability to adapt to relentless pressure to change. Bennis and Nanus (2003) related this characteristic to Burn’s (1978) notion of transformational leadership.

Peter Block (2003) framed leadership as the act of effective questioning. Specifically, he suggested that asking how questions too early in the change process undermines the power of dialogue. Block (2003) further explained that effective leaders are social architects who create a social space that enhances or inhibits the effectiveness of an organization. Block believed that critical leadership skills include convening critical discussions, naming the question, focusing discussion on learning as opposed to premature closure on solutions, and using strategies for participative design of solutions.

Through their work with the Gallup Corporation, Bunningham and Clifton (2001) identified 34 signature talents or strengths that individuals in an organization might possess. They explain that each individual is strong in a few of these talents and weak in some. Bunningham and Clifton (2001) proposed that to build a “strengths-based organization, a leader should spend a great deal of time selecting the right people and legislate outcomes as opposed to the style or manner in which outcomes are
accomplished” (p. 17). Bunningham and Clifton (2001) also suggested training on building identified strengths and avoiding the promotion of people to positions in which their strengths are not an asset. Stated differently leaders should avoid promoting people out of their areas of strength.

James Collins (2001) has also highly influenced leadership in education with his work, Good to Great (2001). Collins’ (2001) research indicated that the difference between good companies and great companies is the presence of what he refers to as Level 5 leaders. Collins explained that Level 5 leaders are more interested in building a great company than are they are in drawing attention to themselves. They blend personal humility with intense personal will. Collins (2001) further explained that these individuals exhibit intense commitment to doing what matters most in their companies regardless of the difficulties. When things go wrong, they tend to look inward for the reasons as opposed to ascribing blame to external factors. Collins (2001) described other factors associated with Level 5 leaders:

1. Relying on high standards as the primary vehicle for attaining goals, as opposed to personal charisma;
2. Surrounding themselves with the right people to do the job;
3. Creating a culture of discipline;
4. Honestly looking at the facts regarding their companies; and
5. Entertaining difficult questions regarding the future of their companies.

The work of Stephen Covey (1992), like that of Collins, has also been highly influential in education. Covey (1992) is best-known for his work in the book, The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People, in which he suggested that there are seven behaviors
that generate positive results in a variety of situations. Covey framed these habits as directives for leaders:

1. **Be proactive** – control your environment as opposed to letting it control you;
2. **Begin with the end in mind** – as a leader always keep the goals of the organization in mind;
3. **Put first things first** – focus on those behaviors that are directly related to the goals of the organization;
4. **Think win-win** – ensure that all members of the organization benefit when the goals of the organization are realized;
5. **Seek first to understand and then to be understood** – establish strong lines of communication by listening to and understanding the needs of those within the organization;
6. **Synergize** – cooperation and collaboration will produce more than can be expected from the isolated efforts of individuals; and
7. **Sharpen the saw** – learn from previous mistakes and develop skills to ensure that they are not repeated; take care of your own renewal as a leader.

In Covey’s book, *Principle-Centered Leadership* (1992), he built on the seven habits as the basic principles of effective leadership. However, he focused on the need for leaders to have a strong sense of purpose in their own lives and principles that guide their actions day-to-day. Covey (1992) believed that effective leaders communicate by their actions a clear sense of purpose and what their lives represent.

Richard Elmore (2000) provided a different understanding of the role of leadership. He agreed with those who promote instructional leadership in that he
emphasizes the importance of understanding effective practices in curriculum, instruction, and assessment and the ability to work with teachers on the day-to-day problems related to these topics. He warned that the knowledge base one must have to provide guidance on curriculum, instruction, and assessment has to be vast. Elmore’s (2000) solution is an organization that distributes the responsibility for leadership. He calls for the use of distributed models of leadership as opposed to models that look to the principal to provide all leadership functions for the school.

Another influential contribution to the theory of leadership is the work of Fullan (1993). His work has focused on the process of change and leadership for change. In Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform (1993), Fullan argued that educational reformers are fighting a battle that is not winnable given that the system has a propensity to continually seek change but is inherently averse to it. He offered no simple solution to the problem but suggests new ways of thinking about change that include seeking problems as opportunities, realizing that change cannot be mandated, ensuring that individualism and collectivism have equal power, and designing schools to be learning communities.

Heifetz and Linsky (2002a, 2002b) discussed the need to adapt leadership behavior to the requirements of the situation. They identified three distinctive types of situations an organization might encounter. Type I situations are those for which traditional solutions will typically suffice. These situations usually involved problems that were part of the normal day-to-day life of an organization.

Heifetz and Linsky (2002a, 2002b) indicated that leadership behaviors that are most appropriate for Type I situations include establishing routines and operating
procedures and protecting staff from problems that might distract them from their work.

Type II situations are those for which traditional solutions will not suffice. Leadership behaviors for these situations include providing resources that help those in the organization identify new ways of addressing problems.

Finally, Type III situations were those that cannot be adequately addressed within the context of an organization’s current beliefs and values. These situations often require the leader to use conflict to facilitate the evolution of new beliefs and values that allow for actions not possible within the context of the old system. In Type III situations, leaders use their authority to shift responsibility for the success of the organization to stakeholders.

**Gender Differences in Leadership Effectiveness**

Eagly’s (1987) social-role theory of sex differences in social behavior yielded predictions about the effectiveness of male and female leaders. Eagly (1987) maintained that as a general tendency people are expected to engage in activities that are consistent with their culturally defined gender roles. Eagly (1987) further explained that social pressures external to individuals generally favor gender role consistent behavior. To some extent, people internalize cultural expectations about their sex and are, consequently, intrinsically motivated to act in a manner consistent with their gender roles.

According to Eagly (1987), this could be problematic for women occupying leadership or managerial roles because of the alignment of these social roles with stereotypical male qualities and therefore with male gender role (Heilman, Block, Martell, & Simon, 1989; Schein, 1985). Numerous organizational theorists have argued that female managers may often face a degree of role conflict (Bass, 1990; Bayes &
Newton, 1978; Kruse & Wintermantel, 1986; Martin, 1992). Eagly (1987) explains that if females violate their associates’ gender expectations, they may be subjected to prejudiced reactions which may include biased performance evaluations and negative preconceptions about future performance. Although competent female managers may win over skeptics in the long run and overcome any lack of self-confidence, male leaders may have an advantage over female leaders and may be somewhat more effective on the average because they are less likely to be subjected to prejudiced reactions.

As Sheppard (1992) argued, many female managers may strive to display a sufficiently businesslike and professional behavior to deem themselves as credible as managers while remaining sufficiently feminine to not challenge associates’ assumptions about gender. Consistent with this reasoning, Eagly and Johnson’s (1990), synthesis of studies that compared the leadership styles of women and men who occupied the same leadership or managerial role showed that on the average, female leaders adopted a relatively democratic and participative style consistent with the female gender role.

A structural perspective considered only the formal role structure of groups and organizations and suggests that leadership or managerial roles provide powerful guides to behavior, aside from the sex of the role occupant (Kanter, 1997). Phillips and Lord (1982), indicated that people develop expectations about the behavior of leaders or managers and these specific expectations should be important determinants of behavior, far more important than expectations based on gender. The structural perspective suggested that men and women who occupy the same leader role elicit similar reactions from others and are equally effective, as long as they have equivalent access to status and power. (Kanter, 1997).
Another perspective took into account the differential selection of men and women for leadership. This argument follows from the assumption that women more than men face formidable barriers to achieving positions of leadership (Kanter, 1997). Eagly and Karau (1991), in a meta-analysis of studies of initially leaderless groups showed that men were more likely to emerge as leaders. A preference for men in managerial roles in organizations, at higher levels, has also been documented (Bowman, Worthy, & Greyser, 1965; Sutton & Moore, 1985). According to Powell and Butterfield (1994), women anticipate a glass ceiling and they may be less likely to apply for leadership positions than equally qualified men. Because of the barriers that women face in achieving leadership roles, whatever the source of these barriers, those women who attain these roles may be more qualified and competent than their male counterparts (Craig & Jacobs, 1985). They further explained that the old adage that a woman has to be twice as good as a man is valid. Women may be superior performers in the longer run as they work to erode negative preconceptions about their competence.

The contingency theory suggested that leaders’ effectiveness depends on their style of leading in interaction with features of the situation (Bass, 1990). From this perspective, women and men may differ in effectiveness, to the extent of that they have chronically different leadership styles. Contingency theories raised the controversial issue of whether women and men differ in leadership style (Bass, 1990; Chemers, 1997; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992).

Eagly and Johnson (1990) investigated sex-related differences in leadership style. In an earlier synthesis of 162 leadership studies that produced 370 comparisons between men and women. They reported that leadership styles tended to be somewhat gender
stereotypic in laboratory experiments. However leadership styles appeared slightly stereotypic in assessment studies that investigated the leadership styles of people not selected to occupy leadership roles (e.g., samples of employees or students). According to Eagly and Johnson (1990), women tended to manifest relatively interpersonally oriented and democratic styles, whereas men tended to manifest relatively task-oriented and autocratic styles.

The only difference noted in the studies between female and male managers was that women adopted more democratic or participative style and a less autocratic or directive style than did men. Eagly and Johnson (1990), also noted that sex-related differences in leadership style may reflect prejudice directed toward female leaders who adopt more masculine styles, consistent with such styles’ violation of the norms associated with the female gender role. However, these sex-related differences could also be influenced by various other causes, such as (a) personality and ability differences especially women’s greater social skills and interest in other people (Eagly & Wood, 1991); (b) the learning of different styles of influence in sex-segregated play groups (e.g. Maccoby); or (c) biologically grounded differences between the sexes (e.g., Kenrick & Trost, 1993).

Sex differences in leadership style could be consequential for leaders’ effectiveness because contingency theorists have focused on aspects of style that are inclusive of this distinction between participative and directive leadership (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). The details of the theories’ predictions differed, and all of these theories predicted that relations between leadership style and effectiveness are moderated by situational variables. For example, Fielder’s contingency theory (Fielder, 1967; Fielder
and Chemers, 1984) suggested that directive task-oriented managerial behavior would be effective only in certain situations with simple tasks in relatively structured situations when the leader has good relationships with subordinates as well as in especially difficult situations that lack all of these features.

Vroom and Yetton’s decision-making model (Vroom & Jago, 1988; Vroom & Yetton, 1973) was in general agreement with Fielder’s predictions but it included additional moderating variables such as the likelihood of conflict among subordinates. In contrast, House’s (1971) path-goal theory suggested that a directive style would be effective to the extent that tasks are ambiguous and therefore would benefit from the leader’s directive structuring (House & Mitchell, 1974). Drenth and Koopman (1984) argued that a participative style is generally facilitative for short-term routine decisions, but that its effects are more variable for longer term, strategic decisions. Given the variety and complexity of these contingency theories, Eagly and Johnson (1990) were not able to test the power of contingency theories to account for any observed sex differences in leaders’ effectiveness.

Although social-role theory suggests that men may be more effective than women in leadership roles, any differences should be small in view of female leaders’ demonstrated tendency to adopt leadership styles that are likely to minimize role conflict (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). However, men may fare better than women in leadership roles that have been defined in particularly masculine terms. In contrast, the structural theory assumption that organizational roles override any effects of gender roles argues for no sex differences in effectiveness, as long as male and female leaders occupy the same role.
They also do not differ in other role relevant attitudes such as seniority in the role (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

From the perspective of social role theory of sex differences and similarities, Eagly, Wood, & Diekman (2000) show through analysis the principle that leadership roles, like other organizational roles, are influences on leaders’ behavior. In addition, leaders elicit expectancies based on people’s categorization of them as male and female. These expectancies constitute gender roles which are shared beliefs that apply to individuals on the basis of their socially identified role. They further explain that these roles are assumed to follow from perceivers’ observations of men and women as concentrated in different social roles in the family and paid employment.

Eagly et al. (2000), further explain that aspects of gender roles that were relevant to understanding leadership pertaining to agentic and communal attributes. Agentic characteristics are ascribed to be more strongly associated to men than women and are described primarily as assertive, controlling, and confident. In employment settings, agentic behaviors might include speaking assertively, competing for attention, influencing others, initiating activity directed to assigned tasks, and making problem-focused suggestions (Eagly, et al., 2000). On the other hand, communal characteristics are ascribed more strongly to women than men and are described primarily as concern with the welfare of other people, interpersonally sensitive, nurturing, and gentle. In employment settings, communal behaviors might include speaking tentatively, not drawing attention to ones self, accepting others’ direction, supporting and soothing others, and contributing to the relational and interpersonal problems (Eagly et al., 2000).
Eagly et al. (2000) argued the influence of gender on roles on organizational behavior occurs, not only because people react to leaders in terms of gendered expectancies and leaders respond in turn, but also because most people have internalized gender roles to some extent. According to Engen, Leeden and Willemsen (2001) the research on sex differences in leadership styles have shown a tendency towards similarity rather than difference, but the inconsistencies in the findings suggested that more research was needed to explore the divergent findings.

Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) conducted a meta-analysis of 45 studies that had examined transformational, transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles among men and women. The authors reported in their findings the possibility that men and women may differ in leadership behavior and that there were some implications for leader effectiveness and advancement within an organization. Lowe et al. (1996) reported some positive correlations between leader effectiveness and components of transformational leadership, as well as the contingent reward component of transactional leadership, substantiating the effectiveness of these styles over transactional and laissez-faire styles.

Perceptions of Leaders

As a result of the women’s movement and the introduction of labor laws, women are slowly gaining positions of power. Hence, the more recent focuses on perceptions of subordinates. The experiments generally conclude that subjects are equally satisfied with male and female leaders (Kushell & Newton, 1986; Rosen & Jerdee, 1973; Stitt, Schmidt & Price, 1983). Bartol and Wortman (1975) found that male and female subordinates did not describe male and female superiors differently. Interestingly, Eagly, Makhijani,
and Klonsly (1992) in a meta-analysis of the research on the evaluation of leaders, reported that there was a small tendency for female leaders to be evaluated less favorably than male leaders. When women held traditionally male dominated positions or they engaged in an authoritarian or directive style of leadership. In this situation, the tendency to devalue the female leaders was even more pronounced (Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonsly, 1992).

Bartol and Butterfield (1976) compared assessments of male and female leaders using four leadership styles: initiating structure, production emphasis, consideration, and tolerance for freedom. They found that males placed values more highly on initiating structure and females were valued more highly on consideration. The researchers also noted that there were no differences in production emphasis and tolerance for freedom.

Leader perception is also related to the task and social dimensions of leadership. Cann and Siegfried (1990) confirmed that males are stereotypically associated with the task dimension and females are associated with the consideration. They found that consideration behaviors were perceived as feminine and structuring behaviors were thought if as masculine. Male leaders are rated higher on task competence (Morrison & Stein, 1985) while females are expected to do more poorly in task situations (Baird, 1976; Johnson, 1976).

Accounting for these perceptions might be the fact that both males and females associate leadership with an authoritarian leadership style (Linimon, Barron & Falbo, 1984) and even women base their leadership ratings on stereotypical notions of leadership (Linimon, Barron & Falbo, 1984). In contrast, Eskilson and Wiley (1976) concluded that women do direct more activity toward creating group affects than do men.
In a meta-analysis of gender and leadership style, Eagly and Johnson (1990) discovered that across categories of studies (organizational, laboratory experimental, or assessment), women tended to adopt democratic or participatory styles.

However, Serafini and Pearson (1984) found no difference in the skills exhibited by male and female leaders. In a study consisting of 202 civil service supervisory and non-supervisory employees at a large government operated psychiatric hospital, Bartol and Wartman (1975) found that female supervisors were rated higher on initiating structure than were males. Maier (1970) reported that “female leaders, given a management solution to a problem, will be as persuasive and tactful as male leaders in getting a supplies solution adopted by their group members” (p. 456).

According to Alderton and Jurma (1980), other factors influence evaluation. Alderton and Jurma (1980) found that both males and females were equally satisfied with male and female leaders as long as they used similar frequencies of task-oriented behavior. According to Bunyi and Andrews (1985), demonstrating a skill and using evidence to support one’s views positively affected influence and credibility ratings for both males and females (Bradley, 1981). Women indicating task relevant competence immediately before a group problem solving session were more influential than women who did not demonstrate such competence (Bradley, 1980).

Gender and Leadership

The literature from higher education and the social sciences fields that investigate gender and leadership style can be grouped into three categories. The first group of studies used qualitative methods and small sample sizes to report descriptions of female leadership styles, and draw comparisons and contrasts with male styles.
A second category of studies is from the discipline of leadership in the social sciences fields. These consist of quantitative studies published in renowned journals by numerous authors. A series of meta-analyses were conducted by Eagly, one of the most prominent researchers to examine gender differences in leadership, and a few of his colleagues. Since the mid-1990, many of these studies have focused on transformational versus transactional leadership styles using the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) as an instrument to collect data. A third category of studies was drawn from higher education literature. Since the 1970, there have been studies measuring whether sex differences exist in leadership styles and effective leadership (Bartol & Butterfield, 1976). Research findings have been mixed; many scholars have argued that leadership styles are marked by sex differences, whereas others have focused on perceptions of leadership (Butler & Geis, 1990; Casimir, 2001; Cooper 1997). According to Butterfield and Grinnell (1999), overall, this area of inquiry has been hotly contested.

Studies that have found support for sex differences have focused on perceptions of leadership (Butler & Geis, 1990; Casimir, 2001; Cooper 1997; Doherty, 1997; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Ragins, 1991; Yammarino et al., 1997). Female and male subordinates have rated women leaders with key aspects of transformational leadership – that is charisma and individualized consideration – more frequently than men (Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996; Bycio, Hackett, & Allen, 1995; Carless, 1998; & Maher, 1997). Druskat (1994) found that female subordinates rated female leaders as displaying significantly more transformational behaviors and significantly fewer transactional behaviors than male leaders who were rated by male subordinates.
Eagly and Johnson (1990) performed a meta-analysis which revealed that the majority of studies had assessed the extent to which leaders or managers were concerned about two aspects of their work. The first aspect they referred to as task accomplishment or task style that is organizing activities to perform tasks. The second aspect was maintenance of interpersonal relationships or interpersonal style that is, tending to the morale and welfare of the people in the setting (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

The distinction between the task and interpersonal styles was first represented in leadership research by Bales (1950). The first of the two categories of leaders proposed by Bales (1950) identified those with an orientation to task accomplishment. The second category consisted of those with a socio-emotional orientation indicative of concern for morale and relationships among group members (Bales, 1950). Task and interpersonal styles in leadership research are obviously relevant to gender because of the stereotypes people have about sex differences in these aspects of behavior (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Wohlers, 1986; Eagly & Steffen, 1984). According to Eagly and Johnson (1990) men are believed to be more self-assertive and motivated to master their environment. The male gender tends to be more aggressive, independent, self-sufficient, forceful, and dominant. In contrast, women are believed to be more selfless and concerned with others. They are perceived to be kinder, more helpful, more understanding, warmer, more sympathetic, and aware of others’ feelings. In research on gender, these two orientations have been labeled masculine and feminine, instrumental and expressive, and agentic and communal (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

Also represented in the meta-analysis by Eagly and Johnson (1990) is the extent to which leaders (a) behave democratically and allow subordinates to participate in
decision-making; or (b) behave autocratically and discourage subordinates from participating in decision-making. The dimension of democratic versus autocratic leadership (or participative versus directive leadership) follows from earlier experimental studies of leadership style (e.g. Lewin & Lippitt, 1983) and has been developed since that time by a number of researchers (e.g. Likert, 1961; Vroom & Yetton, 1973). Although the democratic versus autocratic style is a different aspect of leader behavior than task-oriented and interpersonally oriented styles (Bass, 1981), the democratic-autocratic dimension also relates to gender stereotypes because one component of the stereotype is that men are relatively dominant and controlling (i.e., more autocratic and directive than women).

In their meta-analysis of studies on sex differences in leadership style, Eagly and Johnson (1990) suggested that several factors in the organizational context moderate the emergence and direction of gender difference in leadership styles. A major contextual factor put forward by these two authors is the sex compositions in the organizations. Eagly and Johnson (1990) reported that sex differences relate to the proportion of men among the people whose style is assessed. Differences between male and female managers in democratic and people-oriented styles are significantly smaller in male-dominated management layers than in female-dominated layers (Eagly and Johnson 1990).

Eagly and Karau (1991) examined the emergence of leaders in leaderless groups in a meta-analysis of 75 studies, finding that men’s specialization in task-oriented behaviors is a key to their emergence as group leaders. However, women’s attentiveness to interpersonal relations brings them recognition as social facilitators rather than as
Eagly, Makhijani, and Klonsky (1992) conducted a meta-analysis of studies on gender differences and the evaluation of leaders. They concluded that female leaders were judged less competent, less effective, and less able than men leaders when their leadership style was stereotypically masculine. These negative evaluations were strengthened when women leaders were in male-dominated roles. Although some evidence suggested that as women and men spend time working for a female manager, their negative perceptions of her weaken (Eagly, Ashmore, Makhijani, & Longo, 1991). However, Luthar (1996) found that women gave higher performance ratings than men for female leaders (Korabik, Baril, & Watson, 1993).

Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani (1995) performed a meta-analysis that found men and women were equally effective in their leadership. However, men were more effective when their roles were defined in masculine terms and women in roles defined as less masculine. In another study (Cooper, 1997), women devalued their leadership accomplishments and took less credit for successful consequences.

Eagly and Karau (2001) argued that perceived incongruity between the female gender role and typical leader roles tends to create prejudice toward female leaders. Potential leaders take two forms: (a) less favorable evaluation of women’s (than men’s) potential for leadership because leadership ability is more stereotypic of men than women and (b) less favorable evaluation of the actual leadership behavior of women than men because agentic behavior is perceived as less desirable in women than men. This type of
prejudice stems from the descriptive norms of gender roles that are the beliefs about women’s characteristics and the consequent ascription of female-stereotypic qualities to them, which are unlike the qualities expected and desired in leaders. The second type of prejudice stems from the prescriptive norms of gender roles that are the beliefs about how women should behave. If female leaders violate these prescriptive beliefs by fulfilling the agentic requirements of leader roles and failing to exhibit the communal behaviors that are preferred in women, they can be negatively evaluated for those violations, even while they may also receive some positive evaluation for their fulfillment of the leader role (Eagly and Karau 2001).

Korabik et al. (1993) examined gender differences in conflict management styles. The study involved a sample of 172 evening MBA students, some of which had managerial experience and some did not have managerial experience. The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI-II) was used to obtain self-reported conflict management styles.

The researchers discovered that there were no gender differences in self-reported conflict management styles among the experienced managers. However, women without managerial experience rated themselves as more integrating, obliging, and compromising (Korabil et al., 1993). The research produced evidence to support gender role congruence. That is, women were rated by their subordinates as less effective than men when they used a dominating style. As well men were rated as less effective than women when they used an obliging style. This supported previous findings that both women and men are evaluated less favorably when their behavior is gender incongruent Legalism (Korabik et al., 1993).
Bass and Avolio (1994) presented several studies as evidence that transformational style produces greater effort, performance, and satisfaction than transactional leadership style. They also completed additional studies involving 150 males and 79 female leaders, rated by 582 male and 219 female subordinates. According to Bass and Avolio (1994) the female leaders were rated higher than males on the four transformational scales and on the contingent reward scale of transactional leadership. From this, the researchers concluded that women tend to be more transformational and more proactive.

Gardiner and Tiggerman (1999) tried to measure gender differences in leadership style, job stress, and mental health in both male and female dominated industries. A sample of 120 practicing managers in Australia were selected, 60 in male and 60 in female-dominated industries, with 30 females and 30 males in each group. The study collected self-report data collected from a survey of work pressure (Davidson & Cooper, 1983). The authors reported that gender differences in leadership style may be attributable to both gender of the leader and the gender ratios of industries. The authors also indicated that further research was needed to replicate these results in an organizational context.

Burke and Collins (2001) conducted a study in response to the need to replicate findings of gender differences. They also collected self-report data from 1031 certified public accountants, including 771 females and 320 males who responded to the Management Skills Profile developed by Personnel Decisions, Inc. Female accountants were found to report a transformational leadership style that was more correlated with several management skills associated with success, coaching and developing, and
communication. The researchers also reported that females received more developmental opportunities than male accountants. The researchers were clear to report that these findings were based on self-reported data (Burke and Collins, 2001).

The producers of the MLQ respect the Gold Bar Standard that demands independent, transparent, peer-revised studies. In addition, the MLQ lists a number of top international peer-reviewed journals that contain studies supporting the validity and reliability of the instrument. The researcher selected the MLQ as the choice instrument because studies have indicated that the MLQ is valid across various cultures, leadership levels, and organization styles. The MLQ has also demonstrated both predictive validity and pre and post reliability, hence making it an appropriate instrument to conduct this research.

Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) conducted a study of transformational, transactional and laissez-faire styles of leadership on a sample 9,000 managers who participated in the norming study for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). These managers were rated by subordinates, peers, superiors, or themselves. The researchers noted the following areas on the MLQ in which women exceeded men:

Items on the Transformational Scale included:

1. Idealized Influence – leader attributes that motivate followers to feel respect and pride;
2. Inspirational Motivation – showed optimism and excitement about future goals;
3. Individualized consideration – attempted to develop and mentor followers and attend to their individual needs; and
The researchers also noted that men exceeded women in the following areas:

Items on the Transactional Scale included:

1. Active Management-by Exception – paid attention to followers’ problems and mistakes;
2. Passive Management-by Exception – waited until problems became severe before attempting to solve them; and
3. Laissez-faire – were absent and uninvolved at critical times.

Effects of Leadership Styles on Subordinates

McColl-Kennedy and Anderson (2005) used a Bayesian network approach to assess the combination of gender and leadership style on subordinate emotions, self-esteem and commitment to the organization. They suggested that the gender was not simply a question of female managers versus male managers, in isolation but rather the interaction of subordinate-manager gender combinations and leadership style in a non-linear manner. Using logit analyses, the subordinate-manager combination was found to have predictive advantage over just the manager’s gender (McColl-Kennedy and Anderson, 2005). The results showed that female managers produced the highest levels of optimism in their subordinates, both male and female. Findings also revealed that the highest levels of frustration were experienced when male subordinates were paired with male managers. What's more, the highest levels of self-esteem were experienced when the manager was female and subordinate male, and the next highest by male manager-female subordinate pairs. The highest levels of commitment were conveyed for female and male subordinates reporting to female managers (McColl-Kennedy and Anderson, 2005).
According to McColl-Kennedy and Anderson (2005), transformational leadership style produced the largest probability of optimism regardless of gender combinations. The management-by-exception and laissez-faire style had larger probabilities of frustration across gender combinations. Transformational leadership also showed high probability of self-esteem, while the other styles showed a decrease.

Nadim and Singh (2005) analyzed the perception of male and female followers of their best and worst bosses; they used a sample of 194 managers/followers and found no significant differences in leadership style by gender. The authors called for analyses using larger samples and further inquiry into leadership-follower relationships, particularly from the follower’s perspective. They concluded that this is an area that needs additional research (Nadim and Singh, 2005).

Teacher Efficacy and Principal Behaviors

Teacher efficacy is teachers’ confidence in their ability to promote students’ learning (Hoy, 2000). According to Bandura (1977), efficacy is a belief in one’s ability to accomplish a given task. In his review of research, Jerald (2007) highlighted some teacher behaviors that were found to be related to teacher’s sense of efficacy. Teachers with a strong sense of efficacy:

1. Tend to exhibit greater levels of planning and organization;
2. Are more open to new ideas and are more willing to experiment with new methods to better meet the needs of their students;
3. Are more persistent and resilient when things do not go smoothly;
4. Are less critical of students when they make errors; and
5. Are less inclined to refer a difficult student to special education.
According to Hoy (2000), there are two types of beliefs related to teacher efficacy. The first, personal teaching efficacy, relates to a teacher’s own feeling of confidence in regard to teaching abilities. The second, often called general teaching efficacy, “appears to reflect a general belief about the power of teaching to reach difficult children” (p. 43). Researchers have found that these two constructs are independent. A teacher may have belief and faith generally in the ability of teachers to reach difficult students but lack confidence in his or her own personal teaching ability (Protheore, 2008).

Hipp (1996) identified some principal behaviors that are significantly related to teacher efficacy. Hipp (1996) explains that principals of teachers reporting high levels of efficacy modeled behaviors such as risk-taking and cooperation. In addition, their principals inspired group purpose and developed a shared vision which centered on creating a student-centered atmosphere. Goddard, Hoy, and Hoy (2000) agree with this position but also argue that “although mastery experiences are the most powerful efficacy changing forces, they may be the most difficult to deliver to a faculty with a low collective efficacy” (p. 43).

Goddard, Hoy, and Hoy (2000) suggest that one way school administrators can improve student achievement is by working to raise the collective efficacy beliefs of their staff. Hoy, Sweetland, and Smith (2002) suggest that school leaders “need to lead in ways that promote mastery experiences for teachers” (p. 45). They continue this argument by stating that this can be remedied by providing efficacy-building mastery experiences through thoughtfully designed staff development activities and action research projects.
According to Schein (1985), principals positively influence teachers’ efficacy through various means. Schein states that leaders’ behaviors such as modeling, inspiring with a purpose, and rewarding congruent behaviors send powerful messages to teachers and positively impact teachers’ efficacy. Lortie (1975) found that principals are perceived as being a greater resource than are parents or colleagues in creating conditions needed to develop teachers’ efficacy.

Student achievement is impacted by the teacher’s willingness to: (a) learn and implement new teaching strategies; (b) use classroom management approaches that stimulate student autonomy and reduce custodial control; (c) attend to the needs of lower ability students more closely; (d) emulate efficacious behavior as to influence student efficacy; and (e) exemplify (Ross, 1994). Ross (1994) concludes that teacher efficacy theoretically influences students’ cognitive and affective development.

Teachers in the Blasé and Blasé (2001) study reported that effective principals encourage interaction that promotes teacher reflection on learning and instructional practice. As a result, teachers reflect more, use more diverse instructional strategies, and are risk-takers as well as better planners. Principals also enhance teachers’ reflective behavior and professional growth by providing literary resources, promoting participation in more professional development opportunities, and encouraging reflection and organizational collaboration (Blasé and Blasé, 2001).

Ross and Gray (2004) study of transformational leadership and teacher efficacy recommends three administrative actions:

1. Principals need to overtly influence teacher interpretations of school and classroom achievement data. The critical leadership task is to help teachers
identify cause-effect relationships that link their actions to desired learning outcomes.

2. Principals should help teachers to set goals that will increase their likelihood of mastery experiences.

3. Access to high quality professional development and constructive feedback on their skill acquisition must be provided for teachers.

Synthesis of the Literature Review

The studies outlined in the literature review section of this proposal have presented mixed results on the matter of gender differences and the impact on performance and/or subordinates. Many studies were based on self-reported data of leaders and/or managers. Some studies have reported no significant differences in leadership style by gender and others have indicated statistically significant differences even if it were clarified as a small difference. Some studies have reported that leadership behavior of a principal and his or her role as an instructional leader has significant impact on creating more effective leading to higher levels of student achievement (Cotton, 2003; Gold, et al., 2003; & Quinn, 2002).

Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that the settings of studies can determine whether gender differences are found. In laboratory experiments and assessment studies in which contextual elements are missing and participants take part over the short-term, gender stereotypical results tend to be reported that women are more interpersonally-oriented and men are more task-oriented. However, in organizational studies in which participants are in real-life settings with plenty contextual information, all leaders regardless of gender are equally task-oriented in roles congruent to their gender. These
findings indicate the need to conduct research in real-life settings where leaders can be observed in their day-to-day environments (Eagly and Johnson, 1990).

Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that female leaders tend to be more democratic and males tend to be autocratic. Rosener’s (1990) qualitative study found that women reported using transformational leadership style and men reported using the transactional leadership style. These findings were supported and found in the work of Eagly et al., (2001, 2003).

McColl-Kennedy and Anderson (2005) reported that transformational leadership style produced the largest probability of optimism regardless of gender combinations. Vecchio and Bullis (2001) found that positive levels of follower satisfaction with leader performance decline over time, with the largest declines noted among females supervised by females. Finally, Korabik et al. (1993) found that in conflict role-play simulation scenarios, males and females used the same conflict management style and obtained the same results.

Teachers who believe that they can teach all children in ways that enable them to meet these high standards are more likely to exhibit teaching behaviors that support this goal. Therefore, principals must intentionally help teachers to develop a sense of efficacy because, as Goddard, Hoy, and Hoy (2000) so eloquently reminds us, “it is not enough to hire and retain the brightest teachers – they must also believe that they can successfully meet the challenges of the task at hand” (p. 45).

All of the above research provides some evidence that there is a need for the author to pursue additional studies in the area of gender differences in leadership styles and the impact on student achievement and teacher performance. The research
demonstrates that effective leadership does impact student achievement but there are no clear correlations between leadership and gender indicating if gender of the leader makes a difference. All the existing research presents no clear pattern of differences in male versus female leadership styles and the impact on student achievement and teacher performance. Therefore, the researcher hopes to add to the existing body of knowledge and provide some further clarity and guidance.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study was conducted in a large urban school district. The Institutional Research Board application was processed and permission was obtained from the Office of Accountability (Appendix A) for the participating school district and from The University of Southern Mississippi (Appendix B). The researcher surveyed 110 principals of all high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools of a large urban school district in the southeastern region of the United States. Ten teachers were randomly selected from each school to be surveyed—five male teachers and five female teachers.

Participants

For the purpose of this study, 110 school principals were surveyed along with a random sample of teachers at each school to determine the principal leadership style and the expectations for teacher performance. Ten teachers were randomly selected from each school, five male teachers, and five female teachers. The teachers’ email addresses, names, gender were secured for each of the schools. The principal sample included 69 elementary principals, 25 middle school principals, and 16 high schools of which 80 are female principals and 30 are male principals. The school district included in the study is one of the largest school systems responsible for educating over 106,000 students in a diverse constantly changing suburban area in the Southeastern region of the United States. Among the 14,027 employees, the ethnic breakdown is: 77.5% White, 18.1% Black, 2.4% Hispanic, 1.2% Asian, 0.7% Multi-Racial and 0.1% American Indian. Of the
106,000 students, 45.5% are White, 31.0% Black, 15.8% Hispanic, 4.8% Asian, 2.5% Multi-Racial and <0.1% American Indian.

Procedures

Participants were contacted via email with a follow-up telephone call to solicit participation. Upon agreement, an electronic survey of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5x (Bass & Avolio, 1990) was administered to all participants. Participants answered the items on a survey electronically and submitted all responses electronically. Hard copies were also made available to all participating schools in the event the electronic response rate was low.

Analysis of Results

This quantitative study utilized a cross sectional design where participants were measured at just one point in time on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ—also known as MLQ 5X short or the standard MLQ). The MLQ was developed by Avolio and Bass (1990). It measures a broad range of leadership types from passive leaders, to leaders who give contingent rewards to followers, to leaders who transform their followers into becoming leaders themselves. It contains 45 items that identify and measure key leadership and effectiveness behaviors. The MLQ identifies the characteristics of a leader and helps individuals discover how they measure up in their own eyes and in the eyes of those with whom they work.

The rater form of the MLQ was used to measure leadership as perceived by colleagues, supervisors, peers, and subordinates. The MLQ was chosen because of its extensive use in leadership research, as it has been used in nearly 200 research programs, doctoral dissertations, and master’s theses around the globe (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1995,
The comprehensiveness of the MLQ and the fact that it had been verified by prior research made it an ideal choice for this study.

A five-point scale for rating frequency of observed behavior was used according to a tested list of anchors provided by Bass, Cascio, and O’Connor (1974). The anchors used to evaluate the MLQ factors are presented as follows: 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, and 4 = frequently, if not always. The MLQ links each leadership style to expected performance outcomes, which have been shown through literally hundreds of prior studies to support this connection.

Decades of research indicated that the survey was reliable and valid across a wide variety of cultures and types of organizations; however, differences in findings related to gender and presented many questions (Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996; Eagly & Carli, 2003). The reliabilities for each of the six leadership factor scales ranged from .63 to .92 in the initial sample and .64 to .92 in the replication set. The reliabilities presented here for each scale was consistent with earlier results reported for the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 1990). The Cronbach’s alpha is equal to 0.86 for the original MLQ and alpha=0.87 for the translated MLQ, the reliability values were greater than 0.80 indicating an acceptable statistic testing level. The overall chi-square of the nine factor model was statistically significant ($x^2 = 540.18; \text{df} = 474; <.01$), the ratio of the chi-square to the degrees of freedom ($x^2/\text{df}$) was 1.14, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was 0.03. Gender of participants, principals, and teacher/administrator status will be ascertained in a demographics portion of the survey.

This study used a cross-sectional, quasi-experimental research design. Quantitative analyses of survey results will be completed using SPSS (version 18) as the
The analyses used for each hypothesis is given below.

**Hypothesis 1.** In order to determine whether there are gender differences in leadership styles for male versus female school administrators, a mixed model ANOVA was conducted with gender as the grouping variable and mean scores on the three categories of leadership styles as the repeatedly measured dependent variable.

**Hypothesis 2.** In order to determine whether male versus female teachers perceive the leadership styles of their leaders differently, a mixed model ANOVA was conducted.

**Hypothesis 3.** A mixed model ANOVA was also used for Hypothesis 3 to determine if male versus female teachers perceive the leadership styles of male versus female school leaders differently.

**Hypothesis 4.** In order to determine whether there was an association between principal gender and school performance as measured by AYP status (met or not met), a two-way Chi Square was conducted. In order to determine whether school performance is related to teacher perceptions of their leadership styles, a logistic regression was conducted to predict AYP status from the average scores across teachers for principal leadership styles on each domain. The student achievement data was reflected as overall school performance as meeting or not meeting AYP status (individual student achievement will not be used).

To control for factors known to impact student achievement, percent of students on free or reduced lunch was statistically controlled in all analyses having percent of
students meeting or exceeding grade level on their performance on standardized statewide test as the dependent variable.

Data Collection

Prior to the submission of questionnaires to respondents, permission was obtained from both the school district’s office of Accountability (Appendix A) and the Human Subjects Committee at the University of Southern Mississippi (Appendix B). The researcher then obtained a complete list of teachers from each of the schools. Participants were contacted via email with a follow-up telephone call to solicit participation. Upon agreement, an electronic survey of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5x (Bass & Avolio, 1990) was administered to all participants. Participants answered items on a survey electronically and submitted all responses electronically. The survey took no more than 10 to 15 minutes to complete.

Instrumentation

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ—also known as MLQ 5X short or the standard MLQ) was used in this study. The MLQ, developed by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass (2004), measures a broad range of leadership types from passive leaders, to leaders who give contingent rewards to followers, to leaders who transform their followers into becoming leaders themselves. It contains 45 items that identify and measure key leadership and effectiveness behaviors. The MLQ identifies the characteristics of a leader and helps individuals discover how they measure up in their own eyes and in the eyes of those with whom they work. The classic form of the MLQ includes both self and rater forms. The self-form measures self perception of leadership behaviors. The rater form of the MLQ was used to measure leadership as perceived by
The MLQ was chosen because of its extensive use in leadership research, as it has been used in nearly 200 research programs, doctoral dissertations, and master’s theses around the globe (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1995, p. 6). The comprehensiveness of the MLQ and the fact that it has been verified by prior research made it an ideal choice for this study. A letter granting permission to use the survey was obtained and included as Appendix C.

A five-point scale for rating frequency of observed behavior was used according to a tested list of anchors provided by Bass, Cascio, and O’Connor (1974). The anchors used to evaluate the MLQ factors are presented as follows: 0 = not at all, 1 = once in a while, 2 = sometimes, 3 = fairly often, and 4 = frequently, if not always. The MLQ links each leadership style to expected performance outcomes, which have been shown through literally hundreds of prior studies to support this connection. According to Avolio and Bass (2004), the leadership behaviors measured can be categorized as follows:

Transformational leadership is a process of influencing in which leaders change their associates’ awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way. Transformational leaders are proactive and they convince their associates to strive for higher levels of potential as well as higher levels of moral and ethical standards. The key attributes of transformational leaders include:

1. Idealized Influence Attributes (IA) and Behaviors (IB) – these leaders are admired, respected, and trusted. Followers identify and want to emulate their leaders. Among the things the leader does to earn credit with followers is to consider followers’ needs over his or her own needs. The leader shares risks with
followers and is consistent in conduct with underlying ethics, principles, and values. (IA measured by items 10, 18, 21, 25 and IB measured by items 6, 14, 23, 34);

2. Inspirational motivation (IM) – these leaders behave in ways that motivate those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers’ work. Enthusiasm and optimism are displayed (Measured by items 9, 13, 26, 36); and

3. Intellectual Stimulation (IS) – these leaders stimulate their followers’ effort to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new way (Measured by items 2, 8, 30, 32)

Transactional leaders display behaviors associated with constructive and corrective transactions. The constructive style is labeled contingent reward and the corrective style is labeled management-by-exception. Transactional leader defines expectations and promotes performance to achieve these levels. Transactional leadership can be divided into two subcategories:

1. Contingent reward (CR) – clarifies expectations and offers recognition when goals are achieved. (Measured by items 1, 11, 16, 35); and

2. Management-by-exception: Active (MBEA) – the leader specifies the standards for compliance, as well as what constitutes ineffective performance, and they punish followers for being out of compliance with those standards. They actively monitor performance and take corrective action at the first sign of a potential mistake or error.

Passive/Avoidant Behavior is another form of management-by-exception leadership. It is more passive and “reactive”. Passive leaders avoid specifying
agreements, clarifying expectations, and providing goals and standards to be achieved by followers. The key attributes are:

1. Management-by-exceptions: Passive (MBEP) – this leader fails to take action until problems have become serious. (Measured by items 3, 12, 17, 20) and
2. Laissez-Faire (LF) – this leader avoids getting involved and avoids making decisions. (Measured by items 5, 7, 28, 33)

Transformational and transactional leadership are both related to the success of the group. Success is measured with the MLQ by how often the raters perceive their leader to be motivating, how effective raters perceive their leader to be interacting at different levels of the organization. The outcomes of leadership are not leadership styles; they are outcomes or results of leadership behavior.

The key attributes included are:

1. Extra effort – getting others to do more than they are expected to do
   (Measured by items 39, 42, 44);
2. Effectiveness – effective in meeting others’ job-related needs; effective in meeting organizational requirements and able to lead a group that is effective.
   (Measured by items 37, 40, 43); and
3. Satisfaction with the leadership – able to work with others in a satisfactory way (measured by items 38, 41).

The MLQ scale scores are average scores for the items on the scale. The score was derived by summing the items and dividing by the number of items that made 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.

Validity and Reliability

The MLQ has undergone substantive revisions since Bass (1985) first created the seven-factor model for transactional and transformational leadership. Decades of research indicate that the survey is reliable and valid across a wide variety of cultures and types of organizations; however, differences in findings related to gender and presented many questions (Bass, Avolio, & Atwater, 1996; Eagly & Carli, 2003). The reliabilities for each of the six leadership factor scales ranged from .63 to .92 in the initial sample and .64 to .92 in the replication set. The reliabilities presented here for each scale was consistent with earlier results reported for the MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 1990). The Cronbach’s alpha produced, alpha = 0.86 for the original MLQ and alpha=0.87 for the translated MLQ, the reliability values were greater than 0.70 indicating an acceptable statistic testing level. The overall chi-square of the nine factor model was statistically significant (x^2 = 540.18; df = 474; <.01), the ratio of the chi-square to the degrees of freedom (x^2/df) was 1.14, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) was 0.03, the goodness of fit index (GFI) was .84, and the adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) was .78.

Changes have been made to the MLQ 5X, based on criticisms of the MKQ 5R survey. Conger and Kanungo (1987, 1998) and House, Spangler and Woycke (1991) offered their conclusions and concerns around the high correlations between transformation leadership scales and contingent reward, and among the transformational scales. This concern resulted in the changes made to the MLQ5X.
The meta-analysis of MLQ literature by Lowe et al., (1996) found the MLQ transformational leadership scales to be reliable and to significantly predict effectiveness outcomes. Tepper and Percy (1994) found support for convergent validity, finding “the pattern and magnitude of the factor loadings suggest that the Charismatic and Inspirational Leadership scales converge to capture a global dimension of leadership practices and that this global construct shows good divergence from the Transactional Leadership construct” (Tepper & Percy, 1994, p. 742). In addition, Tepper and Percy (1994) found that:

the MLQ appears to capture a theoretically meaningful dimension of transactional leadership (i.e., contingent reward) that diverges from a global measure of transformational leadership... [and] the MLQ may be used (with caution) to test predictions derived from the augmentation theory of leadership (p. 743).

Summary

This chapter provided a description of the methodology utilized in this study, which includes the population, the research questions, the hypotheses, the instrument, the procedures, the collection of data and the analysis of data. For this study, the MLQ was used to measure various leadership behaviors that fall under transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant, as well as outcomes of these behaviors, including effectiveness, follower satisfaction, and the ability to inspire extra effort from followers. The potential sample population of 110 school principals from 69 elementary schools, 25 middle schools and 16 high schools will be invited to participate. Ten teachers were randomly selected from each school, five male teachers and five female teachers.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Introduction

This study examined five basic questions regarding teacher perceptions concerning the leadership style of principals and the relation between those perceptions and school performance. A Likert-like style survey was administered to 110 school principals and a random sample of 10 teachers (5 males and 5 females) from each school. From this group, 31 principals agreed to participate and a total of 236 teachers completed the survey from the 31 participating schools. The response rate for principal was 28.18% and 21.45% for teachers.

In order to address the first three research questions regarding teacher perceptions of leadership styles and differences in those perceptions based on the gender of the teachers and principal, a mixed model ANOVA was concluded. For the analysis, principal gender was the grouping variable. Leadership style scores were averaged separately for male and female teachers having the same principal and for the passive avoidant domain, the transactional domain, and the transformational domain. ANOVA results from the principal gender (grouping variable) X teacher gender (repeated measures variable) X leadership style (repeated measure variable) indicated a main effect of leadership style, $F(2,58) = 475.73$, $p < .001$, with Tukey’s HSD indicating lower overall scores for the passive avoidant domain (M = .86, SD = .64) compared to both the transactional (M = 3.31, SD =67) and the transformational (M = 3.37, SD = .55) domains which did not differ from one another. There were no male versus female teacher difference (main effect of teacher gender in overall perceptions of their leaders, $F(1,29) =$
1.48, p = .23. After correcting for sphericity violations, an assumption of mixed model ANOVA, differences in male versus female teachers in their perceptions of principal leadership styles (teacher gender by leadership style interaction) was not significant, $F(2,58) = 3.40, p = .058$. However, because there was a trend in the direction of a significant interaction, the means from that interaction are graphed below.

Table 1

*Teacher Perceptions of Their Leaders*

![Graph showing teacher perceptions of their leaders by gender and leadership style](image)

Note. There were no other significant interactions from this analysis.

To determine whether there was an association between principal gender and school performance as measured by AYP status (met or not met) a two-way Chi Square was conducted. Chi Square results indicated no gender x performance association. Chi Square (1) = .375, p = .54. Cell counts of the gender x performance association are located in Table 2.
Table 2

*Gender X Performance Associations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Made AYP</th>
<th>Did Not Make AYP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=31

*Question 5.* In order to determine whether school performance is related to teacher perceptions of their leader’s leadership styles, a logistic regression was conducted to predict AYP status from the average scores across teachers for principal leadership styles on each domain. Average scores on leadership variables were transformed into T scores (M = 50, SD = 10) in order to have interpretable logistic regression coefficients.

A test of the full model against a constant only model was significant indicating that the predictors distinguished between schools making versus not making AYP (Chi Square (3) = 13.91, p = .003). Nagelkerke’s $R^2 = .48$ revealed a moderate relationship between leadership styles and AYP status. Prediction success was 81.2% overall with 85% of predictions correct for those schools making AYP and 75% correct for those not making AYP. The Wald Statistic indicated that passive avoidant (p = .01) and transactional (p =
.009) leadership styles made a significant contribution to the prediction of AYP status with transformational leadership style not significant (p = .069). Exponential b weights indicated that as both passive avoidance and transactional scores increased the school was more likely to make AYP. Logistic regression coefficients are located in Table 3 below.

Table 3

Results from AYP Status Regressed onto Leadership Style Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive Avoidant</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>6.579</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>6.883</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>-.185</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-19.161</td>
<td>7.486</td>
<td>6.551</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

For Chapter IV, the researcher reported the results of the study. The results will be summarized, discussed, and related to prior studies in Chapter V. Additionally, the implications of this study on leadership policy and practice as well as recommendations for future studies will be discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY

Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the research and conveys conclusions drawn from the data collected and presented in Chapter IV. This section of the paper will also discuss findings from the research questions and conclusions derived from the data collected and analyzed in Chapter IV. The guiding question for this study was: Does the gender of the leader affect the effectiveness of the leader? This study attempted to answer questions focused on the impact the gender of an administrator ay have on school leadership. Five basic questions directed the focus of this study:

1. Are there gender differences in leadership style for male versus female school administrators?
2. Do male versus female teachers perceive the leadership styles of their leaders differently?
3. Do male versus female teachers perceive the leadership styles of male versus female school leaders differently?
4. Are there differences in overall school performance for male versus female school leaders?
5. Is school performance related to teacher perceptions of their leader’s styles?

Conclusions and Discussions

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 focused on the gender differences in leadership styles for male versus female school administrators. This study concluded there were no significant
differences in the leadership styles for male versus female school administrators. This was supported by the literature presented in Chapter III. However, Eagly and Karau (2001) reported that the inconsistency between male and female gender roles may be associated with some level of prejudice toward female leaders. This researcher believes that more in-depth longitudinal research is definitely needed to continue to study gender differences in leadership style. Eagly et al. (2000) supported this in their research, indicating that some people have internalized gender roles and react in terms of gendered expectancies and leaders respond accordingly. Eagly, Wood, & Diekman (2000) also supported the theory that leaders exhibit expectancies based on people’s categorization of them as male or female. This researcher concluded that more research is needed to measure current attitudes in this area and there needs to be a control for hidden personal beliefs or biases toward the gender of the principal.

Research Question 2

Do male versus female teachers perceive the leadership styles of their leaders differently? This study concluded that there were no differences in male versus female perceptions of their leaders. Eagly’s (1987) social-role theory of sex differences implied that one can make predictions about the effectiveness of male and female leaders. He further explained that the external social pressures associated with cultural expectations about sex motivate individuals to act in a manner that is consistent with internalized cultural expectations. Because this study found no differences in male versus female perceptions, additional study is needed to determine hidden biases or prejudice and the role this plays so more research is needed to make solid conclusions about gender impacting the performance of the school principal. Childhood early socialization and
training influenced by parents’ personal beliefs about behavior and attitudes of male versus female gender probably also play some major role in how one acts or performs as a male or female. Again, the researchers concluded that there has to be more in-depth longitudinal studies to support the impact of gender in leader effectiveness as a male versus female principal.

Research Question 3

Do male versus female teachers perceive the leadership style of male versus female school leaders differently? This was really the most important question of the study for the researcher as a female principal. This study concluded no significant differences in perceptions. In hindsight, the use of more open-ended questions would have captured better answers to this question. The research referenced in Chapter III presented mixed results about the perceptions of leaders. Eagly, Makhijani and Klonsly (1992) reported that female leaders were evaluated less favorably than male leaders. According to Alderton and Jurma (1980) other factors influenced evaluation. They found that both males and females were equally satisfied with male and female leaders as long as they used similar frequencies of task-oriented behavior (Eagly et al., 1992).

Research Question 4

Are there differences in overall school performance for male versus female school administrators? School performance was measured as making AYP or not making AYP. The sample size was very small. Out the 31 principals surveyed, 9 were males and 22 were females indicating that the results of this study cannot be generalized and applied to all male or female principals.
Again, this study concluded that there are no differences in overall performance for male versus female administrators. In Chapter III, it is mentioned that teachers in the Blasé and Blasé (2001) study reported that effective principals encouraged interaction that promoted teacher reflection on learning and instructional practice. This promoted more reflection, use of more diverse instructional strategies, risk-takers and better planners resulting in higher student achievement. The research clearly demonstrates that effective leadership does impact student achievement but it does not tie gender of the leaders as a variable to the performance. For future studies, this could be explored because the research does not address gender when looking at effective principals or the behaviors of effective principals.

Research Question 5

This question determined whether school performance was related to teacher perceptions of their leader’s leadership style. The findings revealed a moderate relationship between leadership styles and AYP status. The Wald Statistic indicated that passive avoidant and transactional leadership styles made a significant contribution to the prediction of AYP status and transformational was not significant. The research in Chapter II concludes that there are certain behaviors associated with effective teachers and effective principals that impact student achievement. In Chapter II, it is reported that Cotton (2003) identifies certain types of behavior that he believes to have a significant impact on student achievement. Leithwood et al. (2004) shared that leadership not only matters: it is second only to teaching among school-related factors. In Chapter II it is reported by Harris (2005) that school level factors such as leadership, organizational
learning, and teachers’ all have a significant impact on non-academic student outcomes such as participation in school, academic self-concept and engagement with the school.

Limitations

Several limitations were encountered throughout the research process and should be considered for any future studies completed in the area of the topic.

1. This study was conducted in one school district in the southern region of the United States across elementary, middle, and high schools. A limited number of principals agreed to participate in the study so the results of this study cannot be generalized to other principals in different areas.

2. A small sample of 10 teachers including 5 males and 5 females were surveyed from each school.

3. Not knowing the experience of each teacher surveyed was a limitation because teachers with one to three years of experience may have different perceptions of their principals versus teachers with more than five years of experience at the same school.

4. Not including a qualitative section with open-ended specific questions pertaining to male versus female principal expectations for performance limited the data obtained to adequately answer the research question.

5. The extent to which teachers reported perceptions of male versus female principals actual leadership behavior is unknown and we must take cautious with how the results are generalized.
6. Any existing personal relationships in terms of long term friendships developed over the years between principals and teachers may have also influenced the way in which one responded when rating the principal.

7. Many Elementary schools did not have five male teachers in their building and they declined to participate resulting in fewer participants being surveyed.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

The findings of this study showed no significant difference between male versus female principals so it is the opinion of the researcher that the gender of a candidate should not be a factor in the recruitment and selection process for principal ship. The researcher believes that districts must ensure that all principals are properly trained to be competent in the areas of curriculum and instruction, school improvement, policy and planning, operations, school law, communication skills, building relationships, and how to respond to emergency situations. Districts should have comprehensive and relevant professional development for all principals to ensure their success at the local school.

Fullan (2009) stated that leadership development needs to be job-embedded, organization embedded, and system embedded. According to Fullan (2009), it is not enough to provide job embedded training that may be individualistic but leaders must receive organization embedded training that focuses on improving the organization and its culture. He further explained that leaders have to have an understanding of the education system beyond the local school.

A study completed by Louis, et al (2009) for the Wallace Foundation showed that the most effective leaders were those who had a sense of collective efficacy and worked with district administrators to establish a culture focused on student achievement.
Collective efficacy refers to the impact of group dynamics—the impact of a group of individuals who possess self-efficacy, a sense of believing they have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to complete a task (Louis, et al., 2009).

Since this study showed no difference in performance for the gender of the principal, the researcher recommends that college level educational leadership preparation programs focus on developing leaders who are confident and competent to enter the field prepared and ready to perform at high levels. College preparation programs have the opportunity to provide relevant real-world training for all students and train in a matter in which students are cognizant of their own strengths and weaknesses. This self-knowledge may allow candidates to match their individual skill sets to the school profiles when applying for principal positions.

Recommendations for Future Research

Recommendations included in this session are based upon the review of literature, findings, conclusions, discussions and observations obtained from this study. The following recommendations for further study are offered:

1. This study focused on school principals across elementary, middle, and high schools in one school district with a selection of 10 teachers (5 males and 5 females) from each school. Future research on this topic might include a more in-depth qualitative study at one level including all teachers to further investigate this topic. Future studies including a larger sample across multiple school districts may yield different results.
2. A similar study could be conducted in another state or multiple school districts in one state to determine if there are really gender differences in expectations for teacher performance.

3. Initially, the researcher attempted to survey 121 principals. Future studies could explore what superintendents or personnel officers consider in the selection process to determine placement of male versus female principals.

4. This study has more female principals at the elementary and middle levels than high school. Future studies could also explore what influences this gender difference in leadership at the different school levels.

5. The literature on gender differences in principals is rather old so further research is definitely needed to investigate gender differences in school principals.

6. In the review of literature, it is mentioned that the sex-composition of an organization may influence the behavioral styles of male or female managers. Several principals declined to participate because they did not have five male teachers. Future studies could investigate the difference in leadership styles of male versus female principals based on the make-up of the teacher population.

7. In a survey of this type, it is possible that some participants may not have reported their true feelings, in future studies; tests for hidden personal or biased attitudes could be conducted to determine gender differences in teachers’ perceptions of male versus female principals.

Conclusions

Despite the fact that this study showed no significant difference in gender leadership, school performance and teacher expectations, the researcher believes there is
a need to look more closely at the role of the gender to eliminate some of the perceptions about male versus female leaders. As stated earlier in this study, the real issue in leadership differences lies in selecting the right person with the appropriate skill-sets to ensure student success. Is the individual a good fit for the school? Is the leader able to establish relationships and build rapport with students and staff?

Shakeshaft (1987) sums it up nicely when he states that the point of examining these differences is not to say one approach is right or wrong, but rather to help us understand that male and females may have different perspectives and it is necessary to understand those different perspectives to ensure success.
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