A Relational Study of Elementary Principals' Leadership Traits, Teacher Morale, and School Performance

Carla Jean Raines Evers
University of Southern Mississippi

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

Part of the Educational Leadership Commons, and the Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons

Recommended Citation
https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/426

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.
A RELATIONAL STUDY OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS’ LEADERSHIP TRAITS, TEACHER MORALE, AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

by

Carla Jean Raines Evers

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

May 2011
ABSTRACT

A RELATIONAL STUDY OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS’ LEADERSHIP TRAITS, TEACHER MORALE, AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

by Carla Jean Raines Evers

May 2011

The purpose of the study was to determine if a significant relationship existed between elementary principals’ leadership traits and teacher morale. The study sought to identify the impact of the principal-teacher relationship on school achievement as it relates to student performance on state standards as outlined in the Mississippi state academic frameworks and as measured using the Quality of the Distribution Index (QDI) on the Mississippi state end-of-grade test, Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2). The end-of-year assessments, collectively known as MCT2: Reading-Language Arts and Mathematics, administered to students in grades 3 through 8 in the spring of each school year, provided additional quantitative data for the study. Further, the study identified whether a correlation existed between the way principals and teachers perceive the principals’ primary leadership traits.

A quantitative survey-design method was used to conduct the study. The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) -Self and -Observer were used to measure the principals’ leadership traits that have been associated with organizational
effectiveness. The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) was used to measure teacher morale as defined by two selected factors, rapport with principal and job satisfaction. School performance was measured by the end-of-grade state assessment for Mississippi, MCT2, which measures what students know and are able to do in the areas of reading-language arts and mathematics. State statisticians use the collectives schools’ and districts’ scores to develop Quality of the Distribution Indexes for each participating entity.

Findings indicated that classroom-based study participants perceived that each of the Leadership Practices Inventory’s five subscales of leadership traits correlated to the variable Teacher Satisfaction, whereas their Rapport with the Principal correlated with three of five subscales. Study participants also perceived that neither principal’s leadership traits nor teacher morale predicts school performance, which disputes current research. Further, analysis of the data indicated that classroom-based participants did not agree with their principals regarding the principals’ primary modes of leadership by rating the principal lower on the LPI than their principals who rated themselves higher in each of the five factors.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Over the history of public education, according to Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004), various reforms aimed at improving schools depended primarily on the quality of leadership and the leader’s ability to convey the vision and importance of proposed reform to his or her constituents and stakeholders. Since the launching of Sputnik in October of 1957, introduction of effective schools research during the 1970s, and following national reports such as A Nation at Risk, society catapulted the American educational system into a race to educate all of its citizenry to higher levels in subject areas such as math and science (Gorton, Alston, & Snowden, 2007). Such events, research, and reports heightened the sense of urgency educators felt regarding the effectiveness of education in the United States and led to legislation such as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and GOALS 2000; hence, teachers and administrators became charged with the task of preparing students to compete globally for the first time (Dyer, 1978). Although each reform has been different, their success relied heavily upon the talent of principals, instructional leaders, at the local level (Leithwood et al., 2004).

In addition to the changing rigors of education due to the aforementioned events, educators who faced more accountability as outlined in legislation such as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 also began to encounter greater quantities of students who needed more counseling due to poor or inadequate social environments (Jones & Egley, 2007). Hence, educators faced meeting the
challenging demands of educating the youth of the times in spite of overwhelming social obstacles. Along with the additional accountability and increasing social issues students face, teacher morale issues grew more prevalent in the classrooms of the new millennium (Jones & Egley, 2007). Black (2001) specified that when high teacher morale existed, teachers’ satisfaction with their work increased, as did student and school achievement. Although many contributing factors related to teacher morale, no one factor demonstrated more importance than the leadership of the instructional leader, the principal of the school (Black, 2001). Likewise Gorton, Alston, and Snowden (2007) noted that many researchers such as Edmonds, Lezotte, Korkmaz, and Monroe (2007) believed that the principal’s ability to lead presented itself as the most important factor that influenced teacher and school performance. Accordingly, Edmonds, et al.’s (2007) research denoted that the principal’s leadership acted as the key to school culture and systemic change within the school organization. Hence, one would believe that it went undisputed that effective instructional leadership would be critical to improved student achievement. Yet, despite decades of research and reform, noted Leithwood et al. (2004), research continued to be unclear regarding how leadership and improved performance connected. Thus, researchers tended to rely on things other than facts. In a study conducted by Leithwood et al. (2004) at the University of Minnesota, the research team examined the impact of leadership on learning, which assisted with finding answers to critical questions related to the relationship of principals’ leadership and learning. According to the study, leadership played a close second only to
teaching among the factors related to impact on achievement; yet, instructional leadership demonstrated even more importance in schools with high-risk populations. Leithwood et al. (2004) indicated that to achieve a productive teacher-principal relationship, a principal must have developed three key components: (a) setting direction via shared goals, (b) developing the professional skill set of teachers, and (c) establishing a positive working environment.

In modern times, leaders who valued others and who operated in a more collaborative method proved to be more successful than their counterparts who failed to connect to and empower others. Such leaders, noted Tschannen-Moran (2000), understood the importance the social capital and trust within the organization, which relates to the theory that if people connected in a trusting manner they more readily performed high quality job-related acts for each other. Hence, healthy social capital within an organization built upon the concept of trusting human networks in which the leader fostered interdependent interactions within the organization and functioned in the best interest of the whole versus the individual yielded a more productive staff (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Sabo, Barnes, & Hoy, 1996).

Monroe (1997) contended that to maintain a clear administrative perspective for school success, the principal actively engaged in the primary work of the school, educating students. Further, the administrator who lost touch with the primary goals inadvertently perpetuated poor working conditions for teachers through trivial and unfounded pursuits. The daily efforts of the school
leader to communicate verbally and through actions identified how he or she displayed support of the teachers as they worked to improve student achievement (Monroe, 1997). As far back as the early 1980s to the late 1990s, various studies documented teachers’ dissatisfaction with the field of education due to the lack of high quality leadership that utilized effective leadership styles or traits, which developed a positive work environment (Lumsden, 1998). This research, further supported by newer studies such as Mackenzie’s 2007 study of Australian educators, demonstrated, once again, the importance of leadership on the productive function of the school.

As teachers’ roles expanded to include teaching at higher cognitive levels and acting as counselors for high-risk students with a vast array of social issues, it became more important to explore ways to help teachers and administrators handle issues of teacher morale, how a person feels about their job and place in an organization (Mackenzie, 2007). Lumsden (1998), citing William Miller (1981), reported that high teacher morale could have a positive effect on student attitudes and learning. Improved teacher morale not only made the education process more palatable to teachers; it made the process a richer and more effective learning experience for students. Moreover, high morale helped to create what educators called “an environment conducive to learning” (Lumsden, 1998, p. 2) in which teachers teach and students learn.

Vail (2005) contended that by improving teachers’ professional skills through the use of inclusive leadership, principals increased morale and learning. This human resource or social capital investment allowed teachers to find
meaning in their work and to have a voice in the organization. The two aforementioned factors, meaning and voice, allowed teachers to feel a greater sense of commitment and dedication (Lumsden, 1998). Hence, researchers such as Vail (2005) warned that the principal must learn to identify leadership traits that will influence teacher morale in a positive manner and work from the understanding that teacher attitudes permeate to students through instruction and learning expectations. Notably, some related factors, such as self-esteem and pay rates, outside of the principal’s control, persistently existed throughout study after study; however, the principal held the key to improving those things that can be controlled (Vail, 2005). Consequently, given the talent, happy teachers more productively enhanced student achievement. Teachers who felt good about the work that they performed made greater efforts to provide students with high quality instruction and engaging activities, and they more persistently worked with at-risk struggling students (Ware & Kitsantas, 2007). Yet, little research regarding the relationship of principal leadership, teacher morale, and student achievement exists (Vail, 2005).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between elementary principals’ leadership traits and teacher morale. The study further sought to identify the impact of the principal-teacher relationship on school achievement as it relates to student performance on state standards as outlined in the Mississippi state academic frameworks and as measured using the Quality of the Distribution Index (QDI) on the Mississippi state end-of-grade test,
Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2). The end of year assessments, MCT2: Reading-Language Arts and Mathematics, administered to students in grades 3 through 8 in the spring of each school year, provided additional quantitative data for the study. Further, the study identified the relationship of teacher and instructional leader perceptions related to the leadership traits and qualities of effective leadership.

Typically, reported Leithwood et al. (2004), current research failed to give proper attention to the effects of effective leadership. However, in circumstances of greatest need schools that also service high numbers of at-risk students, the actions of the leader affected student performance more significantly than any other factor. Very few instances of documented positive school reform absent a quality leader existed in related literature (Leithwood et al., 2004; Morrissey, 2000). Results such as these evidenced the value of leadership in schools, specifically those in need of reform. “Total (direct and indirect) effects of leadership on student learning account[ed] for about a quarter of total school effects,” stated Leithwood et al. (2004, p. 5). Thus, benefits of the proposed study include: (a) the findings may provide insight about the effect leadership style has on teacher morale; (b) the findings may guide leaders in creating long-lasting systemic change through social capital; and (c) educators may use the project to identify leadership traits that promote improved school performance based on the research findings and implications of the project.

Teacher behaviors influenced student behavior the most and greatly affected student achievement (Squires, Huit, & Segars, 1983). However, the
principal’s interaction with teachers fostered an atmosphere that promoted high expectations and influenced student learning. A positive teacher-principal relationship allowed for the enhancement of teacher capacity with regard to instruction and management, thereby creating a positive work environment, which improved student success, related directly to the leadership capabilities of the principal (Squires et al., 1983). The principal held the greatest responsibility for setting the tone of the school via goals and expectations for teaching, learning, and behavior. According to Barker (2001), by inspecting the execution of the school’s organizational goals and objectives, principals communicated the level of importance held by each goal to the staff, students, and community stakeholders. Although the concept of effective leadership’s foundation lies in the business arena, the concepts of leadership easily transferred to educational settings. However, educators’ deeply rooted beliefs centered themselves around the concept that effective educational leadership, like their business counterparts, possessed the power to alter school-based organizational culture and employee performance (Barker, 2001). Therefore, the current project explored the strength of this relationship to ascertain the benefits to students and to better develop a more informed group of educational leaders.

Research Questions

Questions that were answered during the research included:

1. Is there a correlation between the elementary principals’ leadership traits as measured by the subscales of Leadership Practices Inventory-
Observer and teacher morale as measured by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire?

2. Is teacher morale as measured by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire related to school performance levels on the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index?

3. Do leadership traits of elementary principals as measured by the subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer and teacher morale as rated by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire predict school performance on the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index?

4. Is there a significant correlation between teacher and principal perceptions of the principals' primary leadership traits as rated by the subscales of Leadership Practices Inventory?

Hypotheses

As a result of the research questions noted above, the research project tested the following one-tailed null hypotheses:

H0₁: There is no statistically significant correlation between elementary principals' leadership traits as rated by the subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer and teacher morale as rated by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

H0₂: There is no statistically significant relationship between teacher morale as
measured by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and school performance levels on the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index scores.

H03: There is no statistically significant relationship between elementary principals’ leadership traits on the subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer and teacher morale as rated by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire on school performance as measured by the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index scores.

H04: There is no statistically significant correlation between teacher and principal perceptions of the principal’s primary leadership traits as rated by the subscales of Leadership Practices Inventory.

Definition of Terms

*Academic watch school* – any combination of K-8 school scoring a QDI of 100-132 that demonstrated adequate or outstanding academic gain or a school with a QDI of 133-165 that demonstrated inadequate academic gain (Mississippi Department of Education [MDE], 2009).

*At-Risk of failing school* – any combination of K-8 school scoring a QDI of 100-132 that demonstrated inadequate academic gain (MDE, 2009).

*Full academic year* – students who attend a school or district 70% of the year, at least 6 of the previous 7 months when student data are extracted from the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) in March of each school year (MDE, 2009).
Failing school - any combination of K-8 school scoring a QDI of 0-99 that demonstrated inadequate academic gain (MDE, 2009).

High performing school – any combination of K-8 school scoring a QDI of 166-199 that demonstrated adequate or outstanding academic gain or a school with a 200 plus QDI that demonstrated inadequate academic gain (MDE, 2009).

Instructional leader – a principal who concerns himself or herself with the instructional well-being of the school versus solely focusing on the day-to-day management of said school.

Leadership – “a subtle process of mutual influence fusing thought, feeling, and action to produce cooperative effort in the service of purposes and values embraced by both the leader and the led” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 339).

Leadership style – sets of quantifiable and comparable leadership characteristics, traits, or performances (Sun, 2004).

Low performing school - any combination of K-8 school scoring a QDI of 0-99 that demonstrated adequate or outstanding academic gain (MDE, 2009).

MCT2 – a three-part Mississippi criterion referenced assessment given to students in grades 3-8 during the spring of each school year. The test is formally known as the Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MDE, 2009).

Principal (instructional leader) – “1a: most important, consequential, or influential: Chief 2b: the chief executive officer of an educational institution” (Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary, 1976, p. 915).

Star school – any combination of K-8 school scoring a QDI of 200 or above that demonstrated adequate or outstanding academic gain, (MDE, 2009).
Successful school – any combination of K-8 school scoring a QDI of 133-165 that demonstrated adequate or outstanding academic gain or a school with a QDI of 166-199 that demonstrated inadequate gain (MDE, 2009).

Teacher morale – how a teacher feels about himself or herself as it relates to job performance and job satisfaction. “2a: the mental and emotional condition (as of enthusiasm, confidence, or loyalty) of an individual or group with regard to the function or tasks at hand b: a sense of common purpose with respect to a group: Esprit De Corps” (Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary, 1976, p. 748).

Delimitations and Limitations

Delimiters that may alter or affect the results and responses included:

- The research is limited to 20 school districts in the southern region of Mississippi, which yielded a small sample size of 74 administrators.
- Principals may choose not to return their surveys despite returning teacher surveys.
- Participants may respond in a manner they feel the researcher or their principals wants them to respond.
- The collected data will be limited to the beginning of the school year.

Projected limitations included:

- Implications for workforce application or generalizable nature of the study may not reach beyond the elementary educational workplace in the state of Mississippi.
- For the purposes of this study, the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index (QDI) will serve as the only measure of school performance.
Summary

Various events as far back as the launching of Sputnik in 1957 led to the call for educational reform from the highest levels of government. This phenomenon, evidenced in documents such as *A Nation At Risk* and the reauthorized version of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, noted Gorton et al. (2007), led to higher expectations being placed on teachers and principals. Consequently, the relationship between teachers and principals moved from that of a managerial relationship to one more closely focused on instruction. The success of schools heavily relied upon the principal’s ability to lead in a manner that resulted in improved teacher morale and student performance (Leithwood et al., 2004).

Researchers such as Vail (2005) and Lumsden (1998) continued to caution educators to focus on those leadership traits that influence teacher morale in a positive way. Despite these warnings, little research regarding the relationship of teacher morale and student achievement exists, according to Ware and Kitsantas (2007). Therefore, this study delved deeper into the relationship between elementary principals’ leadership styles or traits and teacher morale and further sought to determine if the relationship impacts school performance.
CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE REVIEW

Over the years, researchers found it impossible to improve school performance absent a skilled and knowledgeable leader and noted that the principal played a critical role in a school’s success (Gorton et al., 2007; Leithwood, Jantzl, Silins, & Dart, 1992; Thomas, 1997; Wallace Foundation, 2004). In a 2004 report, Leadership for Learning: Making the Connections Among State, District and School Policies and Practices, conducted by the Wallace Foundation, researchers reported that among all school-based factors contributing to improved learning, the only thing that outweighed great leadership was great classroom instruction. Among the states that participated in teacher work conditions surveys, teachers ranked leadership as most important when determining their decision to remain in the field of education. The research further supported the teachers’ data by indicating “behind excellent teaching and excellent schools is excellent leadership” (Wallace Foundation, 2004, p. 3).

Argyris (1964) found that considering the needs of employees in the workplace was found to be critical to the success of any organization. Other researchers followed suit when they further likened human needs to that of plants and the leadership position to that of a gardener when they indicated that, like the gardener who knows the need of the plants in his or her garden, so must the leader know the needs of his or her employees (Bolman & Deal, 2003). Hence, establishing good working conditions that addressed the needs of the employees allowed them to evolve and thrive in the work environment (Wallace Foundation,
Human behaviors, according to Bolman and Deal (2003), functioned under two premises: nature and nurture. Under the nature premise, humans possessed certain innate physiological needs, whereas, under the nurture premise, the environment in which humans lived and worked along with the social experiences they encountered determined human behaviors and needs. The duo noted that the nurture premise of human behaviors failed to take into account the genetics or nature of the individual by ignoring the innate human needs. Although the two premises differed tremendously, many researchers (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Cunningham & Cresso, 1993; Glickman, Gordon, & Ross-Gordon, 1995) recognized the importance of fulfilling basic needs as outlined by Abraham Maslow’s (1954) body of research that yielded the Hierarchy of Needs:

1. Physiological (food, shelter, water, health, etc.);
2. Safety (free of danger and threat);
3. Belongingness and Love (positive relationships with others);
4. Esteem (feeling valued by others and self); and
5. Self-actualization (reaching one’s potential).

Despite attempts to validate Maslow’s Hierarchy, researchers such as Lawler and Shuttle (1973) accepted the body of work and used it to influence research related to leadership behavior and decision making. According to Bolman and Deal (2003), human needs and wants, generally described as genetic preferences of one experience over another, guided the behavior of individuals. However, these genetic predispositions sometimes became altered after birth based on an individual’s exposure to various environments,
experiences, and learning. Thus, typical motivation evolved and developed from having the individual’s needs and/or wants met. The leaders or principals, in this context, charged with meeting the needs of their employees in the workplace influenced their constituents’ feelings about their work through their consideration of the employees’ needs (Lawler & Shuttle, 1973). The principal’s supportiveness through the mechanisms of the administrative function met lower levels of Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, according to Glickman et al., (1995). In contradiction, the more interactive supervisory functions of the leader allowed leaders to meet the teachers’ high-level needs. When leaders met the workers’ needs in a nurturing collegial environment, they reported being more satisfied with the workplace environment and aspired to be productive and successful within their respective environments (Glickman et al., 1995).

Leadership and Leadership Theories

Finzel (1994) defined leadership as the ability to influence others in such a profound way that they are willing to travel pathways they would have never traveled. To measure the quality and effectiveness of leadership, DePree (1989) suggested that researchers consider the state of the followers and their success, level of esteem, commonality of vision, sense of empowerment, and thoughts about the leader. He continued that the mere concept of leadership increasingly became the topic of many inspirational and self-help books, articles, speeches, and research. However, the concept of leadership, not only confined to education, progressed to the extent that its impact extended to all facets of life: work, church, home, and school. The leader in any venue acted as the visionary
and steward of the relationships within the organization; hence, securing his or her important role in organizational improvement (DePree, 1989).

With more emphasis being placed on the leader and following legislation such as GOALS 2000, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, the role of the principal began to experience a paradigm shift. Research, such as Edmond’s Effective Schools study, helped to catapult providing a proper teaching and learning environment to the forefront of the educational arena and became the primary purpose of educational leadership. To accomplish this goal, researchers such as Leithwood et al. (2004) suggested that the principal, also known as the instructional leader, start by setting direction in such a manner that all constituents and stakeholders clearly understood the vision for the school. The research suggested that the principal develop the talent of the teaching staff through meaningful and ongoing professional development opportunities and performance evaluations with the purpose of capacity building. This critical step in the effective leadership process also helped to build motivation and morale via the positive and direct experiences teachers encountered with their principals in the workplace (Wahlstrom, 2004). Further, this relationship between principal and teacher developed into one of the major contributing factors that improved student learning (Leithwood et al., 2004). Finally, the conscientious and effective instructional leader, the principal, found ways to redesign the organization or school in a manner that supported performance at all levels. However, the principal also ensured that reform practices matched the instructional and
improvement goals of the school in each studied school culture (Wahlstrom, 2004).

Therefore, in effective and positive school cultures, the principal’s role shifted from that of manager to instructional leader. With this change came more demands on the educational system; the shift refocused the 21st century leaders into different roles than those of earlier times. Gorton et al. (2007) noted that with more insight into the keys to effectiveness, school leaders’ role expectations increased as the research established that the principal’s leadership determined the effectiveness and success of the school. Today, educational researchers view the principal’s role as the most significant role in the educational setting. Gorton et al. (2007) identified the principal as the most influential person when it came to performance shifts from ineffective to effective, low performing to high performing. The transformation, however, did not come about by chance. Collins (2001) and his colleagues found quite the opposite; leaders demonstrated the use of extremely strategic maneuvers during the move to excellence. If schools improved, at the forefront of the shift was effective leadership. The leader forged the pathway to success by initiating strategic changes in organizational goals and objectives and assisting teachers in utilizing instructional best practices (Gorton et al., 2007).

Many leadership studies conducted in the last 70 years have traced their foundational roots as far back as the 1930s when researchers Lewin, Lippitt, and White popularized studying leadership behaviors (Gorton et al., 2007). Such research continued into the 21st century and provided more in-depth looks at
leadership in a variety of venues: business, schools, and churches. Gorton et al. (2007) noted that Lewin, Lippitt, and White’s 1938 research identified three primary leadership styles: authoritative, participative, and laissez-faire. Since the Lewin, et al. 1930s research surfaced, noted Gorton et al. (2007), other researchers, namely Getzel, Edmonds, McGregor, Collins, Blake, Mouton, et. al., developed and studied other categorical leadership styles or traits based on desired leadership behaviors that also supported educational means such as student learning, teacher job satisfaction, and high teacher morale.

Leadership, as it is known today, found its genesis in multiple venues affecting people from industry, business, and education alike. Thus, a leader’s vision and the manner in which he or she carries out that vision emanated from the halls of businesses to the doors of schoolhouses (Thomas, 1997). Since the concept of leadership hales from multiple venues, researchers acknowledge the impact it displays across a wide spectrum of settings. Researchers such as Leithwood, Jantzi, and Silins (1992) continued to add to the growing body of knowledge surrounding the topic of leadership and its impact on school effectiveness. However, the concept of leadership continued to demonstrate its perplexity with the numerous concepts found in research based on leadership theories and leadership effectiveness (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003).

Like other leadership frameworks such as those found in business, educational leadership research notably grounded itself in organizational psychology (Thomas, 1997). The basis for debate since the establishment of group-based work, leadership and leadership styles research, continued to
develop in definition over time stemming from the early works of Lewin, Lippitt, and White (Howard, 2005). As behavioral psychology grew in popularity during the 1950s, educational studies began to focus on leadership styles, which Eagly and Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) defined as a set of stable behaviors displayed by the leader.

The mere connotation of leadership styles research became somewhat of a slogan, as noted in the number of related and sometimes contradicting theories (Leithwood et al., 2004). Thus, It became imperative that styles such as autocratic, laissez faire, and democratic, which are often referred to as distributed or shared leadership, moved from being the menu items of the day and became re-established in a more proper form through research that subscribed to a more conservative attitude toward the concept of styles, noted Leithwood et al., (2004).

Early studies such as Lewin, Lippitt, and White’s 1938 and 1960 studies in which the researchers identified three fundamental leadership styles: (a) autocratic-unilateral leadership, (b) democratic-participative leadership, and (c) laissez-faire-hands-off leadership aided in the development of the educational leadership models of today. Likewise, McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y model aligned with Lewin, Lippitt, and White’s autocratic and democratic leadership styles respectively, noted Thomas (1997) and Bolman and Deal (2003). Theory X more closely aligned with autocratic leadership in that the leaders found their power from the position and believed that employees tended to be slothful and undependable. Conversely, Theory Y aligned more closely with the democratic
leadership style in that the leader drew from his or her constituents who voluntarily followed and demonstrated characteristics of being self-directed and creative (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Thomas, 1997).

In 1978, according to Molero, Cuadrado, Navas, and Morales (2007), J. M. Burns introduced transformational leadership in which the leader and the followers worked in tandem to reach collective goals. Simultaneously, Burns introduced the concept of transactional leadership in which the leader and followers work to achieve individual goals (Molero et al., 2007).

According to Howard (2005), all effective leaders shared four common characteristics. Effective leaders developed a shared common vision for the direction of the organization with the people they lead and ensured that all stakeholders knew and understood the organizational goals and objectives. Next, effective leaders earned trust by behaving in an honest way, which in turn developed mutual trust. Thirdly, they took calculated risks and used action-oriented decision-making strategies that sometimes stretched outside of organizational tradition. Finally, effective leaders communicated hope via effective communication skills by inspiring others to believe that they could achieve the set mission and goals (Howard, 2005).

Kouzes and Posner’s (2002) leadership model identified five practices or traits that exemplary leaders possessed. First, exemplary leaders modeled the way by setting the example for others in the organization. The leader in this theory clarified personal values as well as ensured that they aligned with those shared by the organization. Secondly, the leader inspired a shared vision by
communicating the vision in such a manner that tapped into the employees’ common aspirations and thereby fostered organizational unity. Next, exemplary leaders challenged the process through calculated risk-taking that enabled those within the organization to use their innovativeness to improve the organization. In such a work environment, the leader developed what Covey (2004) called win-win situations for their employees. Then, the effective leader enabled others to act by using a more democratic form of leadership, which encouraged collegiality and shared leadership. Finally, the leader encouraged the heart by showing appreciation for the employees’ efforts and contributions (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Exemplary leaders took care of every aspect of the organization’s employees’ mind, body, and spirit (Covey, 2004).

Likewise, leaders in effective organizations, noted Fullan (2003), possessed a mixture of personal humility and professional will. Leaders often conducted themselves in a reserved and even meek manner, more like Socrates than Caesar, hence more democratic than autocratic. In successful organizations, top-level leaders attributed success to those around them rather than taking credit for themselves. However, when things did not go as planned, exemplary leaders quickly took full responsibility for the outcomes (Collins, 2001).

Fullan (2003) noted that the Collins (2001) leadership studies led to identification or categorization of effective leaders as what has been termed level five leaders. These high-performing leaders led from the precept that if the right people were in place, the team would decide the course for the organization. He
also noted that the right people will understand the dynamics of challenges and will be equipped to handle them, which often led to vigorous debate on the course to great decisions such as that allowed by democratic leadership. Unlike the good-to-great companies, comparison companies tended to use a “genius with a thousand helpers” (Collins, 2001, p. 45-46) or autocratic format for leadership. Yet, in the absence of a brilliant leader, the companies would often reap failure as their harvest (Collins, 2001). However, Kouzes and Posner (2002) stated, “today there is much more demand for leaders who are exemplary coaches and individuals who show respect for people” (p. xix). Collins (2001) argued that the level five leader’s expectations demonstrated rigorousness rather than ruthlessness and did not opt to restructure in an effort to become lean and mean. Conversely, when making rigorous human resource decisions, level five leaders used three basic principles: (a) when in doubt, do not hire – keep looking; (b) when you know you need to make a people change, act; and (c) put your best people on your biggest opportunities, not your biggest problems.

With the many theories of leadership available, Leithwood et al. (2004) warned that researchers should maintain a critical view of “leadership by adjectives” and labels such as those found in most leadership research (p. 4). Thus, after a compilation of many years of leadership and leadership style or trait research as it related to educational and organizational effectiveness, the principal’s role evolved from that of principal-teacher to manager. However, in recent years the role of the principal anchored itself in instructional leadership with an emphasis on the importance of the principal’s role in improving
achievement and sustaining school reform (Thomas, 1997). More importantly, related research that maintained its authenticity in identifying the success of the leader regardless of the style of leadership became prevalent during the 1970s, prior to which researchers based leadership styles research, primarily on the Lewin, Lippitt, and White research from the late 1930s to the early 1960s. Researchers warned that studies should refrain from showing favoritism among styles but should focus on how style enhances teacher morale and student achievement (Leithwood et al., 2004).

The more than 70 years of research identified many factors of school success; however, one factor, instructional leadership, remained consistent across the research and proved to be the key factor in school effectiveness (Glickman, 2002; Leithwood et al., 1992; Marzano, 2003). Similarly, effective schools research of the 1980s denoted that the actions of the principal-leader were the primary determiners of school success (Patterson & Paterson, 2004). Although each leadership theory’s definition of leadership styles or traits had a place that depended on the situations that the principal faced, the principal’s primary leadership style or trait shaped the culture of the organization, which affected job satisfaction, teacher morale, and student achievement (Thomas, 1997; Collins, 2001).

Teacher Morale

As public attitude toward education shifted, as noted by Mackenzie (2007), teacher morale also shifted in a complimentary downward spiral. In addition, over the last 30 years, educational research reported a continued decline in
teacher morale as the work became increasingly more difficult and demanding. However, various reasons perpetuated this phenomenon such as workload, salary, and student behavior. Another contributor, perhaps the most important one, according to Cotton (2003), poor leadership, stood out as the one issue that district level administrators could control.

Researchers (Day, 2000; Eltis, 1997; Sachs, 2003) reported that teachers were considered resilient enough to mentally handle the everyday rigors of the job while maintaining focus on the students’ education, which educators, specifically administrators, often used as the rationale to avoid addressing teacher morale. High teacher morale, when supported by a healthy school environment, created the opportunity for increased student morale and improved student achievement. Conversely, an unhealthy school environment decreased teacher morale. As a result, teachers’ work ethic suffered which, in turn, influenced teacher and student performance. Consequently, teachers felt less committed to their body of work (Day, 2000; Eltis, 1997; Sachs, 2003). Teacher absenteeism increased while retention decreased, and distraught teachers sought alternate employment outside of the education realm. To counteract low teacher morale, leadership paid close attention to both internal and external factors and their interrelatedness to student and school performance. Ninety-seven percent of Australian teacher respondents reported that the principal is the major factor in teacher morale levels (Mackenzie, 2007). Thus, unlike effective leadership, ineffective leadership negatively affected teacher morale. However, results tended to vary from one school to the next due to school diversity. At
At least one respondent in the study disagreed with the idea of the principal’s effect and communicated that teachers who were actively involved tended to have higher teacher morale based on personal experiences. Despite the lone dissention, the respondent’s peers overwhelmingly contradicted the sentiment with only 3% agreeing with the idea that the principal was not the key to teacher morale.

Mackenzie (2007) identified three types or levels of teacher morale that principals should understand and address due to their interrelatedness to overall teacher morale: (a) personal, (b) school, and (c) professional. Personal morale related to a teacher’s personal and private situation and acted as the foundation for the other identified types of morale. While more directly related, school morale was comprised of the daily happenings that occurred within the schoolhouse. This work-based professional morale, although related to the other two forms, in how teachers perceived their status in society. The three combined established and embodied the full essence of what educators commonly referred to as teacher morale (Mackenzie, 2007).

With additional accountability associated with federal and state guidelines, administrators and politicians at both levels, as well as researchers, took a closer look at teaching and learning with specific attention paid to school achievement. Accordingly, school leadership also captured center stage as being important to the success of the school. According to Barker (2001), the School Management Task Force reported that instructional leaders who were visionary and motivational enabled learning environments to be more effective. Great leaders
shaped the climate or culture of an organization in such a manner that it facilitated success and inspired others to do extraordinary things by turning challenges into opportunities (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). In doing so, today’s leaders must consider the benefits of respecting the thoughts and feelings of others as they strive for excellence by being adept in collegial practices such as coaching. Further, leaders who valued others and their opinions tended to be more collaborative and more successful than their counterparts who typically utilized autocratic or lassiez-faire styles of leading. By fostering the growth of social capital, which related to the connotation that people who know and care for each other will do for each other, the leader built upon human networks within the organization, which in turn functioned in the best interest of the whole versus individual needs. Ideally, the leader ensured membership in such networks to build positive interdependence among the staff (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

According to Frase (1992),

There is overwhelming research evidence that teachers entered teaching to help young people learn, that their most gratifying reward is accomplishing this goal, and that the work-related factors most important to teachers are those that allowed them to practice their craft successfully. (p. 46)

Mackenzie (2007) noted that “if we accept a reciprocal relationship between teacher morale and student learning, students in some schools may not be getting the best possible value from teachers affected by low morale” (p. 80). Despite their findings, in the 2000 study conducted by the Organization for
Economic Co-operation and Development, researchers found that education did not live up to public expectations and, as a result, the public became dissatisfied and accountability increased; however, education continued to remain a low priority where funding and prestige were concerned.

Consequently, as the role of teaching changed to meet increasing standards and needs of students, teachers routinely became involved in additional tasks and duties that were not necessarily instructional in nature. Therefore, teachers typically completed additional tasks outside of their regular teaching duties. Such assigned and assumed duties included, but were not limited to, serving morning or afternoon duty, supervising extracurricular activities, and enhancing community relations. Although teachers had little psychology training, they also battled with performing counseling duties as they attempted to address social and psychological student needs. As teachers’ duties continued to expand further, teachers began to feel inept or incompetent to handle the demands of the additional responsibilities in a manner that benefitted students emotionally, physically, or academically (Mackenzie, 2007).

Further, teachers noted that policies, which mandated such acts including special-needs students in the regular classroom setting, diminished their ability to ensure skills attainment because it required delicate balancing of widely varying learning abilities, rates, and styles. Such anxieties about increased expectations and one’s performance led to low teacher morale. Cotton (2003) also noted that other causes of low teacher morale included poor salary, working conditions, and poor leadership, to name a few. Yet others (Day, 2000; Eltis, 1997; Sachs, 2003)
argued that teachers have a remarkable ability to maintain focus on teaching and learning, which led to administrators ignoring the teacher morale phenomenon (Mackenzie, 2007).

When teachers reported positive teacher morale, they felt better about instruction and learning; as a result, student performance improved (Young, 1998). Conversely, when teachers reported low morale, student achievement suffered due to decreased teacher performance, absenteeism, and attrition. Some teachers opted to leave the profession altogether when feelings of inadequacy occurred (Korkmaz, 2007). However, stakeholders expected teachers to improve achievement despite being overworked, underpaid, and provided with limited meaningful professional development (Korkmaz, 2007). Moreover, teachers were not only required to help students become life-long learners, they often served as the students’ role models and mentors (Lumsden, 1998). Coupled with poor leadership, these circumstances often led to teachers working in less than healthy organizations, feelings of incompetence, and low teacher morale. In a 1996 survey of Texas educators, 44% of surveyed teachers indicated that they strongly considered ending their teaching career (Lumsden, 1998). Further, within the first three years of teaching, many novice teachers decide to leave the profession because of being unable to cope with the unexpected demands of the job (Korkmaz, 2007).

The relationship between the follower and the leader proved critical to conceptually understanding leadership (Whitaker, Whitaker, & Lumpa, 2000). Thus, when teachers indicated a positive relationship with their principal in that
the principal’s values aligned with their values, a higher level of commitment and job satisfaction was noted. Further, Sun’s (2004) study found that supportive and encouraging principals who were also intellectually stimulating and living examples of excellence built better working relationships and environments. Leaders who exhibited behaviors of a more transformational versus democratic nature more likely resulted in teachers with more positive behaviors (Sun, 2004). Hence, to create a climate of expressed truth and mutual respect, leaders led through questioning rather than offering the answer to his or her constituents. Effective leaders elected to participate in healthy debate instead of coercion and opened the organization up for fervent discussions, thereby genuinely giving others opportunities to participate in the decision-making process. By conducting business in this manner, those within the organization examined closely the successes and failures without fear of blame and, created improved leader-worker relationships (Collins, 2001).

Some researchers (DuFour, Eaker, & DuFour, 2005; Korkmaz, 2007) identified the principal as the key figure in a school with the quality of his or her leadership style having the greatest impact on teaching and learning. By creating a learning environment that offered teachers creative freedom, principals helped build collegiality and positive morale among the staff, as well as provided students an opportunity to affirm their performances through various demonstrations of learning (Korkmaz, 2007). Principals who created healthy collegial learning environments provided teachers with avenues to improve instructional practice and student achievement (Korkmaz, 2007). Such an
environment helped teachers experience more success and heightened feelings of job satisfaction and high teacher morale, which Lumsden (1998) defined as the teachers’ mental attitude toward the work and working environment. In addition, teachers rated their morale level based on their perceptions of how the work environment met their physical and physiological needs and expectations (Lumsden, 1998). Hence, many principals, the key factor in creating and sustaining a positive work environment, altered their behaviors or leadership styles and acted as the leading avenue for reinforcement of teacher behaviors, which resulted in increased teacher morale (Lumsden, 1998).

Covey (2004) indicated that “human beings are not things needing to be motivated and controlled; they are four dimensional – body, mind, heart, and spirit” (p. 21). The leader’s failure to approach staff holistically created a work atmosphere that conversely affected productivity; workers reported low morale, a sense of being dissatisfied with their work and workplace, or failure to reach their potential using their talents. Working in such an environment stifled staff members’ creativity and innovativeness. Thus, leaders, charged with finding new ways to lead the “whole person,” in turn helped their staffs find their voices by addressing each of the four dimensions (Covey, 2004, p. 20). According to Ruby Payne (2005), subordinates refused to work for those in leadership roles when there was no significant relationship. Building positive relationships inspired teachers to follow their leader. As teachers continued to face challenges that required them to meet rigorous standards while meeting the needs of individual students in an ever-changing instructional environment, they learned to
reciprocate relationship building between them and their students to further improve achievement (Payne, 2005).

High teacher morale, equated with job satisfaction, contributed to increased student achievement in a study conducted by Ellenberg in 1972. Students who encountered teachers with high morale encountered a learning environment and experiences that fostered higher student achievement. However, the opposite, low morale, led to decreases in student achievement due to reduced teacher and student productivity. The implications of high or low teacher morale indicated that morale will extend from the teacher to the student and will affect the strength of the school and impact learning and school performance (Ellenberg, 1972). Thus, researchers (Lumsden, 1998; Whitaker et al., 2000) encouraged principals to provide opportunities for teacher empowerment through shared decision making and to ensure that teachers engaged in meaningful work. Further, teachers also noted that the principal's support in student and parent matters strengthened feelings of empowerment and high morale (Lumsden, 1998).

To ensure that an environment that promoted high academic achievement and high teacher morale existed, Protheroe (2006) suggested that it is critical for principals to create an environment that focuses on learning. Creating such an environment often became complicated by outside factors, such as accountability and high-stakes testing that administrators and government placed on teachers through such legislation as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The current environment of high stakes testing, coupled with increased accountability, forced
principals to find a balance between the messages of offering support and communicating high expectations to teachers. Due to mixed messages, teacher morale issues continued to surface at some schools. Offering pay increases or reducing class size, although desirably providing mechanisms to improve the manageability of teaching, typically yielded to budget constraints. However, Protheroe (2006) reported that principals improved teacher morale when they exhibited behavioral skills routinely linked to democratic leadership. Essential leadership skills included: (a) listening to teachers, (b) being supportive and less evaluative, and (c) expressing appreciation. By balancing their support efforts, principals created an environment where teachers wanted to work and felt good about their work (Protheroe, 2006). Teachers also played a significant role in the school’s reaction to adversity. In non-productive school cultures, teachers focused on the negative aspects of the school, thus creating a toxic school culture. This lack of focus on the mission of the school caused fragmentation among the staff with the final effect being exhausted resilience. However, schools with strong leaders exceeded survival mode; their cultures often improved, and teachers’ working relationships improved (Patterson & Patterson, 2004).

Willis (1994) indicated in his research that if school districts wanted to make a real impact on teaching and learning to the extent that systemic change occurred, teachers must play an integral part in the decision-making process at the classroom level. Further, to meet future educational challenges, leaders empowered teachers to make decisions at a broader level of the decision-making
process to the extent that decisions affected the school as a whole. Effective
administrators held to the theme of selflessness and operated from a team
concept that opened the system to all teachers. This level of involvement
enabled teachers to release their professional energy and potential within the
school and district rather than remain on an academic island unto themselves.
Willis (1994) stated, “If you ask staff members, they’re going to make quality
decisions” (p. 1). He continued, “When districts move to site-based budgeting,
for example, schools become penny-pinchers, he said, and school-level
educators make good decisions on behalf of students” (p. 1).

Willis (1994) noted that the leaders in every district think they are
empowering teachers to make critical decisions; however, in many school
districts, teacher participation is at the surface level only. The principal routinely
continued to decide the outcomes without true consideration of input from others.
Moreover, the principal decided who would and who would not participate in the
process, which sometimes created teams that decided in favor of the principal's
decision. Conducting business in this manner actually had the opposite effect
and became a mechanism to disenfranchise those the principal intended to
empower. By participating in this façade, principals often wrongly thought they
opened the system to shared or dispersed decision-making when, in fact, the
system remained as closed as it had been with the principal failing to cultivate an
inclusive culture that indicated to teachers their importance to the organization
(Coulson, 1988).
Although Willis (1994) advocated broad-based teacher participation, he noted three exceptions to decision making that involved areas that belong in the jurisdiction of district leadership's responsibility. These areas included: (a) setting the direction, (b) making final personnel decisions, and (c) some aspects of budgeting. One reason cited for reserving the three areas to the district/school leadership leaned on the premise that core values are non-negotiable; they guide the district's course.

Thus, empowering teachers involved more than simply turning control over to them; it required teacher participation in appropriate training opportunities to be successful (Coulson, 1988). Without the needed training, attempts to disperse or share decision-making authority yielded unproductive results. Willis (1994) ended with a quote from Jerry Patterson, superintendent in Appleton, Wisconsin:

Opening up the system requires determination, because pushing against the outer limit of the organization causes educators to “bounce back” to the old ways. It also takes a “leap of faith” to move to a new way of relating to others. But such a change is necessary to increase the capacity of the system to stretch and grow. We have to address these issues if public education is to survive. (p. 4)

Collins (2001) stated in the first sentence of the book Good to Great that “good is the enemy of great….this is one of the key reasons why we have so little that becomes great” (p. 1). This principle indicated why organizations such as businesses and schools across the country fall short of being great; they settled
for being good. Even government, as does the individual, fell prey to being good. However, good-to-great transformations happened when companies, businesses, schools, and individuals refused to settle for the status quo. The transformation, however, did not come about by chance. Collins (2001) and his colleagues found that quite the opposite took place; the move from good-to-great required calculated risk, and it began with leadership. Great leaders shaped the climate or culture of an organization in such a manner that it esteemed and inspired others to do extraordinary things by turning challenges into opportunities for success (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Teacher Morale and Student Achievement

Thomas (1997) used the terms job satisfaction, job attitudes, and morale synonymously when she described how teachers felt about their jobs and their ability to perform as a result of the school’s climate, which the principal augmented based on how he or she led the school through leadership traits. The principal’s leadership style, an important key factor in a school’s success, positively or negatively affected teacher morale, although a person typically controlled his or her own morale, noted Houchard (2005). In fact, the principal’s leadership style played a role in altering a teacher’s mental and emotional exhaustion by enhancing and nurturing the teacher (Houchard, 2005), and improved student achievement depended on the principal’s ability to relate effectively within the social structures of the organization (Leithwood et al., 2004). Findings yielded three basic practices for effective leadership: (a) setting
direction, (b) developing people, and (c) redesigning the organization (Leithwood et al., 2004).

Araki (1982) reported on a study conducted in Hawaii, which Sapone (1983) and Goodlad (1984) later corroborated, that as teacher morale increased due to less perceived principal-induced stress and frustration, achievement increased; in other words, so went the principal, so went the school. Further, Barth (1990) indicated that a positive teacher-principal relationship is the most important characteristic of an effective school. Hence, highly participative leadership styles which involved principals being more supportive of teachers and sharing decision-making led to less mental exhaustion and higher teacher morale (Houchard, 2005). On the contrary, unhealthy teacher-principal relationships led to decreased teacher morale and effectiveness, as noted by Barth (1990).

Keeler and Andrews (1963) specified that students of teachers with high morale performed at an increased level above their counterparts whose teachers exhibited low morale. Therefore, the research supported the theory that student achievement and teacher morale are interrelated. In direct relation, Thomas (1997) continued, the principal remained the central figure in building teacher morale or job satisfaction, and in 1985, Johnston and Germinario supported the concept that improved teacher morale and productivity relied heavily on the principal and his or her use of shared decision-making. Thus, more inclusive leadership styles reportedly provided for greater positive impact on teachers and their productivity. Thus, the principal’s leadership behaviors or leadership style
related to different levels of improved outcomes that equated to success (Sun, 2004).

Summary

In schools that made an organization shift to improved instruction, the principal acted as the catalyst (Leithwood et al., 2004) or key (Gurr, 1997) to improved teacher morale and student achievement because they controlled the culture and climate of instruction within the school through their actions and behaviors. Hence, effective principals developed the skill set to manage and sustain the ever-changing teaching and learning environment in such a manner that fostered collegiality and mutuality (Thomas, 1997), while keeping staff morale high (Million, 2005). Inevitably, not everyone possessed the skill or desire to use leadership styles or traits outside of their dominate characteristics or their proverbial comfort zone. Although the leader’s preferred style and decisions closely related to his or her personality and morale value system, he or she may benefit from the use of multiple styles depending on the situation at hand (Howard, 2005).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

At the onset of the 21st century, political leaders began to comprehend and communicate the importance of education to the success of society and survival of this country’s citizenry. To address this concern, the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future supported and called for political and academic leaders to place more emphasis on the nation’s instructional force. To ensure that students received a high-quality educational experience, the commission challenged educational leadership at every level – national, state, and local – to create mechanisms that would support teaching and learning. Darling-Hammond (2007) stated, “the quality of school level leaders and specific practices they engage in is second only to that of teachers in predicting student achievement” (p.17). The labors, or works, of the school’s instructional leader, the principal, enable teachers to do those things that prove beneficial to learning. Hence, it is the leader’s ability to use his or her dominant leadership traits or style to inspire teachers to teach more effectively (Darling-Hammond, 2007).

Therefore, the purpose of the current study is to draw generalizations about leadership traits or styles and teacher morale as they relate to school performance using subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) and the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI). The proposed quantitative study was conducted using a survey-design method in which teacher respondents
completed a 6-item descriptive review and were randomly selected to complete a 40-item opinionnaire, survey, or a 30-item leadership practices inventory.

Methodology and Design

The sample consisted of 2,311 kindergarten through sixth grade elementary teachers from the selected Mississippi school districts, which represent the southernmost region of the state, the Mississippi Gulf Coast. Participants were solicited to participate in the study based upon their districts’ membership in the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium (GCEIC). Therefore, a non-random sampling of districts was chosen to participate in this study. The represented districts provided for a wide array of teacher experiences, economic settings, and student populations as well as leadership styles or traits. Seventy-four administrative respondents, principals, from 20 of the available 23 school districts completed a 36-item, two-part survey that included a 6-item, researcher-designed descriptive review and the 30-item Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)-Self survey, which was developed by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner (2002a). Instructional-based study participants, teachers, completed a 6-item researcher designed descriptive review, and 40 items representing the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire or a 30-item Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer survey.

Both surveys provided demographic information and data regarding the observers’, teachers’, and the principals’ perceptions of the principals’ leadership styles or traits and school and school morale. Performance or achievement-based archival data as they relate to the Mississippi Department of Education’s
newly-approved accountability model, which takes into account both achievement and growth, were collected via the department’s accountability reporting webpage, Mississippi Assessment and Accountability Reporting System, or MAARS. Thus, reported assessment data were based on each school’s student performance on the end-of-grade state assessment, 2009-2010 Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT²) as noted by the schools’ Quality of the Distribution Indices, QDI, which is a measure of student achievement based on the reading-writing and mathematics results. The QDI formula, \[\left(\%M \times 0 + \%B \times 1\right) + \left(\%P \times 2\right) + \left(\%A \times 3\right)\], although simple, provided each school and district with a score that correlates to a specified performance level. The formula used to calculate QDI scores included results of both regular and special needs students who met the full academic year prerequisite by attending a school or district at least 70% of the school year, 6 of the previous 7 school months, as evidenced by information found in the state’s Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS) in March of each school year. Further, the growth status for each district was gathered as additional assessment data. Growth status, reported as met (0) or not met (1), measured the academic value-added to the school as measured by each eligible student’s year-to-year performance (MDE, 2009).

Survey Instruments
To yield descriptive data from the surveys, section one of the two-part surveys contained six items dedicated to identifying teacher and site
demographics to provide an overview and description of the study participants and schools. This researcher-designed portion of the teacher and principal surveys solicited demographic information from the respondents that helped describe the instructional setting, respondent experience, and class demographics. Section two was comprised of 40 items from the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire that yielded research data that specifically addressed teacher morale and job satisfaction, as noted in Table 1 (Houchard, 2005) or Kouzes and Posner’s (2003) Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer, which will yield quantitative information regarding the principal’s leadership traits based upon five factors noted in Table 2 (see Appendix B).

The principal or administrative respondents at each participating school completed a 30-item leadership traits survey, the Leadership Practices Inventory-Self; the leadership items will aid in administrators identifying their primary leadership style or trait and provide corresponding data regarding how principals’ and teachers’ views align or differ. The administrator’s survey, Part I, also solicited similar demographic information from the respondents while the Leadership Practices Inventory-Self, Part II, provided information regarding the principal’s perception of his or her leadership traits.

Teacher morale was measured using factors one and two of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO), which divided teacher morale into 10 related factors to give an opportunity to make generalizations regarding teacher morale that are more meaningful to readers. The 10 related factors, as reported by Houchard (2005) and shown in Table 1, with the correlating survey items include factors
such as Teacher Rapport with Principal, Rapport Among Teachers, and Satisfaction with Teachers. While the PTO delved into two factors relating to teacher morale and job satisfaction, such as the type of relationship the principal builds or fails to build with the staff, the LPI identifies those factors or areas, (Table 2) on which the principals tend to rely heavily in their day-to-day operations.

Table 1

_Purdue Teacher Opinionaire Factors_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Correlating Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher Rapport with Principal</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 33, 38, 41, 43, 44, 61, 62, 69, 70, 72, 73, 74, 92, 93, 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Satisfaction with Teaching</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>19, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 46, 47, 50, 51, 56, 58, 60, 76, 78, 82, 83, 86, 89, 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rapport Among Teachers</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>18, 22, 23, 28, 48, 52, 53, 54, 55, 77, 80, 84, 87, 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teacher Salary</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>4, 9, 32, 36, 39, 65, 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher Work-Load</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 31, 34, 40, 42, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instructional Issues</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>17, 20, 25, 79, 88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alphas</th>
<th>Correlating Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teacher Community Status</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>13, 15, 35, 37, 63, 64, 68, 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community Support of Education</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>66, 67, 94, 96, 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>School Facilities and Services</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>16, 21, 49, 57, 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Community Expectations</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>81, 85, 91, 98, 99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire survey instrument enabled the researcher to draw generalizations at three levels: individual, school-wide, and district-wide (Houchard, 2005). For the purposes of the study, the researcher focused on school-wide morale thereby using only the items related to factors one and two to determine teacher morale. The items on the PTO, designed using a four-point Likert style scale: (1) Disagree, (2) Probably Disagree, (3) Probably Agree, and (4) Agree, measured the degree to which respondents agreed with each statement posed. Cronbach’s alphas, a measure of internal consistency, for the instrument ranged from .55 to .96, respectively as noted by Bentley and Rempel (1980), with a mean reliability coefficient of .79, which was based on a test-retest reliability measure (see Table 1). However, for the purposes of this study, factors one (.96) and two (.88) were the only factors used. The instrument was redesigned omitting items from the remaining eight factors. Each item for factors one and two remained in their original order but were
renumbered for the purposes of the study. The PTO’s copyright has expired, and it falls within public domain; therefore, permission to use the survey was not required, but was obtained (see Appendix A).

Principal leadership traits as measured by Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) for the observer (teachers) and self (principal) provided data regarding each principal’s leadership traits. Each LPI, self and observer, consisted of 30 items, which the developers divided into five factors or practices of leadership as noted in Table 2: (1) Model the Way, (2) Inspire a Shared Vision, (3) Challenge the Process, (4) Enable Others to Act, and (5) Encouraging the Heart (Houchard, 2005; Kouzes & Posner, 2002b). The instrument demonstrated acceptable internal consistency as established via test-retest reliability with coefficients for the LPI-Observer ranging between .88 and .92 and the LPI-Self ranging between .75 and .87 (Kouzes & Posner, 2002b).

Table 2

Leadership Practices Inventory Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha’s</th>
<th>Correlating Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Observer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kouzes and Posner granted this researcher permission to use the Leadership Practices Inventory, as noted in Appendix A. Each 15-minute teacher survey consisted of 36-46 statements from two of three categories: (a) Teacher and School Demographics and (b) Job Satisfaction and Teacher Morale or (c) Leadership Traits. The 15-minute principal survey consisted of 33 statements related to school and respondent demographics and what the respondent perceived his or her primary leadership traits to be.

Population

The population of the study was comprised of elementary teachers and administrators from 20 school districts located in the southern region of Mississippi (see Table 3) with various backgrounds and experiences. The selected districts came from member school districts of the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium (GCEIC), which acts as a professional learning community for the southern region of the state. The elimination of three districts – Forrest County Agricultural School District, because it does not have any elementary schools, Moss Point School District, district 12, due to district-wide restructuring that included administrative reassignment, and The Catholic Diocese of Biloxi, because it is a non-public school district that does not take the same end-of-grade tests as the other districts – narrowed the number of districts to 20.
### Table 3

**District-Level Study Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ID</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of Surveys Per Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bay-Waveland</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Biloxi</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>George County</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Greene County</td>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gulfport</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hancock County</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Harrison County</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jackson County</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lumberton Public</td>
<td>Lamar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ocean Springs</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pascagoula</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pass Christian</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pearl River County</td>
<td>Pearl River</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Perry County</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Petal</td>
<td>Forrest</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Picayune</td>
<td>Pearl River</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District ID</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of Surveys Per Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Poplarville Separate</td>
<td>Pearl River</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Stone County</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were asked to identify their principal's dominate leadership traits from a defined list of practices as identified in the literature and on the Leadership Practices Inventory developed by Kouzes and Posner in 1988 (see Appendix B). The Leadership Practices Inventory's Likert-style scale uses the following ratings from which respondents scored each of the 30 items: (1) Almost never, (2) Rarely, (3) Seldom, (4) Once in a while, (5) Occasionally, (6) Sometimes, (7) Fairly often, (8) Usually, (9) Very frequently, and (10) Always (Kouzes & Posner, 2001). In addition, participating schools’ performance levels and QDI scores in reading/language arts and mathematics as evidenced by their performance on the 2009-2010 end-of-course assessment, MCT2, were collected via the survey and verified using the Mississippi State Department of Education’s webpage (http://www.mde.k12.ms.us). For descriptive purposes, demographic data were also collected regarding the teachers’ sex, grade level currently taught, class size, and years of experience. Using a different Likert-
style 10-point rating scale, teachers also rated the impact their principals’ leadership traits have on their morale, job satisfaction, and productivity, as indicated by Bently and Rempel’s Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire.

After receiving IRB approval and as a precursor to the study, the researcher met with the superintendent corps of the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium to provide them with information regarding the purpose of study and give them a copy of the surveys used in the study (see Appendix A). The intent of the meeting was to gain their permission to conduct the proposed study in their district’s elementary schools. Upon receiving oral or written-signed permission from the superintendents of each participating district, the appropriate number and type of self-addressed stamped, envelope surveys were given to each curriculum director for disbursement to the elementary teachers and principals within their districts via their district’s elementary school secretaries. Teachers in districts where the curriculum director was unable to participate had their surveys hand-delivered or mailed by the researcher. The principals’ surveys were placed in an envelope marked “principal,” and teachers’ surveys were placed in standard white envelopes, which indicated a due date and to whom to return the survey.

Each respondent received a memorandum of consent to participate that also outlined anonymity guidelines (see Appendix A). Further, the accompanying memorandum provided participants who received their surveys from the curriculum directors with more directions regarding the purpose and process as well as an informed consent. Participants were reassured that their responses
would be confidential and anonymous, as indicated on the informed consent forms. Participants’ acceptance of the informed consent was verified via their participation in the study, as evidenced by the returned completed surveys. Respondents not willing to participate did not return their surveys or opted to return blank surveys.

Teachers were randomly selected to receive either survey, LPI-Observer or PTO. Half of the teachers at each site received the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer while their peers received the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. At the end of two weeks, the secretaries at each participating school returned the sealed surveys to the researcher. After collecting an acceptable percentage of the surveys, the researcher entered the information into an Excel document, which was later converted to SPSS-16 for the purpose of conducting the statistical portion of the study.

Principals and superintendents were not given access to their school or district’s individual disaggregated results of the surveys but did receive, upon request, a copy of the final research project and recommendations, Chapters IV and V, to use for their administrative staffs’ professional development.

Analysis of Data

Statistical testing was completed using various statistical tests and analyses. For descriptive purposes, frequencies, standard deviations, and means were calculated using demographic information from both teacher and administrative respondents. Hypotheses one (1) and four (4) were measured using Pearson correlations whereas Hypotheses two (2) and three (3) were
measured using multiple regression to identify selected variables’ predictive qualities. For the purposes of this study, the significance value was set at the $p=.05$ level.

Summary

Participating respondents, elementary teachers and their principals, from the 74 elementary schools in the Gulf Coast Consortium completed a two-part survey, which yielded quantitative data regarding the relationship of principal leadership traits, teacher morale, and school performance as measured by the Quality of the Distribution Index (QDI), which is a calculation of how a school performed in the areas of reading-language arts and mathematics on the end-of-grade state assessment, MCT2. The data aided in the completion of various statistical tests including means and standard deviations, as well as Pearson Correlations and multiple regression. Analyses were conducted to provide school-, district-, and state-level administrators with pertinent information regarding whether the principal’s leadership traits predict or correlate to teacher morale and overall school performance on the end-of-grade assessment, MCT2.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of the study was to determine if a significant relationship existed between elementary principals’ leadership traits and teacher morale. The study sought to identify the impact of the principal-teacher relationship on school achievement as it relates to student performance on state standards as outlined in the Mississippi state academic frameworks and as measured using the Quality of the Distribution Index (QDI) on the Mississippi state end-of-grade test, Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2). The end-of-year assessments, collectively known as MCT2: Reading-Language Arts and Mathematics, administered to students in grades 3 through 8 in the spring of each school year, provided additional quantitative data for the study. Further, the study identified whether a correlation existed between the way principals and teachers perceive the principals’ primary leadership traits.

Description of Study Participants

Table 4 consists of descriptive data regarding the study participants. Participants included elementary principals and teachers who work in member districts of the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium (GCEIC). Of the 23 member districts, 20 districts participated in the study; three districts were omitted from the study for reasons cited in Chapter III. Seventy-four principals representing 2,311 teachers were asked to participate in the study. Of the 74 elementary principals, 46 principals, 62.16%, agreed to participate by returning their surveys accompanied by 797, or 34.48%, of the requested teacher surveys.
Methodology permitted all non-administrative certified staff members such as classroom teachers, librarians, speech pathologists, counselors, physical education teachers, etc., to participate as teacher respondents. All participants worked in elementary settings and taught or supervised students in grades kindergarten through sixth.

Female participants comprised 69.5% of teacher participants for the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer and 69.3% of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire with 3.2% and two and 2.6% being males. Females also dominated the administrative respondent make-up with 63.0% reporting female as their gender. The average age of the administrative respondents equally distributed across age ranges of 31-40, 41-50, and greater than 50, with 23.9% being in each category; no principals indicated 21-30 as their age range. However, 13, or 28.3%, opted not to reply to the request for an age range. The teacher respondents who completed the LPI-Observable varied in ages with the majority (55.3%) being 31-50 years of age and 53.9% of those who completed the PTO being 41 to greater than 50 years of age. The teachers who responded to the teacher morale component survey, PTO, of the study indicated a slightly older age range than their counterparts. Likewise, teacher experience levels primarily aligned to the 5-10 year range (27.4%) for LPI-Observer and greater than 15 range (41.0%) for the PTO respondents, respectively. The majority, 81.1% (LPI-Observer), 83.5% (PTO), and 67.4% (LPI-Self, Principal), indicated Caucasian as their race; whereas 10.9% or less reported themselves as African American on each of the three surveys. Forty-five percent (LPI-Observer) and 49.4% (PTO) of
the respondents indicated that their class sizes averaged between 16-20 students, respectively. The total number of study participants equaled 843 (LPI-Self, n=46; LPI-Observer, n=380; and PTO, (n=417), or 35.76%, participation rate. Several schools that returned completed teacher surveys were omitted from the study due to their principals’ failure to return the principal survey.

Table 4

*Population Descriptives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LPI-Self (Principal)</th>
<th>LPI-Observer (Teacher)</th>
<th>PTO (Teacher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LPI-Self (Principal)</th>
<th>LPI-Observer (Teacher)</th>
<th>PTO (Teacher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>LPI-Self (Principal)</th>
<th>LPI-Observer (Teacher)</th>
<th>PTO (Teacher)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal and teacher respondents of the Leadership Practices Inventory

Self (principal) and Observer (teacher) each rated the principal on his or her primary leadership traits using a Likert-style rating system of the Leadership Practices Surveys self (principal) and observer (teacher) with one (low) to ten (high) representing a scale of how much a principal utilized one of the five effective leadership practices noted in Tables 5 and 6. A review of the descriptive data indicated that teachers tended to rate principals lower on each of the subscales than principals rated themselves. Principals rated themselves on average 8.43 to 8.88 on each of the five subscales or factors (see Table 5).
However, teachers’ perception ratings of the principals’ primary traits ranged between averages of 7.64 to 8.01.

Table 5

_Descriptives: Leadership Practices Inventory – Self (Principal) N=46_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QDI</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>168.50</td>
<td>23.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

_Descriptives: Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer (Teacher) N=380_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QDI</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>171.16</td>
<td>21.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers who responded to the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (see Table 7) indicated that overall teacher morale rated 3.19 for Teacher Satisfaction with the job and 3.06 for Rapport with Principal on a four-point Likert-style scale. Results indicated that on average teachers perceived themselves as having high morale on the selected factors.

Table 7

*Descriptive Statistics for Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (Teacher) N=417*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QDI</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>170.90</td>
<td>22.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport with Principal</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall school performance as measured by the students’ aggregated scores on the MCT2 end-of-year exam for students’, beginning in third grade, scale scores ranged from 168.50 (LPI-Self, Table 6), 171.6 (LPI-Observer, Table 7), and 170.90 (PTO, Table 8), respectively. Results indicated that schools’ performance levels averaged in the upper category of the state’s scale, High Performing. The minimum QDI, 125, ranked Academic Watch, while the maximum reported QDI, 232, received the highest rating of Star School.

Tests of Hypotheses

Pearson correlations measured the results of Hypotheses one (1) and four (4) to determine if a correlation existed between the variables. Multiple
regression tests measured Hypotheses two (2) and three (3) to determine the predictive qualities, if any, of the selected variables. For the statistical results to be deemed significant in the study, the result must have met the \( p=.05 \) significance level.

**Leadership and Teacher Morale**

A Pearson correlation measured \( H_{01} \): There is no statistically significant correlation between elementary principals’ leadership traits as rated by the subscales of the aggregated Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer, and teacher morale as rated by the selected subscales of the aggregated Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. As seen in Table 8, Rapport with Principal as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire did not correlate to all five subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer, which denoted effective leadership traits or practices. Therefore, teacher perceptions of their principals’ leadership traits did not completely align to teacher perceptions of the importance of having a relationship with their principal. Results for the variable Rapport with Principal yielded significant correlations with three of the five factors (60%) of the LPI-Observer: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, and Challenge the Process. However, on the contrary, the variable Teacher Satisfaction aligned to each of the five subscales identified by the LPI-Observer with significance levels ranging from \( p=.01 \) to \( p=.05 \) (See Table 8). Thus, respondents completing both surveys indicated that the principals’ leadership traits significantly correlated to the Teacher Satisfaction portion of morale as measured by the PTO. The results and analysis led to the decision to partially reject the null hypothesis.
Table 8

Pearson Correlation: Principal Leadership and Teacher Morale *N=46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Satisfaction</th>
<th>Rapport with Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging the Heart</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *aggregated N

Teacher Morale and Student Achievement

A multiple regression measured the null hypothesis, H0₂: There is no statistically significant relationship between teacher morale as measured by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire and school performance levels on the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index scores. The multiple regression was not significant at $F(2,43) = .40$, $p = .67$, $R^2 = .02$; an analysis of the data led to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, respondents perceived that teacher morale does not predict student achievement.
Leadership Traits, Teacher Morale, and School Performance

A multiple regression measured the predictive nature of the principals’ leadership traits, teacher morale, and student achievement via the null hypothesis $H_0^3$: There is no statistically significant relationship between elementary principals’ leadership traits on the subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer and teacher morale as rated by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire on school performance as measured by the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index scores. According to an analysis of the test, leadership traits and teacher morale do not significantly effect school performance $F(7,38) = .71$, $p=.67$, $R^2 = .12$. The subsequent analysis led to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis.

Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Principal’s Leadership Traits

To determine if teachers and principals perceived the principals’ leadership in a similar manner, a Pearson correlation test identified that the principals’ perception of their use of the five leadership traits did not significantly align to the teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ usage, as noted in Table 9. Thus, the null hypothesis, $H_0^4$: there is no statistically significant correlation between teacher and principal perceptions of the principal’s primary leadership traits as rated by the subscales of Leadership Practices Inventory, was substantiated by the results. Therefore, the analysis led to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model the Way_P</th>
<th>Model the Way_T</th>
<th>Inspire a Shared Vision_P</th>
<th>Inspire a Shared Vision_T</th>
<th>Challenge the Process_P</th>
<th>Challenge the Process_T</th>
<th>Enable Others to Act_P</th>
<th>Enable Others to Act_T</th>
<th>Encouraging the Heart_P</th>
<th>Encouraging the Heart_T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model the Way_T</th>
<th>Inspire a Shared Vision_T</th>
<th>Challenge the Process_T</th>
<th>Enable Others to Act_T</th>
<th>Encouraging the Heart_T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Five paired samples t tests (see Table 10) resulted in a confirmation of the data noted in Table 5 and Table 6. According to the paired samples t tests, principals’ perception of their usage of the five effective leadership practices rated higher than the teacher respondents’ perceptions on each subscale: Model the Way, \( t(45) = 3.51, p < .01 \); Inspire a Shared Vision, \( t(45) = 2.22, p = .03 \); Challenge the Process, \( t(45) = 2.13, p = .04 \); Enable Others to Act, \( t(45) = 4.12, p = .00 \); and Encouraging the Heart, \( t(20) = 5.24, p < .01 \).
### Table 10

*Paired Samples t Test – LPI Self and Observer*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 1: Model the Way</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Self (Principal)</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Observer (Teacher)</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>≤.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 2: Inspire a Shared Vision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Self (Principal)</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Observer (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 3: Challenge the Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Self (Principal)</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Observer (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 4: Enable Others to Act</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Self (Principal)</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Observer (Teacher)</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>≤.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 5: Encouraging the Heart</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Self (Principal)</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>≤.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI Observer (Teacher)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

A survey of 2,300 teachers and 74 principals yielded results that required the “fail to reject the null” decision for each of the four null hypotheses. Respondents in the study indicated that their perceptions of their principals’ leadership traits do not affect their morale or student achievement as measured by the QDI scores gained from student scores on the MCT2. However, respondents did indicate there was no significant relationship between principal and teacher perceptions of the principals’ leadership traits as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory. However, after conducting five paired sample t tests it was noted that principal and teacher perceptions differ significantly on all five factors of the survey with principals rating themselves higher than their corresponding teachers.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if a relationship existed between the elementary principal’s leadership style, teacher morale, and school performance. With the introduction of legislation such as ESEA of 1964 and its reauthorization as No Child Left Behind in 2001, the role of the principal changed from that of manager to instructional leader. With this change and added accountability the job of the principal became increasingly more high-stakes and complex in nature (Leithwood et al., 2004). Hence, today’s principals are challenged to lead from the classroom rather than from behind his or her desk and to share leadership with teachers versus dictate to his or her constituents (Jenkins, 2009). Further, the research supported the concept of principals fine tuning their interpersonal skills by building collegial relationships with teachers and considering the teachers’ morale in all of its complexity as they lead (Lumsden, 1998).

Based on the aforementioned research, a principal’s leadership style shapes or determines the atmosphere and focus of the school. The principal acts as the primary communicator of expectations for all stakeholders. Hence, effective school’s leadership rated second only to the level and type of instruction provided to students. Hence, leadership ranked among the most important keys to school success. To determine which leadership traits proved to be most effective, leadership studies over the past 70 years focused on those leadership
behaviors or traits which led to various models that date back as far as the Lewin, Lippit, and White leadership research, which identified three traits: autocratic, democratic, lassiez-faire (Gorton et al., 2007). This body of research laid the foundation for leadership studies and models that followed such as McGregor’s Theory X and Y leadership styles and J. M. Burn’s transformational and transactional, wherein in the first style the leader works in a team with his or her constituents versus in the latter style, the leader and the workers work to reach individual goals (Molero et al., 2007).

For the purposes of the study, the leadership model of Kouzes and Posner (1998) provided the foundational model for effective leadership. The duo identified five leadership traits or practices of effective leaders and developed two surveys to measure to what degree leaders and their subordinates agreed upon the leader’s primary practices or traits. The five practices listed below outline those behaviors effective leaders used to promote success in their organization:

1. Model the Way,
2. Inspire a Shared Vision,
3. Challenge the Process,
4. Enable Others to Act, and
5. Encourage the Heart (Kouzes and Posner, 2007).

**Synopsis of the Five Factors of Effective Leadership As Reported by Kouzes and Posner (2007)**

When leaders modeled the way, they clearly expressed and demonstrated their expectations for their constituents. The leader also communicated a
defined set of core values through their actions and by working closely with others in the organization. To inspire a shared vision, leaders saw the potential in their organizations and their constituents. Further, the leader enabled others to fully understand the vision by being outwardly committed and confident about the potential to reach the vision. Sharing the vision with others in a variety of venues and situations encouraged followers to accept the vision as their own. However, just talking about the vision did not satisfy the goal. The leader must know their followers needs, wants, and desires to be able to connect to others emotional connection to their work. Leaders also took risks by challenging the process; they did not believe in success by fate or luck. Leaders acted as trailblazers who were willing to forgo the standard response with fearlessness to achieve a goal or face a challenge. In doing so, the leader encourage others to act. He or she did not act in isolation. The stakeholders were enlisted to help solve challenges and design the pathway to success. Finally, effective leaders used relationship building skills to encourage the heart of the followers in such a manner that when faced with difficulties rather than give up, those involved problem solved and moved forward. To gain the emotional connection to the work, leaders demonstrated appreciation for their followers and celebrated the successes of the individual as well as the organization.

Summary of Procedures

After receiving verbal or written permission from area superintendents, elementary teachers and administrators in 20 of 23 member districts of the Gulf Coast Imitative Education Consortium were selected to respond to one of three
surveys: (a) Leadership Practices Inventory – Self, (b) Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer, or (c) Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire that were chosen for their internal reliability ratings as noted by the Cronbach’s alphas in Tables 1 and 2. The complete Leadership Practice Inventory for both the self and the observer were used; however, of the ten factors associated with the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire, two were selected for use (Teacher Rapport with Principal and Satisfaction with Teaching) in the study.

Over 2,300 surveys were packaged and delivered to each district either via the U. S. Postal Service or an in-district contact person. Upon completion of the surveys, the schools’ secretaries returned the sealed surveys to the researcher in a postage-paid self-addressed envelope. After receiving 62.16% of administrative and 34.48% of teacher surveys, surveys were coded and results were placed in statistical software in preparation for the hypotheses to be tested. Upon completion of the statistical tests, analyses were conducted to determine the outcome of each hypothesis.

Summary of Major Findings

To address the purpose, four research questions and accompanying null hypotheses were designed as avenues of exploring various facets of leadership traits, teacher morale, and student achievement. Research questions included:

1. Is there a correlation between the elementary principal’s leadership traits as measured by the subscales of Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer and teacher morale as measured by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire?;
2. Is teacher morale as measured by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire related to school performance levels on the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index?

3. Do leadership traits of elementary principals as measured by the subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer and teacher morale as rated by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire predict school performance on the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index?; and

4. Is there a significant correlation between teacher and principal perceptions of the principal's primary leadership traits as rated by the subscales of Leadership Practices Inventory?

Four accompanying hypotheses, noted below, helped answer the questions from the perception of the study’s participants. Selected statistical tests measured the participants’ responses. Pearson correlations measured the results of hypotheses one (1) and four (4) to determine if a correlation existed between the variables. Multiple regression tests measured hypotheses two (2) and three (3) to determine the predictive qualities, if any, of the selected variables. For the statistical results to be deemed significant in the study, the result must have met the p=.05 significance level.

Participants indicated:

H₀₁: There is no statistically significant correlation between elementary principals' leadership traits as rated by the subscales of the Leadership
Practices Inventory-Observer and teacher morale as rated by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire.

Results: The analysis led to the decision to partially reject the null hypothesis;

H0₂: There is no statistically significant relationship between teacher morale as measured by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire and school performance levels on the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index scores.

Results: The multiple regression was not significant at $F(2,43) = .40, p = .67, R^2 = .02$; the analysis led to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, teacher morale of the respondents is not predictive of school performance;

H0₃: There is no statistically significant relationship between elementary principals’ leadership traits on the subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer and teacher morale as rated by the selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire on school performance as measured by the MCT2 Quality of the Distribution Index scores.

Results: According to an analysis of the test, leadership traits and teacher morale do not significantly effect school performance $F(7,38) = .71, p = .67, R^2 = .12$. Due to the results, the analysis led to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis; and

H0₄: There is no statistically significant correlation between teacher and principal perceptions of the principal’s primary leadership traits as rated by
the subscales of Leadership Practices Inventory, informed the study’s design.

Results: The Pearson correlation test identified that the principals’ perceptions of their use of the five leadership traits did not significantly align to the teachers’ perceptions. Therefore, the analysis led to the decision to fail to reject the null hypothesis.

Conclusions

After administering valid and reliable surveys to the study participants and conducting a statistical analysis of the results based on participant responses and perceptions, several conclusions were drawn regarding the relationship of elementary principals leadership traits, teacher morale, and school performance. The following statements represent conclusions drawn from the study based on the results:

1. Of the two selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO), one variable, Teacher Satisfaction, correlated significantly with each of the five subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer (LPI-O). However, the variable, Relationship with Principal of the PTO, correlated with three of the five subscales of the LPI-O: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, and Challenge the Process.

2. The variable teacher morale, as measured by the two selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire, does not predict school performance as measured by the QDI earned as a result of students’ scores on the end-of-course assessment MCT2.
3. The combined variables of teacher morale, as measured by the two selected subscales of the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire, and leadership traits of elementary principals, as measured by the five subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer (teacher), do not predict school performance as measured by the QDI earned as a result of student scores on the end-of-course assessment MCT2.

4. Elementary principals' perception of their application of the five subscales of the Leadership Practices Inventory-Self do not correlate to the teachers' perception of the principals' application of the five leadership practices of effective leaders.

Discussion

Although the role of the administrator shifted to that of being an instructional leader versus a facilities manager in the 1980s, discussion and research related to leadership job expectations and focus points vacillated (Brookover & Leozotte, 1982). Twenty-first century educational demands, such as high-stakes testing and the onset of national standards, have required educators to revisit the concept with more emphasis being placed on learning and accountability (Jenkins, 2009). Despite understanding that effective schools rarely exist absent quality leadership, placing the right person in the leadership position is typically not the first priority of district leadership (Stronge, 1988). Fullan (1991) noted that various reasons are given regarding the aforementioned phenomena that include lack of time and training. To address the total school,
leaders seek to find the critical balance between being and instructional leader and a plant manager (Jenkins, 2009).

As the instructional leader, the principal must find ways to work collegially with his or her teachers to ensure that students are receiving a quality education. In doing so, Whitaker (1997) identified four essential things effective leaders must do to foster a successful teaching and learning environment. First, principals must demonstrate appreciation for teachers and the work that they do. It is not enough for the principal to simply be the evaluator of teacher performance, he or she must prove that they are supportive and have the ability to provide teachers with intellectual resources such as professional development and research related to current best practices. Accomplishing this first task may lead principals and teachers to developing professional learning communities that are better equipped to foster student achievement (Blase & Blase, 2000).

Secondly, principals must be highly visible and prepared to act as the chief role model in the school by demonstrating and focusing on those things that are critical to effective teaching and learning. Next, since the principal is the chief communicator, it is critical for the leader to communicate and foster a shared vision for the school by ensuring all stakeholders know and understand the underlying belief systems of the school. Finally, the principal must provide teachers with the proper instructional tools and have a working knowledge of curriculum and instructional practices (DuFour, 2002; Whitaker, 1997).

In seeking balance-leadership, Miller and Anderson (1960) noted that today's teacher demands the principal to establish a relationship in which the
principal more openly interacts with his or her subordinates and seeks their input on important school matters related to planning, organization, and instruction. To establish such a relationship principals must learn to: (a) delegate trustingly, (b) praise in public and criticize constructively in private, and (c) share decision-making on important decisions that impact teaching and learning (Miller & Anderson, 1960).

During early education, the principal-teacher relationship typically manifested as a distant relationship in which the role of the principal aligned to authoritative leadership style where there was a clear distinction between principals and the teachers with whom they worked (Miller & Anderson, 1960). Leaders gave little thought to building collegial relationships with teachers. Researchers (Black, 2001; Edgerson & Kritsonis, 2006; Protheroe, 2006) reported that where a supportive principal-teacher relationship existed, teacher morale and effectiveness improved. When teachers feel their principal’s focus is one that is for the common good versus personal gain, they take more ownership for teaching and learning within the school (McEwan, 2003).

Miller and Anderson (1960) and Ellenberg (1972), suggested that when principals paid attention to the academic tone within the school they developed a healthier school climate and improve teacher satisfaction. Although teacher morale seems to be influenced by internal factors, external factors such as leadership, work-load, compensation, and work environment cannot be excluded as possible influences (Bishay, 1996).
Recommendations

Although the differences between how principals and teachers rated elementary principals’ use of Kouzes and Posner’s (2007) five traits of effective leadership proved to be significant at the p = .05 level, it is worth noting that both teachers and principals rated the use of the leadership traits high across the board with mean scores ranging from 7.64 to 8.01 for teachers and 8.43 to 8.88 for principals on a ten-point Likert-style scale. In addition, standard deviations of both sets of respondents were relatively small indicating that the scores tightly clustered around the mean scores. In other words, both sets of respondents perceived the leader as effectively accessing each trait to address needs in their respective educational settings. In addition, teacher respondents on the PTO rated their morale as high on a four-point Likert-style scale with the factors’ mean scores ranging from 3.06 to 3.19. Despite study findings, which indicated that respondents perceive neither the principal’s leadership nor teacher morale as predictors of school performance, QDI scores of schools and districts in South Mississippi ranked among the highest in the state on the MCT2 at the end of the 2009-2010 school year with few exceptions. Hence, teachers in the study may have made a paradigm shift to accepting responsibility for what happens or fails to happen in their classrooms. In an era when Mississippi ranks 50th on national assessments such as NAEP, this commendable attitude demonstrates a level of accountability that principals often seek in high quality teacher candidates.

What has led to this level of teacher efficacy and leadership effectiveness? Perhaps the answer lies within the regions’ ability to develop
cross-cutting professional learning communities with the Gulf Coast Education Imitative Consortium, GCEIC, acting as facilitator. Educators in the region routinely collaborate using the Consortium as a vehicle for inter-district sharing and capacity building at both the school and district levels. Various professional learning communities, which include superintendents, curriculum directors, federal programs coordinators, and special education directors meet monthly to discuss important issues, solve problems, and learn about current trends in education, such as implementing Common Core State Standards. Teams also discuss topics related to financing projects to programmatic implementation. To ensure teachers remain knowledgeable, the Consortium schedules crucial training workshops for teachers across the region to attend. Thanks in part to this unique and open relationship across districts, coupled with accountable and talented teachers and principals, participating districts lead the way in helping Mississippi’s students rise to higher achievement levels to enable them to compete in a global society.

For Administrative Practice

Although teachers in this study indicated that their rapport with the principal did not significantly impact their morale, teachers did indicate that teacher satisfaction was important to their morale as well as the administrator’s ability to develop a shared vision and the principal’s willingness to take calculated risks. Teachers also indicated that they perceived that neither their teacher morale nor the principal’s leadership traits significantly affect student achievement. Thus, one might surmise that what happens or fails to happen
when the teacher closes the classroom door is the key to improved student achievement. Therefore, principals should not spend the majority of their time being overly concerned with teacher morale as it relates to school performance; they should indulge themselves in curricular matters, instruction, and learning. However, a meta-analysis of the research and study findings demonstrates that principals can improve morale and school achievement by doing the following:

1. establishing and communicating a shared vision and high expectations for teaching and learning;
2. holding collegial conversations with teachers that enable the teachers to communicate their professional and instructional needs;
3. empowering teachers to partake in the decision making process;
4. providing constructive and meaningful feedback and accepting feedback;
5. using visibility to act as the chief examples for others,
6. acting as a trailblazer when change is needed;
7. providing teachers with needed professional development;
8. empowering teachers to take pedagogical risks;
9. reflecting on their own performance or practice as an administrator in a more objective manner; and
10. acknowledging teachers for their work efforts in a variety of ways (Jenkins, 2009; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; McEwan, 2003; Protheroe, 2006; Trail, 2000).
For Study Improvement

The study was conducted for the purpose of determining if a relationship existed between elementary principals’ leadership traits, teacher morale, and school performance. However, a number of questions arose during the study, which could enhance or act as the foundation for future research in this area. The following recommendations for additional study have been made based on the results and subsequent findings:

1. The number of and grade spans of administrators and teachers should be expanded to determine if relationships regarding leadership, morale, and school performance exist at middle and high school levels.

2. A more comprehensive study utilizing all ten factors of morale as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire should be conducted to identify possible links to school performance and other teacher morale concerns.

3. Addition of a qualitative component to the study that includes interviews from principals and the teachers who work with them would provide a more in-depth look into the relationship. As several teachers took the time to write extra notes on their surveys, it appeared that they had more to say than what could be quantified in a bubble on a survey.
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To ensure the study includes the majority of the southern region of the state of Mississippi, I would like to include 21 of the 24 GCEIC school districts. Therefore, I respectfully notify you that I will be sending surveys to all elementary principals and teachers in the Gulfport School District. Your support and your district’s participation is critical to the success of the study. I have attached a copy of the instruments and correspondences related to the study for your review; the surveys will take participants approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Thank you for your support; your district’s participation will be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via my day-time phone (228-XXX-XXXX) or email (carlajevers@XXXXXXX.com).

Respectfully,
Carla J. Evers, Doctoral Candidate
Letter of Notification of Intent to Conduct Study

July 20, 2010

Dear Dr. Tom Clark, Executive Director, GCEIC:

I am currently pursuing my doctorate degree in educational leadership from The University of Southern Mississippi. As part of my quest to meet this goal, I am required to plan and conduct a comprehensive research project that will enhance the field of educational leadership. Being a 20 year educator, I have become quite interested in how and if leadership impacts teacher morale and school performance. Therefore, I will be conducting the research project entitled: A Relational Study of Elementary Principals’ Leadership Traits, Teacher Morale, and School Performance. The goals of the project, (1) explore the strength of the principal-teacher relationship to ascertain the benefits to students, and (2) develop a more informed group of educational leaders, will help focus the project on being a benefit to all stakeholders. Hence, the goals will act as the guiding force and motivation before, during, and after the project.

For the purposes of the study, I will use two instruments, the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire and the Leadership Practices Inventory. For descriptive and comparative purposes, I will also collect demographic and assessment data about each participating elementary school. All respondents’ responses will remain confidential, and participants’ names nor schools will be revealed in the final document. At the conclusion of the study, each superintendent will be provided with a copy of the overall findings and recommendations upon final approval of the submitted dissertation.

To ensure the study includes the majority of the southern region of the state of Mississippi, I would like to include 21 of the 24 GCEIC school districts. Therefore, I respectfully request your organization’s participation and support of the project. I will be sending surveys to all member districts’ elementary principals and teachers in the GCEIC. Your support and your organization’s participation is critical to the success of the study. I have attached a copy of the instruments and correspondences related to the study for your review; the surveys will take participants approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

Thank you for your support; the GCEIC’s participation will be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via phone (228-XXX-XXXX) or email (carlajevers@XXXXXXXX.com). Please sign the form below to indicate your consent to participate.

Respectfully,

____________________

Carla J. Evers
As the Executive Director of the Gulf Coast Education Initiative Consortium (GCEIC), I agree to support the above mentioned project by allowing the researcher an opportunity to address the superintendents and curriculum directors of the GCEIC for the purposes of conducting this research project. Further, the researcher has permission to use the GCEIC’s name as a means of identifying participating school districts.

_____________________________________

Tom Clark, EdD – Executive Director
Principal Investigator: Carla J. Evers

Project Title: A Relational Study of Elementary Principals’ Leadership Traits, Teacher Morale, and School Performance

Purpose: The purpose of the study is to determine the relationship between elementary principals’ leadership traits and teacher morale. The study will further seek to identify the impact of the principal-teacher relationship on school achievement as it relates to student performance on state standards as outlined in the Mississippi state academic frameworks and as measured using the Quality of the Distribution Index (QDI) on the Mississippi state end-of-grade test, Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2), the end of year assessments, MCT2: Reading-Language Arts and Mathematics, administered to students in grades three through eight in the spring of each school year. The data will be gathered and tested to determine if there is a connection between leadership, teacher morale, and school performance.

Duration: A respondent should be able to complete the demographic information (6 items) and Leadership Practices Inventory-Self (30 items) in approximately 10-15 minutes.

Possible Benefits: (a) the findings may provide insight about the effect leadership traits have on teacher morale; (b) the findings may guide leaders in creating long lasting systemic change through social capital; and (c) educators may use the project to identify leadership traits that promote improved school performance based on the research findings and implications of the project.

Confidentiality: The surveys will remain nameless to ensure participants’ anonymity. Final reported results will not identify schools, districts, or participants. All surveys will be shredded by a professional shredding company at the completion of the project.

Contact Information: If you have questions regarding the survey, please call (228-XXX-XXXX) or e-mail (carlajevers@XXXXXXX.com).

Participant Assurance: Whereas no assurance can be made concerning results that may be obtained (since results from investigational studies cannot be predicted) the researcher will take every precaution consistent with the best scientific practice. Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. Questions concerning the research should be directed to Carla J Evers at (228) XXX-XXXX (or e-mail at carlajevers@XXXXXXX.com). This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional
Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human participants follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, Box 5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406, (601) 266-6820. A copy of this form will be given to the participant.

Voluntary Participation: The project has been explained to me in a manner that indicated what participation involves and the nature, purpose, and benefits of the project. I understand that participation is strictly voluntary and that I may ask questions of the researcher at any time. I have read this consent form and agree to participate in the proposed study. Further, I understand that a signed copy of this agreement will be provided to me upon request. My completion of the enclosed survey will act as my informed consent to participate.
Principal Investigator: Carla J. Evers

Project Title: A Relational Study of Elementary Principals' Leadership Traits, Teacher Morale, and School Performance

Purpose: The purpose of the study is to determine the relationship between elementary principals’ leadership traits and teacher morale. The study will further seek to identify the impact of the principal-teacher relationship on school achievement as it relates to student performance on state standards as outlined in the Mississippi state academic frameworks and as measured using the Quality of the Distribution Index (QDI) on the Mississippi state end-of-grade test, Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2). The end of year assessments, MCT2: Reading-Language Arts and Mathematics, administered to students in grades three through eight in the spring of each school year. The data will be gathered and tested to determine if there is a connection between leadership, teacher morale, and school performance.

Duration: A respondent should be able to complete the demographic information (5 items) and Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer (30 items) in approximately 10-15 minutes.

Possible Benefits: (a) the findings may provide insight about the effect leadership traits have on teacher morale; (b) the findings may guide leaders in creating long lasting systemic change through social capital; and (c) educators may use the project to identify leadership traits that promote improved school performance based on the research findings and implications of the project.

Confidentiality: The surveys will remain nameless to ensure participants’ anonymity. Final reported results will not identify schools, districts, or participants. All surveys will be shredded by a professional shredding company at the completion of the project.

Contact Information: If you have questions regarding the survey, please call (228-XXX-XXXX) or e-mail (carlajevers@XXXXXXX.com).

Participant Assurance: Whereas no assurance can be made concerning results that may be obtained (since results from investigational studies cannot be predicted) the researcher will take every precaution consistent with the best scientific practice. Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. Questions concerning the research should be directed to Carla J Evers at (228) XXX-XXXX(or e-mail at carlajevers@XXXXXXX.com).

This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional
Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human participants follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, Box 5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406, (601) 266-6820. A copy of this form will be given to the participant.

Voluntary Participation: The project has been explained to me in a manner that indicated what participation involves and the nature, purpose, and benefits of the project. I understand that participation is strictly voluntary, and that I may withdraw from the task at anytime. Further, I understand that I may ask questions of the researcher at any time. My completion of the enclosed survey will act as my informed consent to participate.
Principal Investigator: Carla J. Evers

Project Title: A Relational Study of Elementary Principals' Leadership Traits, Teacher Morale, and School Performance

Purpose: The purpose of the study is to determine the relationship between Gulf Coast elementary principals' leadership traits and teacher morale. The study will further seek to identify the impact of the principal-teacher relationship on school achievement as it relates to student performance on state standards as outlined in the Mississippi state academic frameworks and as measured using the Quality of the Distribution Index (QDI) on the Mississippi state end-of-grade test, Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2), the end of year assessments, MCT2: Reading-Language Arts and Mathematics, administered to students in grades three through eight in the spring of each school year. The data will be gathered and tested to determine if there is a connection between leadership, teacher morale, and school performance.

Duration: A respondent should be able to complete the demographic information (6 items) and Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (40 items) in approximately 10-15 minutes.

Possible Benefits: (a) the findings may provide insight about the effect leadership traits have on teacher morale; (b) the findings may guide leaders in creating long lasting systemic change through social capital; and (c) educators may use the project to identify leadership traits that promote improved school performance based on the research findings and implications of the project.

Confidentiality: The surveys will remain nameless to ensure participants’ anonymity. Final reported results will not identify schools, districts, or participants. All surveys will be shredded by a professional shredding company at the completion of the project.

Contact Information: If you have questions regarding the survey, please call (228-XXX-XXXX) or e-mail (carlajevers@XXXXXXXX.com).

Participant Assurance: Whereas no assurance can be made concerning results that may be obtained (since results from investigational studies cannot be predicted) the researcher will take every precaution consistent with the best scientific practice. Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits. Questions concerning the research should be directed to Carla J Evers at (228) XXX-XXXX (or e-mail at carlajevers@XXXXXXXX.com). This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional
Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human participants follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, Box 5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406, (601) 266-6820. A copy of this form will be given to the participant.

Voluntary Participation: The project has been explained to me in a manner that indicated what participation involves and the nature, purpose, and benefits of the project. I understand that participation is strictly voluntary and that I may ask questions of the researcher at any time. My completion of the enclosed survey will act as my informed consent to participate.
September 16, 2010

Dear Educator,

I am currently pursuing my doctorate degree in educational leadership from The University of Southern Mississippi. As part of my quest to meet this goal, I am required to plan and conduct a comprehensive research project that will enhance the field of educational leadership. Being a 20 year educator, I have become quite interested in how and if leadership impacts teacher morale and school performance. Therefore, I will be conducting the research project entitled: A Relational Study of Elementary Principals' Leadership Traits, Teacher Morale, and School Performance. To gather data, I will use two instruments: Leadership Practices Inventory (Self and Observer) and the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. Each 33-45 item survey will take each participant approximately 10-15 minutes to complete and will break teacher morale and leadership traits down into specific and meaningful focus areas that will better enable educators to make important findings about the subject matter. As a participant, you will complete one of the two surveys. While participation in the study is completely voluntary, your participation is critical to the success of the study. Your anonymity is guaranteed because the surveys will remain nameless; schools, districts, nor participants will be associated with their results in the final product. More information about the study is included on the Informed Consent document, which is part of this packet. If you have questions at any time, you may contact me by calling 228-XXX-XXXX or email me at carlajevers@XXXXXXX.com. Please return your completed survey to your school’s secretary by Friday, September 24, 2010. The school that returns the greatest percentage of its completed surveys will receive a continental breakfast for the teachers and office staff, and the secretary of that school will receive a gift card to a local eatery.

Thanking you in advance,

Carla J. Evers, Doctoral Candidate
September 16, 2010

Dear School Secretary,

I am currently pursuing my doctorate degree in educational leadership from The University of Southern Mississippi. As part of my quest to meet this goal, I am required to plan and conduct a comprehensive research project that will enhance the field of educational leadership. However, I need your assistance. I have spoken with your superintendent and he or she is aware of my intent to conduct a survey in your school. Therefore, I humbly request that you give the enclosed white envelopes to the certified teachers in your school including the activity and special services teachers, i.e., counselor, speech, P.E., art, librarian, music, inclusion, lead teachers, etc. The envelope, which is marked “principal,” should be given to your head principal. All other envelopes should be given to the teachers at your school. Teachers, notified via their memo, should be reminded to return their completed survey in sealed envelopes by Friday, September 24, 2010. Please place the sealed envelopes into the provided self-addressed postage-paid envelope and return them to me via the U.S. Postal service when your mailperson visits your school on their regular route.

The school that returns the greatest percentage of its completed surveys will receive a continental breakfast for the teachers and office staff, and the secretary of that school will receive a gift card to a local eatery.

Thank you for helping me to reach this lifelong goal. If you have questions at any time, you may contact me by calling 228-XXX-XXXX (office), 228-XXX-XXXX (cell), or email me at carlajevers@XXXXXXX.com.

Thanking you in advance,

Carla J. Evers, Doctoral Candidate

_________________________________________ will serve as your district’s contact person.
Dear Respondent,

Thank you for taking the time to complete this two-part survey; it should take you about 15 minutes to complete. Your participation is strictly voluntary. However, by participating, the information that you share will possibly help strengthen principal-teacher relationships. By submitting this document you are giving your informed consent to use your responses for the purposes of this study. Your anonymity is important to the success of this project. Therefore, your responses will remain nameless, and results will not be reported by school or district. At the conclusion of the study, all surveys will be shredded by a professional shredding company to ensure proper disposal. If you have any questions or comments, please call Carla J. Evers at 228-XXX-XXXX.

When you have answered each item, please place your survey in the provided envelope; seal it; and return it to the school’s office where it will be placed in a secure return box and returned to the researcher. All sealed envelopes must be returned to your school’s secretary by Friday, September 24, 2010.

I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Directions: Please complete the information in this section by marking the appropriate answer with a check mark (✓).

| Grade Level Taught: | ___1 ___2 ___3 ___4 ___5 ___6 |
| Class Size:        | ___11-15 ___16-20 ___21-25 ___>25 |
| Gender:           | ___Male ___Female |
| Race:             | ___Caucasian ___African-American ___Asian ___Spanish ___Native-American |
|                  | ___Other |
| Number of Years of Experience: | ___<5 ___5-10 ___11-15 ___>15 |
| Age:              | ___21-30 ___31-40 ___41-50 ___>50 |
II. LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY-(OBSERVER)
James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner ©2003

This part of the survey will give you an opportunity to express your opinion about your principal’s primary leadership traits.

**Directions:** To what extent does your principal typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the response number that best applies to each statement and record it in the box to the right of that statement. Please **do not** record your name on this document.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sets a personal example of what he/she expects of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seeks out challenging opportunities that test his/her own skills and abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develops cooperative relationships among the people he/she work with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Praises people for a job well done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spends time and energy making certain that the people he/she works with adhere to the principals and standards we have agreed on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Describes a compelling image of what our future could be like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Challenges people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Actively listens to diverse points of view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Makes it a point to let people know about his/her confidence in their abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Follows through on the promises and commitments that he/she makes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Searches outside the formal boundaries of his/her organization for innovative ways to improve what we do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Treats others with dignity and respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Makes sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect other people’s performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Asks “what can we learn?” when things don’t go as expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Supports the decisions that people make on their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Publicly recognizes people who exemplify commitment to shared values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Builds consensus around a common set of values for running our organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Paints the “big picture” of what we aspire to accomplish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Makes certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Gives people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Is clear about his/her philosophy of leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Speaks with a genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Experiments and takes risks, even when there is a chance of failure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Principal,

Thank you for taking the time to complete this two-part survey; it should take you about 15 minutes to complete. Your participation is strictly voluntary. However, by participating, the information that you share will possibly help strengthen principal-teacher relationships. By submitting this document you are giving your informed consent to use your responses for the purposes of this study. Your anonymity is important to the success of this project. Therefore, your responses will remain nameless, and results will not be reported by school or district. At the conclusion of the study, all surveys will be shredded by a professional shredding company to ensure proper disposal. If you have any questions or comments, please call Carla J. Evers at 228-XXX-XXXX.

When you have answered each item, please place your survey in the provided envelope; seal it; and return it to the school’s office where it will be placed in a secure return box and returned to the researcher. All sealed envelopes must be returned to your school’s secretary by Friday, September 24, 2010.

______________________________

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Directions: Please complete the information in this section by marking the appropriate answer with a check mark (✔).

Gender: ___Male ___Female

Number of Years of Administrative Experience: ___<5 ___5-10 ___11-15 ___>15

Age: ___21-30 ___31-40 ___41-50 ___>50

School’s QDI: _____ Met Growth: ____Yes ____No

School’s Performance Level: ___Star ___High Performing ___Successful

___At-Risk of Failing ___Academic Watch ___Failing
II. LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY - SELF  
James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner ©2003

This part of the survey will give you an opportunity to express your opinion about your primary leadership traits.

**Directions:** To what extent does you typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the response number that best applies to each statement and record it in the box to the right of that statement. **Please do not** record your name on this document.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I set a personal example of what I expect of others.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I praise people for a job well done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principals and standards we have agreed on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I actively listen to diverse points of view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I treat others with dignity and respect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I ask for feedback on how my actions affect other people’s performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I ask “what can we learn?” when things don’t go as expected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I support the decisions that people make on their own.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I paint the “big picture” of what we aspire to accomplish.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I find ways to celebrate accomplishments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I speak with a genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contribution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Respondent,

Thank you for taking the time to complete this two-part survey; it should take you about 15 minutes to complete. Your participation is strictly voluntary. However, by participating, the information that you share will possibly help strengthen principal-teacher relationships. By submitting this document you are giving your informed consent to use your responses for the purposes of this study. Your anonymity is important to the success of this project. Therefore, your responses will remain nameless, and results will not be reported by school or district. At the conclusion of the study, all surveys will be shredded by a professional shredding company to ensure proper disposal. If you have any questions or comments, please call Carla J. Evers at 228-XXX-XXXX.

When you have answered each item, please place your survey in the provided envelope; seal it; and return it to the school’s office where it will be placed in a secure return box and returned to the researcher. All sealed envelopes must be returned to your school’s secretary by Friday, September 24, 2010.

I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

**Directions:** Please complete the information in this section by marking the appropriate answer with a check mark (✓).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Taught:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Size:</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>&gt;25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Native-American</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Years of Experience:</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>Over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire
Prepared by Ralph R. Bentley and Averno M. Rempel

Directions: This portion of the instrument is designed to provide you the opportunity to express your opinions about teacher morale. Read each statement carefully. Then indicate, whether you (1) disagree, (2) probably disagree, (3) probably agree, or (4) agree with each statement by circling the corresponding number for each item. There are no right or wrong responses. Please do not record your name on this document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Probably Disagree</th>
<th>Probably Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The work of individual faculty members is appreciated and commended by our principal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teachers feel free to criticize administrative policy at faculty meetings called by our principal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Our principal shows favoritism in his relations with the teachers in our school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>My principal makes a real effort to maintain close contact with the faculty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Our principal’s leadership in faculty meetings challenges and stimulates our professional growth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teaching gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Teaching enables me to make my greatest contribution to society.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I love to teach.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>If I could plan my career again, I would choose teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I would recommend teaching as an occupation to students of high scholastic ability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would stop teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My principal makes my work easier and more pleasant.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>My school principal understands and recognizes good teaching procedures.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The lines and methods of communication between teachers and the principal in our school are well developed and maintained.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>My principal shows a real interest in my department.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Our principal promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in our school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I find my contacts with students, for the most part, highly satisfying and rewarding.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>I feel that I am an important part of this school system.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale: (1) Disagree, (2) Probably Disagree, (3) Probably Agree, or (4) Agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Probably Disagree</th>
<th>Probably Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel successful and competent in my present position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>I enjoy working with student organizations, clubs, and societies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>I am at a disadvantage professionally because other teachers are better prepared to teach than I am.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>As far as I know, the other teachers think I am a good teacher.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The “stress and strain” resulting from teaching makes teaching undesirable for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>My principal is concerned with the problems of the faculty and handles these problems sympathetically.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I do not hesitate to discuss any school problem with my principal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>My principal acts interested in me and my problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>My school principal supervises rather than “snoopervises” the teachers in our school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Teachers’ meetings as now conducted by our principal waste the time and energy of the staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>My principal has a reasonable understanding of the problems connected with my teaching assignment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I feel that my work is judged fairly by my principal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Most of the actions of students irritate me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>My students regard me with respect and seem to have confidence in my professional ability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>My students appreciate the help I give them with their schoolwork.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>To me there is no more challenging work than teaching.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>As a teacher, I think I am as competent as most other teachers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>I really enjoy working with my students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>My principal tries to make me feel comfortable when visiting my class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>My principal makes effective use of the individual teacher’s capacity and talent.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Teachers feel free to go to the principal about problems of personal and group welfare.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I am well satisfied with my present teaching position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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