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ABSTRACT

Principals play a critical role in a school's success. This study investigated how principals’ leadership styles and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership styles related to school performance. The sample for the study included 19 schools, 19 principals, and 139 third, fourth, and fifth-grade teachers. Both principals and teachers were administered a Leader Behavior Analysis II 20-item questionnaire. No Child Left Behind (2002) and increased accountability have intensified the need for principals to be effective instructional leaders who move schools forward. Although principals may have an indirect role in student achievement, they have a direct influence on quality teaching and instruction (Beteille, Kalogrides, & Loeb, 2009). This investigation highlighted some of the numerous challenges that many schools face; however, research continues to reveal that no school can have success without an effective leader (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008). Effective leaders select the leadership style which is best suited to increase performance (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985). This study further sought to discover if one leadership style was more effective than another in achieving overall school improvement. School leaders who use effective leadership styles may impact student performance through motivation of the teachers (Christie, Thompson, & Whiteley, 2009). Data collected from the Leader Behavior Analysis II were analyzed using independent t-Tests, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, and Chi-Square.
The present study revealed no significant difference or no significant relationship between self-reported and perceived leadership styles, flexibility and effectiveness, and school performance.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

School improvement efforts are at the forefront of accountability and they have caused schools to focus on ways to increase progress within the learning environment. School improvement may come in many forms, which may include building relationships with the students, faculty and parents, setting a school mission or vision, and improving school climate through the principal’s leadership behaviors (Gronn, 2008; Nor & Roslan, 2009). School principals are expected to lead their schools’ progress. Accountability has changed the role of principals from manager to instructional leader in charge of evaluating the teaching and learning process (Parkay, Haas, & Anctill, 2010), whereby they are expected to be strong instructional leaders and have knowledge of the teaching and learning process (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Principals must adhere to accountability guidelines and provide a student-centered learning environment that is data-driven (DuFour & Fullan, 2013). Principals are also encouraged to solicit input from stakeholders on ways to further the school improvement process (Portin et al., 2009).

The No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2002) has caused states to focus on school improvement, and principals are being held accountable for a major part of school reform (Knapp, Copland, Plecki, & Portin, 2006). For schools to move forward academically,
“high expectations should be set and attainable for students” (Porter et al., 2008, p. 13). Graue and Johnson (2011) suggested that smaller classes made up of no more than 15 students are one way to move schools forward academically. Inside those smaller classes, teachers were better equipped to meet the diverse needs of all the students, thus making academic progress attainable. For districts which had the luxury of reducing class sizes, the principals would be in charge of leading their schools towards success through ongoing collaboration with teachers (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Leithwood & Mascall, 2008; Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2009). Ongoing collaboration could lead teachers to become more motivated to help students achieve when they have the backing from their leader.

In the study *How Leadership Influences Student Learning* (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004), leadership surfaced as a key factor that led to student success, behind the classroom teacher. This study was replicated in 2010 by the same authors, along with other researchers, who also concluded that leadership impacted student achievement indirectly through the principal’s ability to motivate teachers to maintain a focus on student learning (Louis et al., 2010). Jacob (2010) concurred that leaders can indirectly affect student achievement through curriculum alignment, ongoing collaboration about teacher performance, open communication between school and district about policies, and creating and maintaining a positive school climate.

The daily activities and decisions of a principal may either increase or decrease student success. Those decisions made by the principal must be based on effective strategies that are designed for overall school improvement (Demir, 2008; Noonan & Walker, 2008). Christie, Thompson, and Whiteley (2009) affirmed the notion that school
leaders who use effective leadership styles may impact student performance through motivation of the teachers. Similarly, Leithwood and Jantzi (2005, 2008) also stated that leadership ability is determined by the followers, and not by the leaders alone. Teachers’ perceptions of how they feel respected and appreciated by their leaders can also have an impact on their motivation and students improved academic achievement (Demir, 2008). Regular classroom visits, attendance at grade-level meetings and professional development activities have been found to motivate teachers towards increasing student achievement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005, 2008). The role of the principal could provide implications for increased attention being paid to principals’ leadership styles, and principal development, and may also serve as a guide for principals being faced with the accountability demands of NCLB (2002).

**Statement of the Problem**

No Child Left Behind (2002) focused on providing ways to improve the academic opportunities for students who are at risk of failing. Research has shown that students who continue to struggle academically by the end of third grade have a higher probability of not finishing high school (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). A more alarming statistic was that 67% of fourth graders struggle with basic comprehension skills such as inferencing and drawing conclusions. Of the 33% of fourth graders who could read fluently, one in three scored below Basic in Reading on standardized tests. With regard to race and poverty, more than 50% of African American and Hispanic fourth-grade students scored much lower than White students in Reading (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). As a result of the NCLB (2002) mandates, many school
districts look to their school leaders to implement changes that will bring about the necessary school improvement.

Due to increased accountability standards that schools face, principals are held to a higher standard as the instructional leader (Goddard et al., 2010). Principal leadership is key to leading schools through the many academic challenges they may face. While some principals may not view themselves as instructional leaders, research has shown that instructional leadership is a critical component for effective schools (Omar, Khuan, Kamaruzaman, Marinah, & Jamal, 2011). Principals must fully assume the role of instructional leader and not allow themselves to be consumed with the daily managerial duties (Grissom & Loeb, 2009; Jenkins, 2009). As instructional leaders, principals are charged to secure the needed resources to bring about improved student gains (Grissom & Loeb, 2009). A part of securing needed resources includes constant classroom monitoring to maintain an awareness of needed professional development (DiPaola & Hoy, 2008). Through classroom monitoring, principals are in a position to establish and maintain relationships with the teachers, the ones who impact instruction directly (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008).

As effective instructional leaders, principals must also serve as encouragers and motivators for students and teachers as a means of providing a conducive teaching and learning environment (Gamage, Adams, & McCormack, 2009). Educators are charged to teach students the value of knowing how to locate and utilize necessary resources to find answers to their questions. Preparing students to be lifelong learners is the ultimate goal of teaching. Research continues to support the indirect impact that principals have on student achievement (Hoy & Miskal, 2008). Principals have a responsibility to their
teachers to provide a positive climate where teachers and principals work collaboratively towards a common school mission and vision. Creating a positive climate through offering meaningful professional development and allowing teachers some choice in decision-making could lead to a more cohesive staff striving towards the ultimate goal of increased school performance (Marshall, 2005).

**Purpose of the Study**

This study examined the impact that a principal's leadership style may have on student achievement as measured on standardized tests. This study investigated the principals' self-reported leadership styles and how those leadership styles were related to overall school performance. The researcher also considered teachers' perception of their principals' leadership styles and its relationship to school performance. Because of the heavy reliance on standardized test scores to determine student success, principals carry the responsibility of ensuring that test scores of the students enrolled in their schools are, at a minimum, proficient, based on the levels of the standardized tests. NCLB (2002) has played a role in student performance and highlighted the achievement gaps that exist in students' achievement levels, and principals have been charged with finding effective ways to provide opportunities for students to progress academically. Limited research exists to substantiate the relationship between principals' leadership styles and student achievement; however, principals are widely considered to be in a position to affect the teaching and learning process. School leaders and other educators may benefit from a greater understanding of the impact that principals have on overall school performance. Consequently, findings from this study may provide school districts with additional
information needed to select and develop administrators who are prepared to advance student attainment.

**Justification of the Study**

Principals are a critical element of school effectiveness. Beteille, Kalogrides, and Loeb (2009) found that principals have an indirect role in student achievement, yet they have a direct influence on teacher quality and instruction. Research further revealed that effective principals and teachers account for about 60% of a school’s academic success (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Positive principal and teacher relationships could also lead students to take ownership for their own success (Hulpia, Devos, & Rosseel, 2009). Students strive for classroom success once they feel supported by principals and teachers (Honig, Copland, Rainey, Lorton, & Newton, 2010). The principal sets the tone for a positive learning atmosphere through establishing and maintaining a vision for student success, providing the necessary classroom resources, and engaging in productive professional development. As a result of this positive learning environment, teachers may be more committed to personal and professional growth with regards to overall school improvement. According to U. S. Education Secretary Arne Duncan, effective principals are “the driving force behind student achievement, and improved school performance is an appealing factor for teacher recruitment” (Connelly, 2010, p. 34). Effective principals can develop quality teachers through embracing and protecting instruction and setting instructional goals for the school (Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton, 2010).

Research studies investigating different leadership styles have been conducted, yet little evidence has surfaced to determine if one leadership style is more effective than
another with regard to improving academic performance (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008). Depending on the situation, a principal’s leadership style may vary. The current research study examined principals’ leadership styles to determine whether there was a relationship between leadership styles and student academic performance.

**Conceptual Framework of the Study**

As a result of greater accountability demands for improving schools, education researchers have taken a strong interest in school leadership (Aarons, 2010; Center for American Progress, 2008), and the focus has turned to the principal as the one in charge of improving student achievement (Blase, Blase, & Phillips, 2010; Smylie, 2010). As instructional leaders, principals have many responsibilities that require them to be able to adapt to various leadership styles given the situation (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985). The Situational Leadership II Model suggests that leaders select the style of leadership that is best suited to increase performance (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985). Situational leadership further implies that a different kind of leadership may be used based on the situation, and the leader must possess the necessary skills and flexibility to adapt his or her behavior to a given environment or situation.

The Leader Behavior Analysis II (Blanchard, Forsyth, Hambleton, & Zigarmi, 1991a, 1991b) is the instrument that is based on the Situational Leadership II Model by Blanchard, Zigarmi, and Zigarmi, (1985). This instrument focuses on a leader’s style flexibility and effectiveness. A total of six scores are generated from the instrument, which fall into two primary scores and four secondary scores. The two areas of primary scoring are Flexibility and Effectiveness. Flexibility refers to the number of times a leader uses a different leadership style in a situation. The higher the number of times a
leader uses one style over another is indicative of that leader having low flexibility.

Flexibility scores can range from 0 to 30 with 17 being the mean score as determined by Blanchard, Hambleton, Zigarmi, and Forsyth (1991a, 1991b). Scores from 0 to 14 indicate low flexibility, while scores over 20 indicate high flexibility.

Effectiveness refers to the number of times a leader chooses the most appropriate response in a situation. The effectiveness scores range from 20 to 80, with 54 being the mean score as determined by Blanchard, Hambleton, Zigarmi, and Forsyth (1991a, 1991b). Scores from 0 to 50 indicate low effectiveness, while scores over 58 indicate high effectiveness. The scoring guide ranges from Style 1 (S1) to Style 4 (S4).

S1 (Directing) indicates high direction/low support. In the Directing style of leadership, there is one-way communication. The leader gives a task and indicates how the follower should go about completing the task. The leader focuses on task completion rather than relationship building. The Directing style of leadership is often used when a leader determines that the followers may not have the confidence or maturity to complete a given task and needs close supervision.

S2 (Coaching) indicates high direction/high support. In the Coaching style of leadership, there is open dialogue between the leader and the followers. Although the leader provides controlled direction, he or she works with the followers to get buy in by supporting, persuading, and encouraging them to reach a set goal. The leader focuses on task completion, as well as relationship building.

S3 (Supporting) indicates low direction/high support. In the Supporting style of leadership, two-way communication is encouraged for the purpose of building a relationship. By allowing the sharing of ideas, the leader exhibits high relationship and
low task. Using this style of shared decision making, the leader can devote more time building relationships and less time giving direction.

S4 (Delegating) indicates low direction/low support. In the Delegating style of leadership, the leader takes a passive approach by allowing followers to make decisions, yet still monitors the task. The leader exhibits low relationship and low task, and allows followers the latitude to work towards accomplishing a set goal with minimal direction from the leader.

The four areas of secondary scoring of S1 to S4 tallies the number of times a leader chooses one style over another based on the 20 scenarios. Only one style can be selected for each scenario. The style score represents leaders preferred style and should not be used to make a generalization about all leaders. The final score does indicate the amount of guidance and support that a leader exhibits in a given situation.

The LBAII Self instrument is what the leader uses to assess his or her own leadership style. Presented with a scenario related to a leadership issue, the leader chooses the most likely action plan from four options each closely linked to S1, S2, S3, and S4. The Situational Leadership II Model (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985) maintains that in some instances, one style may be more effective than another and labels responses as poor, fair, good, or excellent. On the LBAII Other, teachers rate how they think the leader would respond to the given scenarios. The leader’s effectiveness is a critical component in this instrument. The score indicates the extent to which the leader has the ability to select the leadership style that best fits a given situation.

The focus of this study was to determine if a principal’s leadership style flexibility and effectiveness were related to school performance. The Leadership
Behavior Analysis II Self and the Leadership Behavior Analysis Other measured the principal’s leadership styles, and principal’s leadership styles as perceived by the principal and by teachers, respectively. In this study, the researcher focused on four leadership styles (a) Directing, (b) Coaching, (c) Supporting, and (d) Delegating (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985).

**Research Questions**

Leadership is important to any organization, and it can affect the behaviors of stakeholders (Cokluk & Yilmaz, 2010). Effective leadership is demonstrated through setting goals and expectations for the performance of the organization (Leithwood, Patten, & Jantzi, 2010). As in any other organization leadership is considered vital, but in a school setting it could also affect the faculty and the role they play in working towards school improvement (Zhao, 2009).

Research has shown that principals who create a positive school climate are more inclined to experience increased student achievement (Printy, 2010). Although principals may indirectly affect student achievement (Louis et al., 2010), they can directly impact teaching through carefully monitoring the learning environment (Supovitz, Sirinides, & May, 2010; Vanderhaar, Munoz, & Rodosky, 2007). Principals who support and motivate their teachers find that teachers’ job performance and job satisfaction increase (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). This notion of increased performance was echoed by Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008) in a study where principals who were effective instructional leaders established relationships with their faculty and students, and as a result of those relationships, their schools experienced improved student gains.
Due to the accountability demands placed on schools, many principals have had to modify their leadership styles to focus on moving schools forward (Jones & Egley, 2009). Principals may employ a variety of leadership styles, yet no one style has been proven superior to another (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008). The current research intends to investigate these leadership styles and their relationship to school performance. As effective leaders, principals should be able to adjust their leadership style depending on a given situation. Because principals play a vital role in school improvement (Hoy & Hoy, 2009), the researcher is interested in gaining an understanding of how principals’ leadership styles impact school performance through addressing the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference between principals’ self-report of leadership style flexibility and effectiveness and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style flexibility and effectiveness?
2. Does principal leadership style flexibility relate to school performance?
3. Does principal leadership style effectiveness relate to school performance?
4. Is there a difference in principals’ primary leadership styles in high performing schools versus principals’ primary leadership styles in low performing schools?

Null Hypotheses

$H_{1a}$: There will be no difference between principals’ self-reported leadership styles and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style flexibility and effectiveness.

$H_{1a}$: There will be no difference between principals’ self-reported leadership style flexibility and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style flexibility.
$H_{1b}$: There will be no difference between principals' self-reported leadership style effectiveness and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style effectiveness.

$H_2$: Leadership style flexibility is not related to school performance.

$H_{2a}$: There will be no relationship between principals' self-reported leadership style flexibility and school performance.

$H_{2b}$: There will be no relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style flexibility and school performance.

$H_3$: Leadership style effectiveness is not related to school performance.

$H_{3a}$: There will be no relationship between principals' self-reported leadership style effectiveness and school performance.

$H_{3b}$: There will be no relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style effectiveness and school performance.

$H_4$: Leadership style is not related to school performance.

$H_{4a}$: Principals' primary leadership styles are not related to school performance.

$H_{4b}$: Teachers' perceptions of principals' primary leadership styles are not related to school performance.

**Definition of Terms**

For the purposes of this study, definitions one, two, three, five and six will be operationally defined and referenced using the Louisiana Believes Bulletin 111: The Louisiana School, District, and State Accountability System (September, 2013).
1. *Adequate Yearly Progress.* Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) is the least amount of growth required for a school to improve within a given time frame, usually a period of two years.

2. *Highly Qualified Teachers.* Highly Qualified Teachers are those teachers who hold a Bachelor’s degree, are state certified, and/or have passed required examinations for licensure (NCLB, 2002).

3. *Integrated Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (iLEAP).* iLEAP is an assessment that is given to students in grades 3, 5, 6, and 7 in four subject areas of English Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. Because this test is norm-referenced, students are ranked based on their performance as compared to other students who took the test.

4. *Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP).* LEAP is an assessment that is given to students in grades four and eight. Because this test is criterion-referenced, a pre-determined score must be obtained to pass to the next grade.

5. *No Child Left Behind (NCLB).* The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was designed to increase the educational opportunities for low performing students (Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425, 2002).

6. *School Performance Categories.* School Performance Categories are the letter grades that schools receive based on their school performance score. The school letter grades range from A to F, with 150 being the highest score and 0 being the lowest score, respectively.

7. *School Performance Score.* School Performance Score (SPS) is the score that schools receive based on student performance on standardized tests.

**Summary**

No Child Left Behind (2002) and increased accountability have intensified the need for principals to be effective instructional leaders who move their schools forward. Being effective leaders requires principals to be of the mind-set that all children can learn (Lezotte & Snyder, 2011). Principals set the tone for teachers and other stakeholders to follow with regard to school improvement.

The focus of this study was to identify principals’ leadership styles and determine what effect their leadership styles may have on student academic achievement. Teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership styles were investigated and compared to principals’ self-perceptions with regard to school performance.

AS THE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER, THE PRINCIPAL IS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING CHANGES DESIGNED TO ENHANCE THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS. TO BE EFFECTIVE, PRINCIPALS MUST CONSTANTLY BE AWARE OF FACULTY AND STUDENTS’ NEEDS AND EQUIP THEM WITH THE NECESSARY TOOLS FOR ACADEMIC SUCCESS. EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS ARE ALSO AWARE OF HOW THEIR ACTIONS ARE PERCEIVED BY THEIR FOLLOWERS, AND THEY ARE ABLE TO ADJUST THEIR LEADERSHIP STYLE TO POSITIVELY GUIDE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT (HESS & KELLY, 2007).

EXAMINATION OF PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STYLES THAT AFFECT SCHOOL PERFORMANCE WAS THE FOCAL POINT OF THIS STUDY. SPECIFICALLY, THE RESEARCHER SOUGHT TO DETERMINE TO WHAT EXTENT THE PRINCIPALS’ LEADERSHIP STYLES IMPACT STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT. THIS CHAPTER PROVIDES A REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY AS IT PERTAINS TO NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (2002), PRINCIPAL LEADERSHIP STYLES, AND THE ROLE THAT LEADERSHIP STYLES PLAY IN AFFECTING STUDENT PERFORMANCE.
The literature review is organized by discussion topics, with some exceptions, with most of it covering the period after 2001. The studies used in the review were selected based upon their publication after the No Child Left Behind (2002) legislation. While the majority of the studies reported the principals’ diverse roles, teachers are the main factor impacting students’ academic efforts. Overall, it is accepted that the principal leadership style ultimately affects school performance. Stakeholders are interested in knowing how and to what extent principals are the instructional leaders for the school. No studies could be found to validate principals’ direct effect on student achievement, which is why an investigation into this relationship is both timely and warranted.

**School Reform**

The findings of the 1966 Coleman Report implied that socioeconomic background was a good indicator of student success, and that socioeconomic background had a greater influence than any schools could offer. The findings from *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* (1983) further highlighted the failures of the American educational system and, together with the Coleman Report, has continued to spark debates on and criticism of education in the United States.

The 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk* led states to become more focused on school reform initiatives, accountability, and standardized tests (Hoy & Miskel, 2005). As schools continued to focus on school reform, public education remained the object of criticism that students were being inadequately prepared for future academic success. The ultimate result of school reforms was the creation of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (Jazzar & Algozzine, 2006). No Child Left Behind (2002) highlighted the
achievement gaps that existed among students, and required states to develop ways to close achievement gaps through education reforms. States are responsible for closing student achievement gaps, and principals have become the focus of school improvement initiatives.

**No Child Left Behind**

Public school education in the United States has undergone many reforms since the early 1990s, during which time the concept of School Choice was introduced. The No Child Left Behind Act (Pub. L. No. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425, 2002) became law in 2002 under the administration of President George W. Bush, and it provided a means of holding schools accountable for making adequate yearly progress.

No Child Left Behind (2002) only applies to Title I schools, including charter schools, and school districts with a high population of students who have failed to grow academically for two years in a row. Title I schools are those schools where at least 40% of their students come from low-income families. Low income families are those families where students qualify for free or reduced lunch. These schools receive funding to be designated for programs such as after-school tutoring, to assist the schools in meeting minimum proficiency requirements on standardized tests.

NCLB (2002) placed high standards on all public schools. It bases the measurement of student, teacher, principal, school, and district quality on the results of student assessments. Students in third through eighth grade take standardized tests that are now aligned to national Common Core Standards. No Child Left Behind (2002) was intended to result in the following improvements regarding student achievement by the end of the 2013-2014 school year: (a) highly qualified teachers in the classrooms, that is a
teacher who holds a bachelor's degree, is state certified, and/or have passed required examinations for licensure, (b) third-grade students reading on level, (c) a goal of proficiency for limited English students, (d) a safe and conducive learning environment, and (e) students graduating high school on time.

No Child Left Behind (2002) has led to improvements in teachers being highly qualified; however, it has also led to less flexibility for teachers. Teachers are now spending more hours in planning and less time in professional development. Due to curriculum changes, teachers are experiencing a sense of little to no independence, and these changes have led to an increased number of teachers choosing to leave the education profession altogether (Phillips & Flashman, 2007).

According to Hoff (2009), almost 30,000 U. S. schools did not meet the minimum academic requirements from the 2007-2008 school year. This number indicated a 28% increase from the number of failing schools for the 2006-2007 school year. More than half of those schools continued to decline academically for at least two years after their initial decline. To measure the amount of progress a school made, the test results were compared to other schools based on the growth in Reading and Math for a given year. Based upon its growth, a school was given a school improvement score which was then compared to the goal score. If a school did not reach its target growth for two years in a row, it would then be labeled as academically unacceptable. Once a school was labeled as academically unacceptable, the school would receive extra assistance, such as tutoring and after-school programs, and the students at those schools would be given an opportunity to transfer to a school that was not designated as academically unacceptable (Hoff, 2009).
Some school districts have resorted to investing additional funds in programs designed to improve test scores (Lezotte & McKee, 2006), only to find that the programs failed to produce the desired results (Thompson, Madhuri, & Taylor, 2008). As more and more schools failed to meet the minimum growth requirements, NCLB (2002) caused states and districts to focus on the school leaders to help meet the challenges of improving overall student achievement (Hoff, 2009). Since the federal government is dedicated to improving failing schools, schools that do not meet minimum academic progress could face losing federal funds, replacing school staff, including the principal, having a longer school year, or making changes to the curriculum (Abrevaya & White, 2009; Hoff, 2009).

Heightened accountability has led to schools being faced with the threat of corrective actions and principals being faced with finding ways to maximize student opportunities through quality teaching (Kohn, 2004). Through quality teaching, principals can build relationships and develop a faculty focused on overall student and school success. With increased performance being the goal of schools, it is even more important that principals provide effective instructional leadership through positive interactions with stakeholders (Fullan, 2007; Printy, 2010).

A publication released by the Wallace Foundation in 2007 defined lessons that effective leaders used to help narrow the achievement gap in schools. Specifically, effective leaders do the following:

- focus on what they change with the students instead of what they cannot change;
- act in such a way that the students know they are a priority at the school;
- is an instructional leader and aware of what goes on in the classrooms;
• act in such a way that teachers know that they are important and that they make a
difference at the school (Wallace Foundation, 2007, p.17).

Effective leaders find ways to address the academic challenges of students,
thereby helping to break the cycle of failure. As students continue to enter school with
academic deficits, the leader must work with all stakeholders to find ways to meet those
academic challenges, or the achievement gap will continue to widen (Haycock, 2006).

Crum and Sherman (2008) conducted a study of principals from high achieving
schools in Virginia to determine what made their schools successful. The study was
conducted as a result of the limited research regarding effective school leadership
following the enactment of No Child Left Behind (2002). The selected principals had
served at least two years and their schools were accredited based on state and federal
guidelines. Throughout the study, principals discussed particular behaviors that had led
to their schools' success. Some of the behaviors were: (a) positive collaborative
interactions, (b) shared leadership, (c) accountability awareness, (d) support and
motivation of staff, (e) instructional leadership, and (f) effective implementation of
change. The findings further indicated that principals in the study were cognizant of the
fact that their staff had also contributed to overall school improvement by being the direct
link that helped to motivate the students toward academic achievement.

Leadership

Leadership is a term that many researchers have tried to define, yet they have
failed to agree upon a common definition (Stogdill, 1974). Like the process of change
(Hall & Hord, 2006, 2011), leadership is continuous, and changes are made as the
organizational needs change (Peretomode, 2012). Although one broad definition of leadership may not be determined, multiple definitions continue to evolve.

Hersey and Blanchard (1969) asserted that leadership is defined with regard to management. Their research maintained that leadership involved working with others to accomplish set goals. Leadership is about building relationships with the people you plan to lead. In contrast, Stogdill (1974) contended that the words leader and leadership originated as far back as the 1300s and 1800s, respectively, and suggested that even though many researchers have tried to come up with a general meaning of leadership, no common definition has been determined. Later, Day (2000) described leadership in terms of establishing an organizational vision, maintaining a positive organizational culture, as well as building collaborative relationships within an organization, while Donaldson (2001) viewed leadership as a person’s ability to cause people to acclimate to set practices and beliefs of a school that focus on success for all students. There is no doubt that school leaders should be focused on student success; however, faculty and other stakeholders also have a role in moving a school forward. As stated by Furman (2003) and Yukl (2006), the leader can influence an organization to move forward and encourage others to uphold that same vision (Mangin & Stoelinga, 2008). Although leadership has been defined in numerous ways, the leader should possess the necessary faculties to adjust leadership styles based on a given situation (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985).

**Instructional Leadership**

As the educational needs of students have changed, so too have the ways in which principals lead schools. Instructional leadership surfaced in the 1970s when schools were
labeled as being effective or ineffective based on how they educated students, regardless of race or social class (Lezotte, 2001). Leaders were thought to be successful based on individual qualities, rather than a strong knowledge base (Hallinger, 2005). Those schools that surfaced as successful were believed to have an effective leader. While individual qualities were sufficient for the 1970s, accountability changes have made it difficult for leaders to be selected based on personal traits alone.

During the 1980s, instructional leadership was based on the impact that the principal had on the school climate by setting high goals and expectations for everyone to follow (Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003). High expectations were modeled by the principal through continuous day-to-day classroom monitoring. Principals were responsible for maintaining a positive school climate while establishing a clear vision for the school. During the 1990s, principals’ focus shifted to a more managerial aspect as schools became accountable for student achievement through teaching and learning (DuFour, 2002; Lashway, 2002a).

Principals of the 21st century are expected to be instructional leaders for the school and maintain a balanced, learning environment (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005). Leaders are expected to be focused on education, and, consequently, are the ones who remain in the spotlight for improving school performance (Hallinger, 2005). Schools are being scrutinized by society, media interests, and federal and state guidelines. Principals must be able to successfully accommodate these multiple interests while remaining focused on the school’s educational goals (Guthrie & Schuermann, 2010). As instructional leaders, principals are expected to stay abreast of changes in curriculum and have knowledge of how it is being implemented in the
classrooms. Maintaining effective relationships with faculty, students, parents, and community partners is an approach that principals can use to collectively increase the academic success for all students (Yukl, 2006).

According to the National Association of Elementary Principals (NAESP, 2001) instructional leadership has been viewed as a component of learning communities, and within those communities, staff collaborate regularly through joint problem solving, and student achievement is at the forefront of their discussions. As instructional leaders, the principals: (a) have a focus on learning, (b) set high expectations, (c) ensure student success, (d) create a culture of learning, (e) are data driven, and (f) utilize community resources. Later, in 2008, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, in conjunction with the Collaborative Communications Group, Inc., distributed a publication entitled Leading Learning Communities: Standards for What Principals Should Know and Be Able To Do. This publication focused on (a) developing the whole child and the importance of individualized instruction and alternate student assessment, (b) the changing role of principals, (c) school and community collaboration, and (d) using multiple data sources to make informed school-based decisions (NAESP, 2008). As principals’ roles continue to change, those principals who develop learning communities focused on teaching and learning may be more effective as instructional leaders (Glatthorn & Jailall, 2009).

The connection between instructional leadership and student achievement has been supported by many studies (e.g., Catano & Stronge, 2007; Cotton, 2003; Fulmer, 2006; Gentilucci & Muto, 2007; Janerette & Sherretz, 2007; Marsh & LeFever, 2004;
Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2004), and the findings are a principal consideration in this study.

A meta-analysis study by Cotton (2003) explored the connection between the school principal and student achievements in low socio-economic schools. She studied 81 reports, which contained studies from primary and secondary schools, and other reviews, analyses and research based on the behaviors of principals. Some of the behaviors that led to higher student success included high principal visibility in the classrooms, data-driven collaborations, and public praise for school accomplishments. Cotton’s study concluded that principals who were effective instructional leaders had a larger number of students who achieved academic success than the less effective instructional leaders.

In similar research, Waters, Marzano and McNulty (2004) conducted another meta-analytic study on the behaviors of principals who had experienced high numbers of students who attained academic success. The research included thousands of studies, including almost 3,000 schools, almost 15,000 teachers, and over one million students; however, the findings concluded only two specific factors that had an effect on student achievement. The first factor was the ability of effective leaders who revered the teaching and learning environment. The second factor was the ability of principals to adjust their leadership styles based on change that had taken place as a result of increased accountability. It was concluded that maintaining high achievement standards for the school must be the focus of an effective instructional leader.

Marsh and LeFever (2004) also led investigations on school leaders from two different academic settings. The first investigation was conducted in a private school
setting where standards of student performance were assigned to principals and not measured by predetermined accountability standards. In contrast, the second investigation was conducted in a public school setting where student performance was based on predetermined accountability standards. The goal of the investigations was to determine how school reform impacted principals' leadership behaviors and their ability to be effective leaders. Data collection for the study consisted of an open-ended questionnaire and three types of interviews: (a) audio-taped, (b) self-guided, and (c) one-on-one. The findings of the first investigation revealed that principals collaborated and used student results to guide the teaching and learning environment without the added pressure conforming to mandated accountability guidelines that determined student progress. In contrast, the findings of the second investigation highlighted the large amounts of time and energy that principals devoted to ensuring that the curriculum and instruction aligned to accountability standards that would be used to determine student progress. These findings revealed that both principals had an active role in developing academic standards; however, the principals in the first investigation had the autonomy to determine what constituted student progress. Both investigations also emphasized the importance of principals' leadership behaviors in establishing a professional learning community focused on increasing academic opportunities for students to excel.

Fulmer (2006) conducted a qualitative study of the impact of principals' behaviors on teachers' ability to improve student achievement. The data collected was based on principals' leadership experiences as the instructional leader, as well as data ascertained from academic reports. Fulmer reported that instructional leadership was
determined to be a vital part of making academic changes designed to influence teachers’ roles in increasing student success.

**Behavioral Leadership**

Leadership behaviors have long been of interest to researchers to determine if a particular leadership style caused employees to perform in a certain way. To fully understand how principals’ behaviors affect not only student achievement, but also job performance, background knowledge into studies that have led to the increased attention is discussed. To connect former leader behavior theories to present-day attention being paid to leaders, three classic studies are reviewed from: (a) Ohio State (Fleishman, 1953; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957), (b) The University of Michigan (Katz & Kahn, 1952; Likert, 1961, 1967), and (c) The University of Iowa (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939).

The Ohio State Study (Fleishman, 1953; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957) investigated patterns of leaders’ behaviors to determine a leader’s effectiveness in producing desired results. The study included military officers and other personnel, civilians, business leaders, school administrators, superintendents, university students and professors, and other lay people from various organizations. The participants were given the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and asked to rate their superiors. Based on the outcome of the study, two leadership behaviors emerged: (a) initiating structure, and (b) consideration. Initiating structure was indicative of a task-centered style of leadership that resulted in high productivity, positive job performance, and the leader told employees what to do and when to do it. Consideration, on the other hand, was indicative of an employee-centered style of
leadership that resulted in increased job satisfaction, mutual respect between leader and employees, and shared decision-making. Although the focus of the Ohio State Study was to outline specific leadership behaviors that improved job satisfaction and performance, the findings concluded that a leader’s effectiveness should not be based on employee productivity alone, but rather should include employee satisfaction as well. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed by Stogdill (1963, 1970) and Halpin (1957). The LBDQ contained 150 items and measured nine different leadership categories. Participants were asked to answer based on how they thought their leader would react in a given situation. The outcomes of the LBDQ concluded that an effective leader possessed the ability to inspire and motivate employees to achieve high levels of productivity.

The University of Michigan Study (Katz & Kahn, 1952; Likert, 1961, 1967) was a correlational study conducted with a group of supervisors and employees to identify leadership behaviors that increased employee production and job satisfaction. Two behaviors that surfaced were employee orientation and production orientation. Employee orientation, similar to consideration in the Ohio State Study, focused on the relationship facet of work. Production orientation, on the other hand, was similar to initiating structure in the Ohio State Study and focused more on the mechanical facet of work. The leaders who established relationships with the employees had a more favorable outcome with regards to productivity. Both the University of Michigan and the Ohio State Studies laid the foundation for other behavioral studies to follow which, in turn, have contributed to present-day interest in school administrators.
The University of Iowa Study (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939) investigated the leadership styles of leaders of boys’ clubs who were grouped based on aptitude, strengths, and admiration. These groups were further divided into three leadership styles: (a) autocratic, (b) democratic, and (c) laissez-faire. After six weeks, the group leaders were asked to adapt a different leadership style. Findings indicated that the autocratic leaders did not permit shared decision-making to complete a task, the democratic leaders worked collaboratively and solicited input from others in the group, and the laissez-faire leaders offered little or no direction and allowed the group to make decisions on their own. The outcomes of this study revealed that democratic leaders received more favorable accolades followed by laissez-faire leaders; however, the autocratic leader ultimately received more production than the other two styles. The outcomes of this study further revealed that a leader has the ability to adapt a different leadership style given the situation.

The three major leadership styles noted above are closely related to the situational leadership styles: autocratic (directing), democratic (coaching), and laissez-faire (delegating). To define the three major leadership styles further, Stogdill (1948) used the following: (a) autocratic leaders use a dictator style of leadership and expect others to follow, (b) democratic leaders work collaboratively with a group for a common cause, and (c) laissez-faire leaders do not adhere to time constraints and relax the rules.

The Autocratic style of leadership is sometimes equated to the power associated with rulers who operated with absolute power. This type of leader is often perceived as conceited, unreceptive, proud, and self-centered, and projects the image of knowing what is best for the organization (Brennen, 2002). Autocratic leadership, similar to the
Directing style of leadership, relies on one person to make all the decisions and those under his or her leadership are expected to carry out given orders without question. Not everyone works best under this style of leadership which allows little to no room for creativity or deviation. This type of leadership may be appropriate for industries such as the armed forces or the penal system, but it is not a recommended style of leadership to use when building relationships throughout the school community (Brennen, 2002; Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939).

In education, the autocratic type of leadership may be used by someone who is relatively new to the educational field or when a group decision cannot be reached. These leaders give a lot of themselves; however, they are usually not team players, which in turn, could lead to worker dissatisfaction and, with them eventually leaving the field of education altogether. Not only are these leaders not team players, but they also tend to give negative feedback if a task or goal is not going according to their specifications (Dinham, 2005). Under this style of leadership, creativity is not considered when decisions are made. Autocratic leaders may find it difficult to use other styles of leadership, but those who work under this type of leader often feel threatened by this leadership style (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). The style may be viewed as dated, yet it is still an active style of leadership because it generally comes naturally to leaders.

The Autocratic leadership style may be viewed as a dictatorship; however, certain situations may lend themselves to this style such as: (a) emergencies or crisis situations, (b) working towards a common goal/solution, (c) adhering to established deadlines, and (d) ultimate decision-making. Along with benefits or advantages come disadvantages. Some of the disadvantages include (a) lowered employee motivation and creativity, (b)
increased workload, (c) independent decision making, and (d) an unfriendly work environment (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939).

Democratic leadership was often referred to as participative leadership and had been found to be a favorable leadership style (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). Those leaders provided direction to employees, had a positive attitude, and welcomed employees into the decision making process, although the final decision was still left up to the leader. This style of leadership, similar to the Coaching style of leadership, encouraged stakeholders to stay motivated and allowed them to use their creativity on tasks. While this style of leadership may be viewed as a sign of weakness, it actually strengthens the level of mutual respect between the leader and the employees. The leader delegated responsibilities and encouraged others to assume more of a leadership role, which, in turn, enhanced the leader’s decision-making ability. The Democratic style of leadership encouraged stakeholders to take part in making decisions that could lead to continual professional development, rather than the principal having all the authority and influence (Brennen, 2002; Furman, 2003; Leithwood & Riehl, 2003).

The Democratic style of leadership created a positive work environment, impacted the school climate positively, and caused employees to take pride in their work. In contrast to the authoritarian leadership, this type of work environment produced collaborative communication and increased job satisfaction (Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2000). This style may be viewed as a preferred style of leadership and lends itself to a number of positive situations that include: (a) friendly work environment, (b) better decision-making, (c) more creative thinking, and (d) increased employee retention. The advantages sometimes do not outweigh the disadvantages that are: (a) more time spent on
making decisions, (b) tasks require more employee participation, (c) missed or extended deadlines, and (d) limited leadership style flexibility (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939).

The Laissez-Faire style of leadership provided little or no direction to employees and gave them free reign over the decision-making process, yet the leader was still responsible for the final decision (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939). This style of leadership, similar to the Delegating style of leadership, encouraged employee participation and allowed those highly skilled individuals to receive much deserved recognition. The key to allowing individuals control over the decision-making process was to make sure they were skilled in a variety of areas, and no great harm could come as a result of the decisions made (Brennen, 2002). The Laissez-Faire style of leadership can leave employees feeling alone with no guidance and no established vision. These leaders do as little as possible to get by and have no problem delegating their responsibilities (Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

The Laissez-faire leadership style was preferred by highly skilled employees who assisted with making decisions for the organization and could be used in positive situation such as (a) employees take pride in their work, (b) a more trusting work atmosphere, (c) more employee collaboration, and (d) more creativity. This style of leadership may offer some benefits for the leader who does not like to assume responsibility; however, not all organizations can benefit from just this one style of leadership. Some of the notable disadvantages include (a) lack of feedback from the leader, (b) employee insecurity, (c) reduced work load for leader, and (d) leader can camouflage weaknesses (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939).
Situational Leadership

Due to limitations noted in behavioral leadership theories, researchers began to look for other approaches that might lead to understanding the study of leadership. Thus, situational leadership models were developed by Blake and Mouton (1964), and Blanchard, Zigarmi, and Zigarmi, 1985. Situational leadership states that a leader decides on the best leadership style based on the situation and that a leader should be adaptable enough to use a variety of leadership styles as needed to improve overall performance.

The Managerial Grid (Blake & Mouton, 1964) was developed to capture the behavior traits of effective leaders. It highlighted the notion that although a leader may rely on one main leadership style, he or she can also adjust to another style of leadership given the situation. This style of leadership also highlighted three characteristics of leaders: (a) production centered, (b) people centered, and (c) hierarchical traits. The first two characteristics, production centered and people centered correlated to initiating structure and consideration as stated in the Ohio State study. The hierarchical trait is linked by the connections between the leader and the regards for the people in the organization.

Five leadership styles are outlined under the Managerial Grid: (a) Indifferent Style; (b) Country Club Style; (c) Dictatorial Style; (d) Status-quo Style; and (e) Team Style.

- The Indifferent style refers to a managerial approach where there is little regard for people and productivity. Leaders who use this style are viewed as ineffective, lazy, and employee motivation is low.
• The Country Club style has high regard for people, but little concern for productivity. Leaders who use this style are concerned with maintaining relationships and a sociable work environment.

• The Dictatorial style manager is more concerned with productivity than building relationships with people. Leaders who use this style have dissatisfied employees which lead to high job turnover.

• The Status-quo style has an appropriate balance between employee concern and concern for productivity. Leaders who use this style are more concerned with favorable ratings; however, ultimately the needs of the company and the employees could be compromised.

• The Team style is focused on both people and productivity. Leaders who use this style experience high employee motivation as a result of contributing to a team-centered work environment. As with any leader, determining the best leadership style will be centered on the situation and the best fit for the organization.

The Managerial Grid describes five leadership styles, and offers advantages and disadvantages to each of the styles. This theory could lead one to assume that there is one main leadership style that should prevail over others. That is not the case. An effective leader should use his better judgment and select the leadership style that may result in the most suitable outcome for the organization.

The Situational Leadership II Model (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985) focuses on effective leaders developing a relationship with their employees. The leaders offer employee support to ensure accountability in a given setting. In a school setting, the principals would offer their support to stakeholders in meeting the requirements set
forth by NCLB (2002). Situational leadership may be described as what the leaders do with the employees, as opposed to what the leaders do to the employees. The basis of situational leadership is to establish open communication throughout an organization to improve overall performance. When other researchers explaining situational leadership, Syque (2007) suggested that this style of leadership focuses on a leader’s ability to adapt to a given situation based on the followers’ behaviors. Peretomode (2012) similarly described situational leadership as a leader who can move from one end of a spectrum to another based on the situation and identified effective leaders as those leaders who can adapt to any given situation as needed. Some common features of situational leadership are: (a) there is no one best way to respond to a given situation, (b) an effective leader may appear to be a failure in the same organization when a situation changes, and (c) both internal and external variables play a role in a leaders’ ability to be effective in a given situation. A leader’s appropriate response to a situation can also help to create a positive school environment driven towards academic success.

The Situational Leadership II Model (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985) includes four leadership styles: (a) Directing, (b) Coaching, (c) Supporting, and (d) Delegating.

- A Directing style of leadership is required for employees who lack skills and motivation which indicate a low level of readiness. These employees require specific instructions and close supervision. This style is considered high-task, low-relationship. The leader maintains control of decisions and allows for no input from the employees.
• A Coaching style of leadership is required if an employee has motivation, yet lacks proper skills. These employees also require specific instructions; however, less supervision is needed. This style is considered high-task, high-relationship style. The leader maintains control of decisions, but solicits input from the employees.

• The Supporting style of leadership is required if an employee has the appropriate skills, but little motivation. The leader works alongside the employees as a means of motivation. This style is considered low-task, high-relationship. The leader forms relationships with the employees and offers appropriate accolades for employee accomplishments; however, the ultimate decision is made by the leader.

• The Delegating style of leadership is used when an employee is highly skilled and motivated and the leader gives the employee the reign to make and carry out the decisions. This style is considered low-task, low relationship. The leader and the employees have a trusting relationship. The leader delegates some responsibilities; however, he/she is still reserves the ultimate decision (Hackman & Johnson, 2000).

Using the Situational Leadership II Model (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985), leaders recognized that they must be flexible enough to adjust their leadership styles as situations change. Leaders also recognized that as situations changed, followers developed the confidence in their abilities to perform given tasks. The following study is an example of how situational leadership was applicable across school settings.

A study conducted by Awan, Zaidi, and Bigger (2008) explored the situational leadership styles of principals at the university level in Punjab, Pakistan. The factors that
were studied included principal-teacher interactions with regards to employee
satisfaction, principal behaviors, acceptance of the leader, and expectations of the job.
The principals’ leadership styles were categorized as supportive, directive, participative,
and achievement-oriented. Six teachers were randomly selected from 34 districts in
Punjab, Pakistan, and they each completed a questionnaire that measured how they
perceived their individual abilities as it related to job satisfaction. The leadership
behaviors ranged from high to low and were based on the principals’ perceptions of their
leadership styles. The findings of the study concluded that principals who had a high
directive style of leadership caused a negative effect on job satisfaction although the
teachers had positive perceptions of their abilities. The leadership styles that had a
positive effect on teachers’ motivation need for achievement and job satisfaction were
participative, supportive and achievement-oriented respectively. The style of leadership
that the principals exhibited in each category depended on the situation.

Effective leaders have the ability to adapt their leadership styles based on the style
that brings about the most effective change (Chemers, 2002; Waters & Grubb, 2004).
Leaders may use all three styles, but there is one style that may be preferred over another
one. Effective leaders know how to use their leadership styles to improve their school’s
overall performance. Research has investigated various leadership styles, yet concrete
evidence fails to present one leadership style as more favorable to another style in
improving student achievement (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008).
Factors that Impact Student Achievement

Principal’s Tenure

As more and more demands are being placed on schools, many principals have decided to vacate their positions, and once aspiring candidates are deciding against pursuing the role of administrator (Cranston, 2007). Although principals are viewed as having an indirect effect on student achievement and school climate, other variables must be considered that also affect student achievement and the desire to lead a school. The variables include demographics of the school, years of experience, curriculum changes regarding accountability, and principal training and support (Goddard, Salloum, & Berebitsky, 2009).

School Demographics

The demographics of a school, such as the race and socioeconomic status of students, are variables beyond the control of the district, let alone the principal. In some situations, principals are finding themselves at the forefront of schools that have high poverty and low achievement. Although the findings of the 1966 Coleman Report inferred that socioeconomic background was a good indicator of student success, principals are still responsible for providing for the academic needs of all students. Research has shown that students who come from low SES backgrounds achieve less success academically than their counterparts who come from higher SES backgrounds (NAEP, 2011), and the achievement gap continues to widen. No principal can affect student achievement alone. He or she must secure and retain effective teachers who will work together to provide a clear school vision, set high expectations, and maintain professional relationships to ensure a safe and structured learning environment (Knapp,
Copland, Plecki, & Portin, 2006; Rutledge, Harris, & Ingle, 2010). It is no longer acceptable for a principal to sit in the office and run a school. Principals are now expected to be in the classrooms to observe firsthand the quality of instruction that is taking place. Using race and low socioeconomic status of students as an excuse for low achievement is unacceptable. Principals are expected to network with other successful principals to find out what strategies have been used to increase student achievement in their schools. To take on the challenge of demographic issues, seemingly alone, is one of the factors that could lead to increased principal burnout (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2009; Cranston, 2007). Research further contended that race and low student achievement could also lead to increased frustrations, which in turn, could lead to principals seeking new careers (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2009).

**Years of Experience**

A study was conducted by Young and Fuller (2009) regarding principals' tenure in public schools in Texas for a period of about 12 years, from 1996-2008, in both elementary and high schools. Results of the study varied according the school population and socioeconomic background. Findings indicated that principals' tenure was five or fewer years in schools with higher populations of students from low income families, while principals' tenure was five or more years in schools with fewer students from low income families. As a result of low retention rates of principals, districts found themselves facing a shortage of qualified personnel to lead the schools. When compared to a similar study of schools in Arizona (Norton, 2003), the responses from principals revealed comparable results. Principals planned to leave the education profession due to
retirement or a change in careers, and only a small percentage of principals expressed an interest in continuing in their role as a principal.

**Curriculum Changes**

Concerns over ways to adequately prepare students for college and/or careers have led to the development of curriculum changes (Darling-Hammond, 2010; Heller & Greenleaf, 2007). Politicians, educators, and other stakeholders share in this growing concern, and they are interested in helping to better educate students for the future (Grossman, Reyna, & Shipton, 2011). In Louisiana, curriculum changes have come by way of adopting the Common Core State Standards (CCSS; NGA, 2010) to rigorously challenge students' while preparing them academically for life beyond high school. Students in Louisiana continue to rank below students in most other states and countries in English Language and Math, coming in at 44th and 46th, respectively (Louisiana Believes, 2013).

As with any change, full knowledge and implementation happens over time, usually a period of three-to-five years and includes a process of learning (Hall & Hord, 2006, 2011), and change can only be as effective as those who implement it. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (Hall & Hord, 2006, 2011) refers to change in three stages: (a) Stages of Concern--the emotional side of change, (b) Levels of Use--the behavioral side of change, (c) and Innovation Configurations--variations of the change to be implemented. The research pertaining to this model is based on the premise of what path an organization takes to reach the ultimate goal of change.

Implementation of the CCSS has not come without some resistance and added costs and responsibilities to states, school districts, and school principals alike due to a
lack of resources and knowledge (Fullan, 2010, 2011; Thomson, 2008). In response to that resistance, some districts in Louisiana have secured Common Core experts to provide professional development to individual schools to help transition from the previous Grade Level Expectations (GLE) that were used in previous years. While states have been given the task of developing how the CCSS will be delivered to districts, principals, too, bear the burden of how the CCSS will be effectively delivered in the schools. Although other states have fully implemented the CCSS Curriculum (Grossman, Reyna, & Shipton, 2011), much debate continues around the implementation in Louisiana. As the instructional leaders, principals are expected to be embrace the CCSS by acquiring the knowledge and skill base to convey changes to teachers, parents, and other stakeholders.

**Principal Training and Support**

Along with curriculum changes come evaluation changes, and principals are no exception to the rule. Concerns continue to be raised about adequate principal training before securing a principalship appointment (Gamage, 2009a; Hess & Kelly, 2007). Politicians have grown more interested in principals’ preparation and performance in the schools. In 2010, House Bill 1033 was signed by Louisiana Governor Bobby Jindal which tied principals’ evaluation and salary to student achievement for the 2012-2013 school year. Although there is still some discussion about the validity of the evaluation (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2009), principals are feeling the pressure to find resourceful means of improving school performance, while securing their own personal careers. Many principals are not aware of what is entailed in being a principal and some find themselves overloaded with paperwork and other bureaucracies instead of focusing
on teaching and learning. In a Florida study by Homg, Klasik, and Loeb (2009), results concluded that principals spent almost 50% of their time on paperwork and student related issues and less than 20% on improving instruction. These results further exacerbated the concern over principal preparation (Grisom & Loeb, 2009).

The role of school principals have continued to change as accountability requirements have changed. Traditional leadership programs have produced ill-prepared leaders due to the lack of adjusting the requirements to meet the needs of an ever-changing educational society (Hess & Kelly, 2007). Colleges and universities now offer programs dedicated to training aspiring administrators for the demands that accompany school leadership (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, & Cohen, 2007).

The implications regarding principals' tenure should lead districts to look for ways to retain principals in the education profession through professional development and training (Darling-Hammond, Wei, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). Districts could pair principals with a mentor principal who could model, assist, or simply provide support on ways to make improvements in the school. District personnel could also offer support through phone calls, visits, and verbal and other forms of accolades for school improvements. Principals who felt supported by their district supervisors were more likely to dig their heels in and do whatever it took to make their school performance scores improve (Johnson, 2005). On the contrary, principals who felt they were left to run the school as a separate entity from the district were more dissatisfied with their job, and were less committed to the job. While studies continued to show that principals have an indirect effect on student achievement, research has also shown that principals' length of stay at a school does tend to have an effect on student performance (Heck, 2007). For
example, if a teacher were hired during a principal’s tenure, he or she may feel more
loyal to the principal, school, and may feel obligated to work collaboratively with the
principal and other stakeholders to improve school performance. On the other hand, if a
principal left a school, the teachers hired during his or her tenure may feel less loyal to
the school, which in turn, could negatively impact the teacher’s classroom performance.

**Teacher Quality**

Although principals play a vital role in school performance (Gentilucci & Muto,
2007; Gamage, 2009a), NCLB (2002) holds teachers primarily accountable for student
improvement. NCLB (2002) also recognizes that while principals are a valuable part of
student improvement, teacher quality is also an important factor affecting student
achievement (Sawchuk, 2011).

One reform in the area of teacher development is the requirement that all teachers
are highly qualified and certified according to their content area and/or hold a master’s
degree (U.S. Department of Education, 2003a). Therefore, principals have the
responsibility of attracting and retaining these highly qualified teachers in all classrooms
to avoid the possibility of receiving low school performance scores (Center for Teaching

Access to quality teaching can serve as a barrier to a quality education and further
impact achievement gaps (Darling-Hammond, 2006). According to Peske and Haycock
(2006), students in low-income area schools have a higher likelihood of being taught by a
teacher who may not be highly qualified, certified, or a teacher who is teaching out of
their field. Regardless of qualifications, teachers still have a responsibility to education
to find the most appropriate resources necessary to accommodate the academic needs of their students.

In addition to strengthening teacher qualifications, NCLB (2002) placed heightened emphasis on teacher leaders who aimed for school improvement (Birky, Shelton, & Headley, 2006; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). NCLB (2002) recognized that quality teacher leaders are respected by their peers, and motivated students regardless of race or prior academic performance (Center for Public Education, 2009). Quality teachers are critical to teaching and learning and are vital to sustained instructional improvement when they are a part of shared decision making (San Antonio, 2008; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Teacher leaders can also help to improve teacher retention rates by serving as mentors to new teachers.

Teacher leaders can have an impact on the overall school improvement, which in turn, could help to ensure that the faculty, staff, and students are working toward accomplishing the same goal (Phelps, 2008). Although some principals have a difficult time sharing decision-making, research shows that developing teachers as leaders can also positively affect school performance (Austen, 2010). Though principals reserve the right to make the final decisions, allowing teacher input with regard to student achievement can create a collaborative environment where teachers support school improvement (Blankstein, Houston, & Cole, 2009; Lunenberg & Ornstein, 2008). Having teacher input can also help to develop valuable relationships where teachers feel empowered by their principals (English, 2008; Northouse, 2010). Teachers who feel empowered by their principals exhibit higher morale, are more satisfied with their jobs, and are more likely to remain in the educational field. Research has shown that
principals heighten opportunities for teachers to positively impact student achievement when they maintain consistency throughout the school, develop shared norms and values (Louis et al., 2010; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008), and consistently involve teachers in decision making aimed towards improving student achievement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Louis et al., 2010; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Principals were also responsible for evaluating classroom instruction to ensure that teachers were using effective strategies to improve student achievement (Toch & Rothman, 2008).

Teacher leadership with shared decision-making is not a new concept; it has just taken time for some principals to get used to the idea (Printy & Marks, 2006). Shared decision-making is one way that principals can relieve themselves of duties to become more visible in the classrooms. Additional research has validated the impact that shared decision-making can have on the teaching and learning environment. Printy and Marks (2006) conducted a study of principals and teachers applied shared leadership roles. The researchers’ study included 420 schools that included 2,718 teachers and administrators used the National Educational Longitudinal Study, and a national sample of 24 schools from the Schools Restructuring Study that focused on teacher-to-teacher interactions. The researchers found a strong correlation between the administrator and the teaching and learning process, and ongoing collaboration was vital to the school’s success. When the principal and the teachers shared in goal setting, teachers took more of an active role in supporting efforts to improve student achievement. Stakeholder input was vital to the school’s vision and helped to strengthen their commitments to the overall teaching and learning process.
Although principals have an indirect impact on student achievement, teachers are in the classrooms with the students and can directly impact student achievement (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). They are the ones who bridge the gaps between teaching and learning, and it is the principal’s responsibility to make sure that quality instruction takes place in the classrooms (Omar, Khuan, Kamaruzaman, Marinah, & Jamal, 2011; Grigsby, Schumaker, Deckman, & Simion, 2010). No longer are principals just viewed as managers, they are now the ones who are looked upon to lead instruction at all costs and not let the day-to-day running of the school get in the way of school improvement (Jenkins, 2009).

The principal’s role has changed in regard to accountability, and is now more focused on building professional learning communities. According to Schmoker (2005), schools which operated as an efficient and effective professional learning community were more likely to affect increased student achievement. As a part of the professional learning community, effective principals included teachers in shared decision-making with a higher level of commitment towards implementing changes that led to continuous school improvement (Barber & Mourshed, 2007).

Effective leaders are knowledgeable of the teaching and learning process, and utilize all available resources to maximize student achievement (Hall & Hord, 2006; Coelli & Green, 2009). Effective leaders also have the capacity to meet the growing demands that have been placed on their schools as a result of the NCLB (2002) mandates. Effective leaders are aware that education remains to be a target of public concern, and they are poised to find appropriate means of addressing these concerns with stakeholders.
Effective leaders are aware that being a part of the instructional process is a key part of their day to day responsibilities (Hoy & Hoy, 2009). Effective leaders also recognize the importance of classroom observations to understand the role that teachers have in influencing student achievement (DiPaola & Hoy, 2008; Ing, 2009; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Frequent classroom observations allow principals to monitor classroom instruction, provide support, and make an impact on the educational atmosphere of the school (Ing, 2009). Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008) stated that “if principals wanted to support teachers in improving student outcomes, they needed to spend time in the classrooms observing what teachers were doing” (p. 669). As a result, those classroom observations could lead to improved instruction, and encourage teachers to become a vital part of the school improvement process (Sawchuk, 2011).

**Socioeconomic Status**

The Coleman Report (1966) indicated that parents’ socioeconomic status (SES) was a good predictor of a child’s potential for academic success. Ainley and Long (1995) defined SES as the social and economic factors that contribute to one’s social status. Research has both confirmed and denied the Coleman Report (1966) findings. According to Fisher (2003), SES had no relationship to student test scores; however, Benson (2003), in the same year, found a correlation between low SES and poor school climate. Students from low-income families can impact the achievement levels of a school as a whole and could further widen the achievement gap and a student’s potential for future academic success. Researchers further contended that the SES makeup of a school tended to further impede students’ success rates more than race or SES (Borman & Dowling, 2006).
Unfortunately, significant achievement gaps do exist among the disadvantaged and the advantaged students in the United States. According the 2009 Census Bureau, 15.5 million families with children 18 and younger lived below the poverty line, which meant those families annual income was less than $22,000 for a family of four. Of the 15.5 million, 4.9 million of these families were white children, 4 to 5.6 million were African American and Hispanic children, respectively, and the remaining five million children were below five years old. Research stated that students who struggled academically by the end of third grade had a higher likelihood of not finishing high school than those students who lived above the poverty line (Hernandez, 2011).

Teachers can have a positive impact on students through building and maintaining a positive relationship where students feel they can succeed. A positive teacher-student relationship can motivate a student to want to learn. With teachers having the most direct impact on students, it befits them to use their influence as a means of teaching literacy in the classroom. Literacy is a necessary tool for academic success. The lack of literacy has a detrimental influence on a child’s opportunities for academic achievement. In Ruby Payne’s (2003) book, A Framework for Understanding Poverty, poor academic achievement was linked to low socioeconomic status. The poverty levels in the United States showed that children who came from low socioeconomic status stood a greater chance of having minimal academic success than children who came from middle to upper class socioeconomic status. Children from low-income families may sometimes find it a lifelong challenge to escape the vicious cycle of poverty.

The National Center for Children in Poverty (NCCP) highlighted the following evidence (Klein & Knitzer, 2007):
• Typically, preschoolers whose families lived below the poverty line entered kindergarten significantly behind students who came from high socioeconomic families.

• For children who lived at or below poverty, at age four they were already 18 months behind students of their own age who came from affluent families. By the time that child reached age 10, the academic achievement gap widened even more.

• Upon entering the third grade, students who lived below the poverty line had a vocabulary that consisted of about 4,000 words, whereas children from middle or upper-class families had a vocabulary of about three times as many words.

NCLB (2002) and other early intervention programs such as response to intervention (RTI), are designed to prepare students for academic success (Fletcher, Lyon, Fuchs, & Barnes, 2007; Denton, 2012). Although research showed that these programs may have some positive effects, many students from low-income families with academic challenges remained below average in Reading and Math (Wanzek & Vaughn, 2008; O'Connor & Fuchs, 2013). Principals can play a major role in how these students develop academically by ensuring that the curriculum is aligned to rigorous academic standards, as well as providing meaningful professional development for teachers that encourages academic success for all students.

School Climate

Principals are responsible for the school building and all of its contents. As a part of the building, principals are also responsible for establishing a positive school climate. According to Zins, Weissberg, Wang, and Walberg (2004), school climate is the feeling
Engels, Hotton, Devos, Bouchennooghe, and Aetterman (2008) further defined school climate as the established customs of the school that inspired stakeholders to be on one accord. One way to positively affect school climate is to develop a school vision where all faculty and staff can work collaboratively towards school improvement. While research indicated that principals impacted student achievement indirectly, they were viewed as having a direct impact on school climate.

School climate can also enhance student achievement, motivation of staff and students, encourage teacher retention, and contribute to overall school success (Smith & Piele, 2006). When a positive school climate is established, teachers may be more dedicated to differentiate student needs. Effective leaders make a commitment to all stakeholders and they are willing to guide the faculty and students toward making positive changes (Smith & Piele, 2006).

Hoy and Hannuum (1997) investigated 86 middle schools and determined that student achievement and school climate had a reciprocal relationship. Later in 2005, O’Donnell and White also studied the reciprocal relationship in Pennsylvania middle schools based on the principal’s leadership style as perceived by the teachers. The findings from both studies concluded a direct association between the leadership style of the principal and school climate. Overall school improvement depended on the principal’s ability to maintain a conducive learning environment.

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (2004) identified physical, social, and academic aspects of the building as being three factors that contributed to school climate. The physical factors included: (a) overall appearance, (b) school size, (c) organization, (d) available resources, and (e) safety. The social factors
included: (a) the quality of relationships, (b) fair treatment of students, (c) social
competition and comparison among students, and (d) shared decision making. The
academic factors included: (a) quality instruction, (b) high expectations, and (c) ongoing
progress monitoring.

While the physical and social factors are important to school climate, the
academic aspects are the ones that capture the most attention. Although research
contends that principals have an indirect impact on instruction (Leithwood, Louis,
Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004), they do, however have a direct impact on school climate
(Shindler, Jones, Williams, Taylor, & Cardenas, 2009). The benefits of maintaining a
positive school climate can encourage more collaboration, more comradery, and develop
mutual respect between principals, teachers and students, while a negative school climate
could lead to decreased attendance, morale, and motivation to learn by both the faculty
and the students, as well as increased discipline issues (Marzano, 2007; Bryk, Sebring,
Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton, 2010). In essence, principals are evaluated by the
perceived climate of the learning environment (Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008).

Some principal evaluations have been redesigned to include school climate as a
measure of principal performance (Shindler, Jones, Williams, Taylor, & Cardenas, 2009).
One such example was the Organizational Climate Index (OCI) developed by Hoy, Smith
and Sweetland (2002). This inventory included 30 items that measure four different
dimensions: (a) principal leadership, (b) teacher professionalism, (c) student
performance, and (d) community influence. A second inventory was the Comprehensive
School Climate Inventory (CSCI) developed by the National School Climate Center.
This inventory included 64 items that also measured four different dimensions: (a) safety,
relationships, (c) teaching and learning, and (d) environment. This inventory also pointed out areas of strengths and weaknesses, as well as the needs of the school and the faculty. The feedback from school climate inventories aligned to the principals’ daily responsibilities could be used to reflect on ways to improve principals’ practices.

Although positive school climates have been associated with higher student achievement, little research has confirmed this assumption. The school principal has a responsibility for the overall functioning of the school. A vital part of the overall functioning includes building meaningful relationships, keeping shareholders informed of changes, and leading and maintaining a student-focused learning environment. A principal can strengthen or weaken a school’s climate based on the way he or she is perceived by teachers, students, and anyone who may enter the school.

Summary

Many dynamics go into making a school successful. Effective principals are considered a key element in improving student achievement, setting goals, and developing a vision for the school (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Rivkin, Hanushek, & Kain, 2005; Rockoff, 2004). According to Schnur (2007), a principal’s leadership style may be related to his or her ability to attract, retain, and develop teacher leaders who can motivate students to achieve academic success. Empowering teacher leaders could help to ensure positive collaboration among colleagues while helping to build necessary leadership skills among teachers (Barber & Moursheed, 2007; Fullan, 2005; Johnson, Kardos, Kauffman, Liu, & Donaldson, 2004).
Principals who are passionate about wanting to improve student achievement must be focused on improving the teaching and learning process (Southern Regional Education Board, 2004). Although there will be advantages and disadvantages to any leadership style used, principals must select the style that will bring about the most effective changes in school improvement. Furthermore, the principal is the person in the school who can have a direct effect on the school community, as well as the one who helps to establish the climate of the school (Sergiovanni, 2005, 2006). He or she is responsible for the building and all of its contents and is held accountable for improving the academic performance of the school as a whole (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

Principals cannot impact student achievement alone. To be successful, principals must be supported by their school districts, parents, and community partners to effectively impact student learning (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; National Staff Development Council, 2008; Spillane, 2006; Wong & Nicotera, 2007). As accountability demands have required school principals to achieve annual growth, principals must become familiar with a variety of leadership styles and know the most appropriate style to produce maximum student effort (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Muijs, Harris, & Chapman, 2004; Yukl, 2006).

Accountability mandates have continued to add increasing pressure on schools and their leaders (DuFour & Fullan, 2013). Along with accountability, principals find themselves faced with a number of other variables, such as school demographics and curriculum changes, which could make overall school improvement even more challenging. Research reveals that some of the most academically challenged schools are
being led by principals who are ill-prepared for the job (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2009). With work conditions as such, principals and other educators are deciding to choose different careers (Phillips & Flashman, 2007).

Being a principal requires a wealth of knowledge regarding effective leadership that leads to improved school performance. As more research details the lack of preparation that principals may have received before their assignment (Gamage, 2009a; Hess & Kelly, 2007), school districts are thereby charged to partner with universities and other professional development programs to ensure that schools are led by administrators who are committed to instructional leadership. The preceding research has explored numerous challenges that many schools are facing; however, research continues to reflect that no school can have success without an effective leader (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008).
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

School leadership is a crucial factor in school performance. With the added pressures of accountability being placed on schools, principals are at the helm of improving student achievement (Horng, Kalogrides, & Loeb, 2009). Since principals are a major part of the school improvement team, they are expected to find innovative ways to increase student success, increase teacher performance, and secure appropriate funding to ensure that all students have an opportunity for a meaningful education. Principals have a gamut of responsibilities, and to be effective they must develop rigorous instructional goals as the instructional leader (Grissom & Loeb, 2009).

Chapter Three describes the proposed research questions and hypotheses in this study. The purpose of the present research was to examine the relationship between principals’ leadership styles and school performance. Although limited research existed regarding the effects of principals’ leadership styles on school performance, principals are still widely regarded as a key component of the school (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2009).

Research Design

A descriptive research study (Aron, Aron, & Coups, 2008) was utilized to investigate the relationship between principals’ leadership style flexibility and effectiveness and school performance. To acquire quantitative information, the Leader
Behavior Analysis II Questionnaire (Blanchard, Forsyth, Hambleton, & Zigarmi, 1991a, 1991b) was selected. A convenience sampling method (Cohen, Manion, & Morison, 2007; Mann, 2003) was used to collect data on leadership styles through paper-pencil questionnaires from principals and teachers across northern Louisiana. This study also used an Ex-post facto data collection method (Cohen, Manion, & Morison, 2007) as the archival data on school performance was used. Ex post facto data are data that already exist and have not been manipulated. For this study, the School Performance Scores (SPS) for the 2012-2013 school year were used. A school’s SPS determines its letter grade. Schools receive a performance score and letter grade based on the following scale: A = 100-150; B = 85.0-99.9; C = 70.0-84.9; D = 50.0-69.9; and F = below 50 (Louisiana Believes, 2013). In this study, school letter grades were used to categorize schools as either high performing, A and B, or low performing, C and D. The SPS of selected schools was compared to principals’ leadership styles to determine if those leadership styles were related to school performance.

Methodology

Sample

A total of 310 principal and teacher questionnaires were delivered to three school districts by the researcher. A total of 193 completed questionnaires were returned, indicating a 62% response rate. Of the 193 completed questionnaires returned, four principals were removed because they had not been in their positions for two consecutive years, and their corresponding teachers were also removed. Further data examination revealed that only 19 schools had data for both principals and teachers; therefore, 19 principals and 139 teachers’ questionnaires were analyzed for the study. Participants for
the study were selected from 19 schools and included 19 principals and 139 third, fourth, and fifth-grade teachers from school districts in Northern Louisiana. The sample was selected using a convenience sampling method (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling method of collecting data about a population. Although data collected from convenience sampling may be viewed as biased and not generalizable, it does offer a representative sample of the selected population being studied (Bryman, 2008). The selected districts were also chosen to be representative of the populations to be studied. Schools were selected based on principals who had been in their positions for at least two consecutive years, and schools where both principals and teachers participated in the study. Principals and teachers were asked to complete demographic information that included age, gender, ethnicity, level of education, and years of experience, in addition to the completing the questionnaires. Data collected from all schools included School Performance Scores (SPS), which included a school letter grade, and school demographics, including percentage of free and reduced lunch. The data were made available at the Louisiana Believes website for the 2012-2013 school year.

Instrumentation

School Performance Scores and the Leader Behavior Analysis II Self (principals) and Other (teachers) were used to identify the extent to which leadership styles of principals related to school performance. For the purpose of this research, only grades three, four, and five were used based on convenience sampling and availability.
School Performance Scores (SPS)

Schools with grades three through five receive a yearly SPS based on how well students perform on the standardized LEAP and iLEAP tests. In these grades, SPS is based entirely on students' test results. Once test results were calculated for the 2012-2013 school year, schools received a performance score with a corresponding letter grade (Louisiana Believes, 2013).

Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP)

The LEAP test is given to students in grades four and eight in Louisiana. This test is criterion-referenced, thus, a pre-determined score must be obtained to pass to the next grade. Content validity was determined using a panel of subject matter experts which included Louisiana educators and other educational consultants. After extensive review, content validity was determined to be incorporated throughout the test and the test was deemed a valid assessment (Louisiana Believes, 2013). Reliability for any test may contain a small margin of error, therefore, higher reliability equates to less margin of error (Louisiana Believes, 2013). Internal consistency for the LEAP test was calculated using Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, Schonemann, & McKie, 1965), and ranged from .85 to .92 (Louisiana Believes, 2013).

Integrated Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (iLEAP)

The iLEAP test is given to students in grades three, five, six, and seven. This test is norm-referenced and students' test results are used to make comparisons to other students who take the same test. The iLEAP’s content validity was determined similar to the LEAP (Louisiana Believes, 2013). Internal consistency for the iLEAP test was
calculated using Cronbach’s alpha (Cronbach, Schonemann, & McKie, 1965), and ranged from .83 to .93 (Louisiana Believes, 2013).

**Leader Behavior Analysis II (LBAII)**

The Leader Behavior Analysis II (LBAII) was developed by Blanchard, Forsyth, Hambleton, and Zigarmi (1991a, 1991b) to evaluate leadership styles. Six scores were obtained from the LBAII, two primary (flexibility and effectiveness) and four secondary (S1, S2, S3, and S4). The four leadership styles are Directing (S1), Coaching (S2), Supporting (S3), and Delegating (S4). The Leader Behavior Analysis II Questionnaire has two different instruments, LBAII Self for principals, and LBAII Other for teachers.

The LBAII Self Questionnaire consists of 20 work scenarios involving a principal and how he or she would respond to them. The principal may select only one response for each scenario. Two primary scores, flexibility and effectiveness, were determined. Flexibility refers to the number of times a leader uses a different leadership style in a situation (S1, S2, S3, and S4). The higher the number of times a leader uses one style over another is indicative of that leader having low flexibility. The more variation in styles used is indicative of that leader having high flexibility. Scores can range from 0 to 30 with 17 being the mean score as determined by Blanchard, Hambleton, Zigarmi, and Forsyth (1991a, 1991b). Scores from 0 to 14 indicate low flexibility, while scores over 20 indicate high flexibility.

Effectiveness refers to the number of times a leader chooses the most appropriate response in a situation. The leader’s effectiveness is a critical component in this instrument. In research studies by Birden (1992) and Zigarmi, Edeburn, and Blanchard (1993), effectiveness scores have shown a positive correlation to school climate. The
level of effectiveness ranges are from (a) Poor = 1, (b) Fair = 2, (c) Good = 3, and (d) Excellent = 4. The scores range from 20 to 80, with 54 being the mean score. The level of effectiveness and the mean scores were determined by the designers of the instrument (Blanchard, Forsyth, Hambleton, & Zigarmi, 1991a, 1991b). For example, if a principal, when completing the questionnaire, selects excellent for each response, then his or her level of effectiveness would be calculated by multiplying 4 x 20 (number of items in questionnaire), which would result in a score of 80. This principal would be considered to have high effectiveness. Scores from 0 to 50 indicate low effectiveness, while scores over 58 indicate high effectiveness. The scoring guide ranges from Style 1 (S1) to Style 4 (S4), and the styles include:

- S1 indicates high direction/low support based on an employee’s need for extra guidance and support. Using S1, the leader is in charge of making decisions and the employees have no input.

- S2 indicates high direction/high support based on an employee who exhibits high motivation to complete a task, yet lacks the appropriate experience and skills. Using S2, the leader makes the final decision; however, he or she will consider employee input.

- S3 indicates low direction/high support based on an employee who has the appropriate experience and skills, but has little motivation to complete a task. Using S3, the leader works along with the employee as a form of motivation and as a means of establishing a relationship; however, the leader still assumes responsibility for the ultimate decision.
• S4 indicates low direction/low support based on an employee who exhibits both appropriate experience and skills and is capable of making decisions. Using S4, the leader allows employees to make decisions, but the leader still has the final decision.

The four areas of secondary scoring of S1 to S4 tally the number of times a leader chooses one style over another based on the 20 scenarios. The style score represents the principal's primary style and should not be used to make a generalization about all leaders. The final scores for flexibility and effectiveness indicate the amount of guidance and support that a leader exhibits in a given situation (Anderson 1984; Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Nelson 1993; Zigarmi, Edeburn, & Blanchard, 1997). Zigarmi, Edeburn, and Blanchard (1995) conducted multiple research studies using a stratified random sample to determine external validity and to lessen bias when using the instrument, and found that six of those studies indicated reliability coefficients between .54 and .86, and a median of .74.

The Leader Behavior Analysis II Other Questionnaire was used for teachers. The LBAII Other Questionnaire also consists of 20 work scenarios involving the teachers selecting how they think the principal would respond. The questionnaires for the teachers were scored the same way as was done for principals.

For the purposes of this study, principals' leadership style flexibility and effectiveness scores were considered. For example, a highest score on S2 meant that a principal's primary leadership style was Coaching. A frequency data on the total number of principals using each leadership style was used for final data analysis. The LBAII Self Questionnaire also identified the primary, secondary, and developing leadership
styles depending on the scores a principal received on the four leadership styles, S1 through S4. The developing leadership style analyses were not used in the study, but were reported for compliance requirements stated for instrument use (see Appendix Tables A1 to A5).

Data Collection Procedures

Approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of Louisiana Tech University was obtained prior to data collection. After IRB permission was granted, an email was sent to the district superintendents of the selected parishes to seek approval to conduct research in their schools. A summary of the study was included in the email, as well as information about the availability of the results once requested. Once the superintendents granted approval, the study proceeded.

The traditional data collection techniques are comparable to web-based methods (Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John, 2004); however, due to the timing of the approval to conduct the study, paper-pencil questionnaires were administered. Information obtained from the questionnaires was entered into the computer and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0 software.

Data Analysis

The descriptive analyses (i.e., mean, standard deviation, and percentages) were obtained for each of the four leadership styles, flexibility, and effectiveness. The Blanchard Companies granted permission to use the instrument provided the following information was reported: (a) Average Flexibility Score and Standard Deviation, (b) Average Effectiveness Score and Standard Deviation, (c) Average Style Score means and
Standard Deviations to Styles 1 through Styles 4, (d) Percent of Primary Styles 1 through Styles 4, (e) Percent of Development Styles 1 through Styles 4, and (f) Maximums and Minimums.

Research Questions

Four research questions are addressed with this study. The questions are:

1. Is there a difference between principals’ self-report of leadership style flexibility and effectiveness and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style flexibility and effectiveness?

2. Does principal leadership style flexibility relate to school performance?

3. Does principal leadership style effectiveness relate to school performance?

4. Is there a difference in principals’ primary leadership styles in high performing schools versus principals’ primary leadership styles in low performing schools?

Null Hypotheses

H₁: There will be no difference between principals’ self-reported leadership style flexibility and effectiveness and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style flexibility and effectiveness.

H₁ₐ: There will be no difference between principals’ self-reported leadership style flexibility and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style flexibility.

H₁₅: There will be no difference between principals’ self-reported leadership style effectiveness and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style effectiveness.

H₂: Leadership style flexibility is not related to school performance.
H$_{2a}$: There will be no relationship between principals' self-reported leadership style flexibility and school performance.

H$_{2b}$: There will be no relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style flexibility and school performance.

H$_3$: Leadership style effectiveness is not related to school performance.

H$_{3a}$: There will be no relationship between principals' self-reported leadership style effectiveness and school performance.

H$_{3b}$: There will be no relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style effectiveness and school performance.

H$_4$: Leadership style is not related to school performance.

H$_{4a}$: Principals' primary leadership styles will not be related to school performance.

H$_{4b}$: Teachers' perceptions of principals' primary leadership styles will not be related to school performance.

**Hypothesis One**

There will be no difference between principals' self-reported leadership style flexibility and effectiveness and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style flexibility and effectiveness. In order to test H$_{1a}$ and H$_{1b}$, an independent $t$ Test (Aron, Aron, & Coups, 2008) was used. Leadership style was used as the independent variable, and flexibility was used as the dependent variable. An independent $t$ test analysis was conducted using flexibility to determine if a difference existed between principals' leadership style flexibility and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style flexibility. In a separate $t$ test analysis, effectiveness was used to determine if a
difference existed between principals' leadership style effectiveness and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style effectiveness.

**Hypothesis Two**

Leadership style flexibility is not related to school performance. In order to test $H_{2a}$ and $H_{2b}$, a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007) was used to determine if leadership style flexibility was related to school performance. Two separate correlational analyses were conducted using leadership style flexibility and school performance to determine if a relationship existed between (a) principals' leadership style flexibility and school performance, and (b) teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style flexibility and school performance.

**Hypothesis Three**

Leadership style effectiveness is not related to school performance. In order to test $H_{3a}$ and $H_{3b}$, a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007) was used to determine if leadership style effectiveness was related to school performance. Two separate correlational analyses were conducted using leadership style effectiveness and school performance to determine if a relationship existed between (a) principals' leadership style effectiveness and school performance, and (b) teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style effectiveness and school performance.

**Hypothesis Four**

Leadership style is not related to school performance. In order to test $H_{4a}$, a Chi-Square analysis (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007) was used. The frequency of leadership styles and SPS was analyzed using Chi-Square. School performance data
were divided into two categories: (a) high, and (b) low. High performing included schools with a letter grade of A and B and an SPS of 100-150 and 85.0-99.9, respectively. Low performing included schools with a letter grade of C and D and an SPS of 70.0-84.9 and 50.0-69.9, respectively. A Chi-Square analysis was used to determine if primary leadership styles were different across high and low performing schools. A 2 (high and low school performance) x 4 (S1, S2, S3, S4) contingency table was used for hypothesis testing. Effects in this 2 x 4 contingency table were defined as relationships between school performance (row) and leadership styles (column) variables.

In order to test H4b, a Chi-Square analysis (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007) was used. A Chi-Square analysis was used to determine if teachers' perceptions of the primary leadership styles were different across high and low performing schools. A 2 (high and low school performance) x 4 (S1, S2, S3, S4) contingency table was used for hypothesis testing. Effects in this 2 x 4 contingency table were defined as relationships between school performance (row) and leadership styles (column) variables.

**Limitations of the Study**

The following limitations were found to exist for this study:

1. Select school districts with grades three through five in Northern Louisiana were used for the study. In Louisiana, students begin taking standardized tests in the third grade. Since elementary schools were used, grades three through five were considered.

2. Only teachers from grades three through five were used in the study. Students are expected to be literate by the time they enter third grade. Teachers in these grades
have an opportunity to impact student learning, which in turn, could have an impact on school performance.

3. Some teachers may have felt obligated to give the principal a positive rating. Teachers may have perceived their principals' as being effective through some of his or her leadership qualities. Those perceptions may have resulted in the teachers responding favorably to the questionnaire.

4. Participants in the study were not randomly selected. The participants for the study were selected based on convenience and availability. All teachers in the selected schools did not have an equal chance of being selected since this study focused on students who took standardized tests in elementary schools.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions were made regarding this study:

1. Participants responded truthfully to the questionnaire.
2. The leadership style questionnaire accurately reflected principals' leadership styles.
3. The teachers' information accurately reflected their perceptions of principals' leadership styles.

Summary

Chapter Three of the current study included research questions, hypotheses, methodology, and statistical analyses. Data analyses determined how principals' leadership styles and school performance scores were related. It is anticipated that the research finding will contribute to the understanding of how leadership styles vary among leaders, while also providing an understanding of how similar or different the perceived
leadership styles are from the leaders' self-reported styles. It is also expected that insights gained in this research will further the understanding of how various leadership styles may impact the overall academic performance of schools.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine how principals’ leadership styles and school performance may be related. This study investigated the principals’ self-reported leadership styles and how those leadership styles were related to overall school performance. The researcher also considered teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ leadership styles and its relationship to school performance. Current research regarding school leadership has stressed the importance of the principal in improving school performance (Blankstein, 2010; Bulach, Lunenburg, & Potter, 2008; Fullan, 2010; Marzano & Waters, 2010). As school performance continues to be an area of concern to educators and stakeholders, principals are increasingly expected to be instructional leaders for their schools (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005; Hallinger, 2005, Guthrie & Schuermann, 2010). Furthermore, as principals’ roles continue to change, effective principals are developing learning communities throughout their schools to help maintain a focus on instruction (Glatthorn & Jailall, 2009). Principals are expected to adjust their leadership styles in such a way that produces maximum results for their schools (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985). Because principals’ leadership styles may vary, additional research to determine a particular style or styles of leadership that improves school performance is needed.
The research questions that guided this study concentrated on two major themes: (1) differences between principals’ leadership style flexibility and effectiveness and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style flexibility and effectiveness, and (2) the relationship of self-reported and perceived leadership style flexibility and effectiveness to school performance. In the present study, a leadership style variable was expressed in three different ways: (1) flexibility (i.e., the number of times a leader uses different leadership styles); (2) effectiveness (i.e., the number of times a leader chooses the most effective leadership style); and (3) primary leadership style (i.e., leader’s most preferred style of leadership). The results of the statistical analyses were used to answer the following specific research questions based on the previous two themes:

1. Is there a difference between principals’ self-report of leadership style flexibility and effectiveness and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style flexibility and effectiveness?
2. Does principal leadership style flexibility relate to school performance?
3. Does principal leadership style effectiveness relate to school performance?
4. Is there a difference in principals’ primary leadership styles in high performing schools versus principals’ primary leadership styles in low performing schools?

This chapter focuses on the sample and the data collected. The results of the statistical analyses and a brief discussion of the findings are also included in this chapter.

Sample

Participants for the study included 19 schools, 19 principals, and 139 third, fourth, and fifth-grade teachers from school districts in Northern Louisiana. Data collected from each school included School Performance Score (SPS) that included a school letter grade,
and school demographics, including the percentages of free and reduced lunch, and were accessed via the Louisiana Believes website for the 2012-2013 school year. As a result of a limited response from superintendents and the number of participants (i.e., principals and teachers) removed from the study, the anticipated sample size was reduced. A total of four superintendents granted permission to conduct research in their schools. The researcher then visited the principals of the schools and explained the study. During the visit, the principals were given the questionnaires to disseminate to the third, fourth, and fifth-grade teachers in their schools. The questionnaires included an envelope in which to return the completed instrument to the office in a sealed envelope with the participant’s name signed across the sealed envelope. Once the questionnaires were completed by the principals and teachers, the researcher was notified via phone call, and the questionnaires were picked up. A reminder phone call was made to the schools if questionnaires had not been completed one week after they had been delivered. Each school was given a code of one number, followed by two letters. Table 1 shows the demographic data of principals who were included in the final analysis of this study, Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics for the principals, Table 3 shows the demographic data of teachers included in the study, and Table 4 shows the teacher descriptive statistics.
### Table 1

**Demographic Data of Principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>31.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (N=19)* includes the total number of principals used in the final analysis.

### Table 2

**Descriptive Statistics for Principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>54.84</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>69.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a principal (in years)</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at current school</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (N=19)* includes the total number of principals who were used in the final analysis.
Table 3

Demographic Data of Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>97.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>82.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td>Master + 30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (N=139)* includes the total number of teachers who corresponded to principals in Table 1.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (in years)</td>
<td>40.19</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>63.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience as a teacher (in years)</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>&gt;1.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years at current school</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>&gt;1.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (N=139)* includes the total number of teachers who corresponded to principals in Table 1.
Gender, ethnicity, highest degree, age, and experience were the descriptive statistics that were listed in the study. More female principals (68%) than male principals (32%) participated in the study. White females accounted for 68% of participants, while African American males accounted for 32% of participants. The large percentage of female administrators complemented the number of schools who had a predominantly female faculty. The average age of the principals who participated in the study was 54. Of the 19 principals who participated in the study, more than half (68%) had a master’s degree or higher. Principals had an average of 12 years of administrative experience, and an average of nine years’ experience at their respective schools.

Instrumentation

School Performance Scores (SPS) and the Leader Behavior Analysis II (LBAII) Self (principals) and Other (teachers) were used. The LBAII was developed by Blanchard, Hambleton, Zigarmi, and Forsyth (1991a, 1991b) to evaluate leadership styles. Six scores are obtained from the LBAII, two primary (flexibility and effectiveness) and four secondary (S1, S2, S3, and S4). The four leadership styles are Directing (S1), Coaching (S2), Supporting (S3), and Delegating (S4).

Data Analysis

Data from the Leader Behavior Analysis II Questionnaires and School Performance Scores for 2013-2013 were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0 software. Data were analyzed using independent t-Tests, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation, and Chi-Square to determine if statistically significance existed. Mean, median and mode were calculated for flexibility and
effectiveness (see Appendix G). Mean and standard deviation for flexibility and
effectiveness were calculated for $t$ tests; correlation ($r$) was used for Pearson Product-
Moment; and frequencies for each leadership style (S1, S2, S3, and S4) were used for
Chi-Square. Statistical tests for this study were reported using an alpha level of $p < .05$.

**Research Questions**

The research questions answered as a result of the data analyses are:

1. Is there a difference between principals’ self-report of leadership style flexibility
and effectiveness and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style
flexibility and effectiveness?

2. Does principal leadership style flexibility relate to school performance?

3. Does principal leadership style effectiveness relate to school performance?

4. Is there a difference in principals’ primary leadership styles in high performing
schools versus principals’ primary leadership styles in low performing schools?

Following are the results of each hypothesis for the present study.

**Self-Reported and Perceived Leadership Style
Flexibility and Effectiveness**

$H_{1a}$: An independent $t$ test analysis was conducted using the calculated scores for
principals’ leadership style flexibility and the mean score from teachers’ perceptions of
principals’ leadership style flexibility to determine if a difference existed between
principals’ self-reported leadership style flexibility and teachers’ perceptions of
principals’ leadership style flexibility. Mean scores were calculated by taking the average
flexibility score across the third, fourth, and fifth-grade teachers within each school for
flexibility. As shown in Table 5, there was no statistically significant difference, \( t(36) = -.822, (p > .05) \); therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 5

*Results of t-Test for Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Leadership Style Flexibility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>-.822</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \( p > .05 \)

\( H_{1b} \): An independent \( t \) test analysis was conducted using the calculated scores for principals' leadership style effectiveness and the mean score from teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style effectiveness to determine if a difference existed between principals' self-reported leadership style effectiveness and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style effectiveness. Mean scores were calculated by taking the average effectiveness score across the third, fourth, and fifth-grade teachers within each school for effectiveness. Table 6 shows there was no statistically significant difference, \( t(36) = 1.782, (p > .05) \); therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.
Table 6

Results of t-Test for Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of Leadership Style Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50.53</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.782</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $p > .05$

Leadership Style Flexibility and School Performance

$H_{2a}$: A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was conducted using the calculated scores for principals' leadership style flexibility and the mean school performance score. Table 7 shows there was no relationship between principals' self-reported leadership style flexibility and school performance, $r = .04, p = .866 (p > .05)$. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 7

Mean Scores and Results of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation for Principals' Leadership Style Flexibility and School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83.58</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $p > .05$
A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was conducted using the mean score from teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style flexibility scores and the mean school performance score. As shown in Table 8, there was no relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style flexibility and school performance, $r = .18, p = .463 (p > .05)$. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83.58</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $p > .05$

**Leadership Style Effectiveness and School Performance**

A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was conducted using the calculated scores principals' leadership style effectiveness and the mean school performance score. As shown in Table 9, there was no relationship between principals' self-reported leadership style effectiveness and school performance, $r = -.04, p = .864 (p > .05)$. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Table 9

Mean Scores and Results of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation for Principals’ Self-Reported Leadership Style Effectiveness and School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50.53</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83.58</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. p > .05

**H₃b**: A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was conducted using the calculated mean score for teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style effectiveness and the mean school performance score. As shown in Table 10, there was no relationship between teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style effectiveness and school performance, \( r = -.20, p = .415 \) (\( p > .05 \)). The null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 10

Mean Scores and Results of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation for Teachers’ Perceptions of Principals’ Leadership Style Effectiveness and School Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>83.58</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. p > .05

**Leadership Styles and School Performance**

**H₄a**: A 2x2 Chi-Square analysis was conducted using the most frequently used principals’ primary leadership styles for high and low performing schools to determine if
leadership style was related to school performance. Frequencies for S1 and S4 were less than five; therefore, these were not considered in the analysis. Frequencies for S2 and S3 were used in this analysis. As shown in Table 11, principals' primary leadership styles, S2 and S3, were not related to school performance, $\chi^2 = 2.98$, $df=1$, $p = .585$. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 11

*Principals' Primary Leadership Styles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Styles</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (N=17); These are observed frequencies.

**$H_{4b}$**: A Chi-Square analysis was conducted using teachers' perceptions of principals' primary leadership styles (S1, S2, S3, and S4) to determine if teachers' perceptions were different across high and low performing schools. Frequencies were tallied for each perceived leadership style for teachers for high and low performing schools. As shown in Table 12, teachers' perceptions of principals' primary leadership styles were not related to school performance, $\chi^2 = 1.864$, $df=3$, $p = .601$. The null hypothesis was accepted.
Table 12

*Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Primary Leadership Styles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.864</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (N=120)* only teachers' perceptions with one primary leadership style were calculated. These are observed frequencies.

Statistical tests for this study were reported using an alpha level of $p < .05$. The researcher used caution when interpreting the results of these statistical tests. The results of this study were used to determine if a relationship existed between variables and not to make a prediction of one causing the other.

**Summary**

Data analyzed from the Leader Behavior Analysis II Questionnaires and SPS offered results related to the research questions. As revealed in the data, no significant differences or relationships existed for the given hypotheses. In Chapter Five, a synopsis of the research design and methods, along with limitations, in this study will be discussed. Also included in the chapter will be recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The educational needs of schools have changed, thereby, requiring principals to be at the helm of improving overall school improvement (NAESP, 2008). As school demographics continue to change, principals are challenged to utilize available resources to help drive instruction (Glatthorn & Jailall, 2009). In addition, schools that have achieved success have found that involving teachers and other stakeholders in decision-making was an effective means of improving school success (Austen, 2010).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine principals’ leadership styles as they related to school performance. Teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership styles and the relationship to school performance were also considered. Research stated that principals have an indirect effect on school improvement (Louis et al., 2010); however, research further contended that principals were a direct link to helping to motivate teachers and students towards increased academic attainment (Crum & Sherman, 2008).

Discussion

This study was guided by several research questions related to leadership style flexibility and leadership style effectiveness. Flexibility referred to the number of times a
leader uses a different leadership style in a situation (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985). Leaders who selected one style more than the others were viewed as having low flexibility, which meant principals predominantly used one style [i.e., Directing (S1), Coaching (S2), Supporting (S3), or Delegating (S4)]. In contrast, leaders who selected a number of leadership styles were viewed as having high flexibility, which meant they may have used all four of the leadership styles (i.e., Directing, Coaching, Supporting, and Delegating). In this study, there was no preferred leadership style that prevailed as having a direct impact on improving school performance.

Effectiveness referred to the number of times a leader chose the most appropriate response in a situation (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985). An effectiveness score was calculated based on the number of times a leader selected one of the given responses. If a majority of the participants selected responses that were defined as poor according to the Leader Behavior Analysis II (LBAII), they would receive a low effectiveness score. On the other hand, if a majority of the participants selected responses that were defined as effective according to the LBAII, they would receive a high effectiveness score. Low effectiveness scores would be indicative of an ineffective leader, while high effectiveness scores would be indicative of an effective leader.

Results are discussed as a function of the research questions posed.

1. Is there a difference between principals' self-report of leadership style flexibility and effectiveness and teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership style flexibility and effectiveness?

The results of the t Test indicated that there was no significant difference between the principals' perceptions of their leadership style flexibility and leadership style
effectiveness and teachers' perceptions of those two variables. These findings support research suggesting an alignment of leader and follower perceptions of leadership style is important for the smooth functioning of any organization (Demir, 2008; Hess & Kelly, 2007). When leader and follower perceptions are aligned, a stronger work commitment exists, which, in turn, could lead to improved organizational success (Felfe & Heinitz, 2010). In this study, perceptions were aligned in that principals rated themselves as having above average flexibility and the teachers rated the principals as having above average flexibility. Principals also rated themselves as effective as did the teachers. These alignments could be indicative of individual relationships that may have been established between the principals and the teachers which played a role in the ratings that led to leader and follower alignment. With both principals and teachers being rated so closely, this may explain why no statistical differences occurred.

2. Does principal leadership style flexibility relate to school performance?

The results of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation indicated that there was no significant relationship between leadership style flexibility and school performance. Though the null hypothesis was confirmed, the review of research indicated that a relationship should exist between leadership style flexibility and school performance (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008). Principals have to maintain a balance between the many demands of running a school and selecting the appropriate leadership style for given situations that may occur. Exhibiting appropriate leadership style flexibility could mean the difference between a school's success or failure. If principals are perceived by the teachers and students as not being flexible, this could serve to undermine a school's success. Although both principals and teachers in this study rated the principals as
having above average flexibility, flexibility had no effect on a school’s performance. These findings were in contrast to the literature. These findings could indicate that the principals understood the importance of using a variety of leadership styles or that the leadership styles they used were appropriate for their school settings.

3. *Does principal leadership style effectiveness relate to school performance?*

The results of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation indicated that there was no significant relationship between the principals’ leadership style effectiveness and teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership style effectiveness and school performance. Principals rated themselves as effective as did the teachers. These findings differed from the research which indicated that school leaders who used effective leadership styles could impact student performance (Christie, Thompson, & Whiteley, 2009). According to Zigarmi, Edeburn, and Blanchard (1993), effectiveness scores have been shown to have a positive correlation to school climate. Principals who created a positive school climate were more inclined to experience increased academic performance (Printy, 2010). Effective leaders could impact the climate of a school through building positive relationships and setting and maintaining high goals for the school. Effective leaders can either build up or tear down a school’s climate based on the relationships that he or she has established with stakeholders.

In addition to investigating leadership style flexibility and leadership style effectiveness, the researcher further investigated the differences between principals’ leadership styles in high performing schools versus principals’ leadership styles in low performing schools in relations to school performance. Currently, the state of Louisiana uses school performance scores to measure school improvement. Schools receive a
performance score and a corresponding letter grade based on a 0-150 numerical scale (Louisiana Believes, 2013). With schools continuing to decline academically (Abrevaya & White, 2009; Hoff, 2009), many principals have had to modify their leadership styles to focus on moving schools forward (Jones & Egley, 2009). NCLB (2002) has further intensified the emphasis being placed on principals, causing districts to focus on principals being the instructional leaders who work towards improving academic success.

4. Is there a difference in principals' primary leadership styles in high performing schools versus principals' primary leadership styles in low performing schools?

The results of the Chi-Square analysis indicated that there was no significant difference between principals' leadership styles and school performance. The frequencies tallied indicated that the most frequently used leadership styles were Coaching (S2) and Supporting (S3) in both and high and low performing schools. The principals rated themselves as using these two styles as did the teachers. In fact, principals in both high and low performing schools were just as likely to use the Coaching (S2) and Supporting (S3) leadership styles. Although the two leadership styles were used by principals in both high performing schools and low performing schools, there was no difference in the impact that those two leadership styles made on school performance. The other two leadership styles, Directing (S1) and Delegating (S4) were rated among the teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership styles; however, these styles were not represented among the principals' self-report of leadership styles. These findings are in contrast to the literature that stated that principals' leadership styles could affect school performance (Jones & Egley, 2009). Therefore, the factors that distinguished high performing schools and low performing schools were not the
principals' leadership styles. Along with accountability, some principals have found themselves faced with a number of other variables, such as school demographics and curriculum changes, which have served to further challenge the school improvement process. Since principals are generally assigned to a school based on a school's need and appropriate fit, the findings could be an indication that principals' leadership styles were not indicative of how well or how poorly a school may perform academically. Although leadership style is important (Cokluk & Yilmaz, 2010), in this study, it had no effect on a school's performance. Because Coaching and Supporting were the most prevalent leadership styles among the principals, this could be an indication that the teachers in the schools responded better to principals who focused on building relationships. Research showed that when teachers felt respected and appreciated by their leaders, they were more likely to work together with the principals to focus on improving school performance (Demir, 2008).

**Findings**

Leader and follower perceptions of leadership style flexibility and leadership style effectiveness were aligned, which corresponded to the research regarding perceptions of leadership (Demir, 2008; Hess & Kelly, 2007). The average amount of years at a particular school for principals was nine years, and the average number of years at a particular school for teachers was six years. The length of time at the schools corresponded to the research which stated that the longer a principal works with the same teachers, the more comfortable the teachers become with that principal's leadership style, and the more likely both principals and teachers will have similar perceptions (Richards, 2003). Principals and teachers had similar ratings of leadership style flexibility and
leadership style effectiveness. Principals and teachers rated the principals as having above average flexibility, and both principals and teachers’ ratings of leadership style effectiveness indicated that the leaders were effective. The ratings could have been similar because principals and teachers felt equally responsible for their school’s success.

Being able to adapt to different leadership styles depending on the situation is considered an attribute for leaders (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985; Leithwood & Mascall, 2008), yet in this study, leadership style flexibility did not have a relationship to school performance. While research indicated that a relationship should exist between leadership style flexibility and school performance (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008), the findings did not correspond to the research. This could be due to the fact that each situation may require a different type of approach in a school setting as every school may have its own unique set of issues. Principals should be mindful of the student populations that they serve and consider what would be in the best interest of the school. Depending on how much experience a principal may have in dealing with school issues, he or she may defer to the leadership style that they are more comfortable using. However, in such cases, using a preferred leadership style may not yield the most appropriate results and could result in more harm than good.

Effective principals and teachers have been shown to have a positive influence on school performance (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005), yet the results from this study differed from the research which indicated that school leaders who used effective leadership styles could impact student performance (Christie, Thompson, & Whiteley, 2009).
Having flexibility is an important attribute so that a leader is able to adjust leadership styles to fit a range of situations that might occur in a school setting (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985). In fact, research indicated that a principal may use a variety of leadership styles in various situations (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008). Supporting research for the Leader Behavior Analysis II Questionnaire indicated that the higher a principal’s flexibility, the more likely were his or her chances to select a leadership style that yield increased positive outcomes for school improvement (Blanchard, Hambleton, Zigarmi, & Forsyth, 1991a, 1991b), thus having a potential impact on the overall performance of the school.

Although research supported the idea that principals may use a variety of leadership styles (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008), results of this study did not indicate that the use of those leadership styles were related to school performance or that they used a variety of leadership styles. The use of two primary leadership styles, Coaching and Supporting surfaced as rated by the principals self-report and teachers’ perceptions however, no generalization can be made from the results of this study that these leadership styles affected school performance. Leithwood and Mascall (2008) emphasized that leadership style is intuitive, and the research is in alignment with this study in that no one leadership style prevailed as having more of an impact on school performance than the other.

**Implications**

The mandates of NCLB have caused school administrators to feel the pressure of increasing school improvement. Research has stressed the importance of having effective leaders who can move schools forward (DuFour & Fullan, 2013; Parkay, Haas, & Anctill,
Principals are expected to exhibit leadership style flexibility to accommodate a variety of daily situations that they may face in schools. Aside from focusing on leadership style flexibility, principals must also maintain a focus on the impact that their leadership styles may have on teachers and other stakeholders. The findings in this study may help to highlight the importance of aligning leader and follower perceptions in an effort to impact school performance. Although the findings from this study indicated that principals' leadership styles alone were not enough to impact school performance, principals are still responsible for establishing a conducive school environment by setting high instructional goals for all students. Making adequate yearly progress is the bottom line of school accountability. As demonstrated in this study, when principals.

Research suggested that flexibility in leadership styles could lead to school improvement and increased performance through higher test scores (Hess & Kelly, 2007). Limited research has validated the use of one leadership style over another with regards to increasing school performance (Leithwood & Mascall, 2008); however, principals are becoming more aware of how situational leadership may be used to produce the most desirable results for their schools (Blanchard, Zigarmi, & Zigarmi, 1985). Principals must continue to find creative and resourceful ways to meet the needs of the students in their schools. Students enter school with various learning styles and abilities, and as the instructional leaders, principals should accept those challenges and strive to find ways to bridge the academic gaps between students through their leadership styles when working with other school stakeholders (Haycock, 2006).

Additionally, research has shown that principals and other school administrators who set high goals for their schools and maintain an instructional focus on a daily basis
(Hoy & Hoy, 2009) may find that the teachers are more likely to remain committed to focusing on overall school improvement (Ing, 2009; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Principals are also the main individuals who establish the school climate (Gronn, 2008; Nor & Roslan, 2009), and a positive school climate has been associated with higher student achievement (Birden, 1992; Zigarmi, Edelburn, & Blanchard, 1993).

While research highlighted the indirect role that principals have on student achievement (Beteille, Kallogrides, & Loeb, 2009; Jacob, 2010; Louis et al., 2010), teachers are viewed as the ones who have the most direct effect on students’ classroom performance (DiPaola & Hoy, 2008; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Ing, 2009; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Effective teachers build professional relationships with the principals to maintain a student-centered learning environment (Knapp, Copland, Plecki, & Portin, 2006; Rutledge, Harris, & Ingle, 2010), and they are willing to provide rigorous instruction to students regardless of actual or perceived challenges (Center for Public Education, 2009).

As principals realize the importance of including teachers in decisions that affect the school, principals are more available to make frequent observations to understand the kind of instruction that is taking place in the classroom (DiPaola & Hoy, 2008; Ing, 2009; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Through constructive feedback provided from frequent observations, teachers may feel supported by their principals and encouraged to work towards overall school improvement (Sawchuk, 2011). Although some principals may not feel the need to include teachers in such decisions, research has shown that schools that encourage teachers to share in decision making have experienced

There is no doubt that effective teachers are an asset to any school, and principals recognize those teachers and try to find ways to retain them through working collaboratively to set high goals for the school, maintaining positive reciprocal relationships, while recognizing the importance of the teaching and learning environment (Knapp, Copland, Plecki, & Portin, 2006; Rutledge, Harris, & Ingle, 2010). Through quality teaching, principals are able to maintain schools that keep students as their main focus. With overall school improvement being the focus of a school, principals realize the importance of building and maintaining professional relationships with the stakeholders who may have the greatest impact on student learning (Fullan, 2007; Printy, 2010).

**Recommendations for Further Research**

The present study examined principals’ leadership styles as they related to school performance. The researcher has identified several recommendations that may strengthen future research.

Consideration should be given to using an additional instrument, such as a school climate inventory, to investigate other contributing factors that could be related to school performance. One such instrument may be the Organizational Climate Index that measures principal leadership, teacher professionalism, student performance, and community influence. Using such an instrument may give a better perspective of the principal’s leadership style, in conjunction with other factors that may affect school performance. Another instrument such as the Comprehensive School Climate Inventory
focuses on areas of school safety, relationship building, teaching and learning, and the school environment. The benefit of using this inventory is that it may reveal areas of strengths and weaknesses, with regards to the school and the faculty. The principal in turn, could take the results of this inventory to determine best practices that may be used to improve principals’ school behaviors in order to affect overall school performance.

It is possible that the use of a qualitative or mixed-methods study may have provided more significant results through adding the perceptions of the participants through the use of open-ended questions or interviews. Consideration may be given to surveying students to have a well-rounded view of their perceptions of principals’ leadership styles. Since students are the ones who actually take the standardized tests that yield a school performance score, soliciting their input could lead the principals to set more rigorous instructional goals for the school.

While the researcher expected to find a connection between principals’ leadership styles and school performance, the results showed otherwise. The findings could suggest that although principals’ are expected to be the instructional leaders for the schools, their influence on the learning environment did not make an impact on teachers’ classroom performance. The findings could indicate further that the principals did not exhibit leadership style flexibility and may have relied on a preferred leadership style.

Principals are the ones who demonstrate instructional leadership for the faculty, staff, and students to follow. They are responsible for maintaining a conducive learning environment where all students have an opportunity to be successful. While effective principals know how to use a variety of leadership styles to adjust to different school situations, less experienced principals may find themselves ill-equipped for some of the
ongoing academic challenges of the students. One such challenge may be the demographics of a school, such as the race and socioeconomic status of students, which are beyond the control of the principal or the school district. In some instances, less experienced principals are finding themselves at the forefront of schools that have high poverty and low achievement. Though the Coleman Report viewed socioeconomic background was as a predictor of student success, effective principals, through building professional relationships with stakeholders, find means of providing academic opportunities to meet the needs of their students.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine principals’ leadership styles as they related to overall school performance. The researcher also considered teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ leadership styles and the relationship to school performance. The present study revealed no differences between self-reported and perceived leadership style flexibility and effectiveness and school performance, nor did the study reveal any significant relationship between these variables.

NCLB (2002) and accountability have changed the role of principals from managers to instructional leaders in charge of evaluating the teaching and learning process who are expected to move their schools forward (DuFour & Fullan, 2013; Parkay, Haas, & Ancill, 2010). NCLB (2002) has also provided guidelines for states to follow to ensure that all students have access to an appropriate education. Politicians, educators, and other stakeholders share in this growing concern, and they are interested in helping to better educate students for the future (Grossman, Reyna, & Shipton, 2011). Effective principals are capable of securing the necessary resources to advance their
schools academically (Hall & Hord, 2006; Coelli & Green, 2012). Research studies continued to support principals' indirect impact on school performance (Jacob, 2010; Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Louis et al., 2010), yet limited research existed on principals' leadership styles and their relationship to school performance. The information acquired via this study may serve as a reference for ways that principals and other school leaders may achieve overall school improvement through maintaining an awareness of how their leadership style flexibility and effectiveness may affect the teachers' classroom performance. Principals should continually seek ways to improve their schools. As the demands of education continue, principals must remain focused on ways to continually improve themselves as leaders. Although alignment of leader and follower perceptions is important, principals should encourage feedback from their teachers on ways to not only improve the school, but also on ways to become a more effective leader. As principals receive feedback from their teachers, they should, in turn, utilize the feedback to focus more on what goes on inside the classrooms. Through maintaining an awareness of the teachers' classroom performance, principals can foster meaningful relationships with the teachers, which in turn, can further impact instruction (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). Those positive relationships could also help to instill a desire for students to take ownership for their academic success (Hulpia, Devos, & Rosseel, 2009). As a result of teachers' improved classroom performance, students may achieve increased academic success. Key to achieving academic success is the belief from the teachers that all children are capable of learning. Although the education of all children may appear to be a daunting task, it is imperative that educators continue to work collaboratively in an
effort to leave no child behind. The array of challenges that face education are never
ending and continue to challenge today’s educational leaders, yet further study into ways
to offset those challenges may lead to further understanding of how principals’ leadership
styles may play a role in improving school performance.
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HUMAN USE COMMITTEE FORMS
STUDY/PROJECT INFORMATION FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE

TITLE:
How Principals’ Leadership Styles Affect School Performance

PROJECT DIRECTOR(S):
Doris A. Lewis
Dr. Kimberly Kimbell-Lopez

EMAIL:
dan009@latech.edu
kklopez@latech.edu

PHONE:
Dr. Kimbell-Lopez—318-257-2982
Doris A. Lewis—318-278-0227 or 318-251-2654

DEPARTMENT(S): Curriculum and Instruction

PURPOSE OF STUDY/PROJECT:
The major purpose of this study will be to determine if a relationship exists between the principal’s leadership style and student achievement as measured on standardized tests.

SUBJECTS:
Principals and third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers from elementary schools in Bienville, Jackson, Lincoln, Ouachita, including Monroe City Schools, Richland, Tensas, and Union Parishes.

PROCEDURE:
Principals and third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers in the 49 selected elementary schools will be asked to participate in the study.

NOTE: Permission to collect data will be requested through the aforementioned School Board Offices and the principals and teachers of the selected schools. Student permission will not be needed for this study since School Report Cards of the District’s and individual School Performance Scores are publicly available via the Louisiana Believes website (http://www.louisianabelieves.com).

INSTRUMENTS AND MEASURES TO INSURE PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY, ANONYMITY:
Instruments to be used to collect the data for this study will be (a) Leader Behavior Analysis II Self Questionnaire for principals, (b) Leader Behavior Analysis II Other Questionnaire for teachers, (c) School Performance Scores, and (d) demographic
information from principals and teachers. Participants’ names will not be used on any responses published with the results of the study.

RISKS/ALTERNATIVE TREATMENTS:
There are no risks associated with participation in this study.

BENEFITS/COMPENSATION:
None

SAFEGUARDS OF PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL WELL-BEING:
Data will not be collected until permission has been granted from the Human Use Committee of Louisiana Tech University. Individuals will be given the opportunity to ask questions of the researcher and the project director. Participation is voluntary. Participants may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. All information collected from the surveys will be held strictly confidential.
HUMAN SUBJECTS CONSENT FORM

The following is a brief summary of the project in which you are asked to participate. Please read this information before signing the statement below.

TITLE OF PROJECT:
How Principals’ Leadership Styles Affect School Performance

PURPOSE OF STUDY/PROJECT:
The major purpose of this study will be to determine if a relationship exists between the principal’s leadership style and student achievement as measured on standardized tests.

PROCEDURE:
Principals and third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers in the 49 selected elementary schools will be asked to participate in the study.

NOTE: Permission to collect data will be requested through the aforementioned School Board Offices and the principals and teachers of the selected schools. Student permission will not be needed for this study since School Report Cards of the District's and individual School Performance Scores are publicly available via the Louisiana Believes website (http://www.louisianabelieves.com).

INSTRUMENTS:
Instruments to be used to collect the data for this study will be (a) Leader Behavior Analysis II Self Questionnaire for principals, (b) Leader Behavior Analysis II Other Questionnaire for teachers, (c) School Performance Scores, and (d) demographic information from principals and teachers. Participants’ names will not be used on any responses published with the results of the study.

RISKS/ALTERNATIVE TREATMENTS:
There are no risks associated with participation in this study.

BENEFITS/COMPENSATION:
None
I, ____________________, attest with my signature that I have read and understood the following description of the study, "How Principals' Leadership Styles Affect School Performance", and its purposes and methods. I understand that my participation in this research is strictly voluntary and my participation or refusal to participate in this study will not affect my relationship with Louisiana Tech University or my grades in any way. Further, I understand that I may withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any questions without penalty. Upon completion of the study, I understand that the results will be freely available to me upon request. I understand that the results of my survey will be confidential, accessible only to the principal investigators, myself, or a legally appointed representative. I have not been requested to waive nor do I waive any of my rights related to participating in this study.

Signature of Participant __________________________ Date __________

CONTACT INFORMATION:
The principal experimenters listed below may be reached to answer questions about the research, subjects' rights, or related matters.

Doris A. Lewis—dan009@latech.edu 318-278-0227 or 318-251-2654
Dr. Kimbell-Lopez—kklopez@latech.edu 318-257-2982

Members of the Human Use Committee of Louisiana Tech University may also be contacted if a problem cannot be discussed with the experimenters:

Dr. Stan Napper (257-3056)
Dr. Mary M. Livingston (257-5066)
TO: Ms. Doris Lewis and Dr. Kimberly Kimbell-Lopez
FROM: Dr. Stan Napper, V.P. Research & Development
SUBJECT: Human Use Committee Review
DATE: May 9, 2014
RE: Approved Continuation of Study HUC 698
TITLE: “How Principals’ Leadership Styles Affect School Performance”

HUC-698*

The above referenced study has been approved as of May 9, 2014 as a continuation of the original study that received approval on May 10, 2010. This project will need to receive a continuation review by the IRB if the project, including collecting or analyzing data, continues beyond May 9, 2015. Any discrepancies in procedure or changes that have been made including approved changes should be noted in the review application. Projects involving NIH funds require annual education training to be documented. For more information regarding this, contact the Office of University Research.

You are requested to maintain written records of your procedures, data collected, and subjects involved. These records will need to be available upon request during the conduct of the study and retained by the university for three years after the conclusion of the study. If changes occur in recruiting of subjects, informed consent process or in your research protocol, or if unanticipated problems should arise it is the Researchers responsibility to notify the Office of Research or IRB in writing. The project should be discontinued until modifications can be reviewed and approved.

If you have any questions, please contact Dr. Mary Livingston at 257-5066.

*NOTE: Signed permission from the superintendents in Bienville, Jackson, Lincoln, Ouachita, Union, Richland and Tensas Parishes must be on file in University Research before data collection can begin.
Permission from the Superintendent

Dear Colleague,

I am requesting permission to collect data from your school district’s third, fourth, and fifth grade principals and teachers. Your signature is separate from the signature that must be obtained from the principals and teachers who wish to participate in the study. Information pertaining to the study is listed below.
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**PROJECT DIRECTOR(S):**
Doris A. Lewis  
Dr. Kimberly Kimbell-Lopez

**EMAIL:**
dan009@latech.edu  
kklopez@latech.edu

**PHONE:**
Doris A. Lewis—318-278-0227 or 318-251-2654  
Dr. Kimbell-Lopez—318-257-2982

**DEPARTMENT(S):** Curriculum and Instruction

**PURPOSE OF STUDY/PROJECT:**
The major purpose of this study will be to determine if a relationship exists between the principal’s leadership style and student achievement as measured on standardized tests.

**PROCEDURE:**
Principals and third, fourth, and fifth grade teachers in the 49 selected elementary schools will be asked to participate in the study.

**NOTE:** Permission to collect data will be requested through the aforementioned School Board Offices and principals and teachers of the selected schools. Student permission will not be needed for this study since School Report Cards of the District’s and individual School Performance Scores are publicly available via the Louisiana Department of Education’s website (http://www.louisianabelieves.com).

**INSTRUMENTS:**
Instruments to be used to collect the data for this study will be (a) Leader Behavior Analysis II Self Questionnaire for principals, (b) Leader Behavior Analysis II Other Questionnaire for teachers, (c) School Performance Scores, and (d) demographic information from principals and teachers. Participants’ names will not be used on any responses published with the results of the study.
RISKS/ALTERNATIVE TREATMENTS:
There are no risks associated with participation in this study.

BENEFITS/COMPENSATION:
None

I, ____________________, attest with my signature that I have read and understood the following description of the study, "How Principals’ Leadership Styles Affect School Performance", and its purposes and methods. I understand that my participation in this research is strictly voluntary and my participation or refusal to participate in this study will not affect my relationship with Louisiana Tech University or my grades in any way. Further, I understand that I may withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any questions without penalty. Upon completion of the study, I understand that the results will be freely available to me upon request. I understand that the results of my survey will be confidential, accessible only to the principal investigators, myself, or a legally appointed representative. I have not been requested to waive nor do I waive any of my rights related to participating in this study.

Signature of Superintendent Date

CONTACT INFORMATION:
The principal experimenters listed below may be reached to answer questions about the research, subjects' rights, or related matters.

Doris A. Lewis—dan009@latech.edu 318-278-0227 or 318-251-2654
Dr. Kimbell-Lopez—kklopez@latech.edu 318-257-2982

Members of the Human Use Committee of Louisiana Tech University may also be contacted if a problem cannot be discussed with the experimenters:
    Dr. Stan Napper (257-3056)
Dr. Mary M. Livingston (257-5066)
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LETTER TO PRINCIPALS
Letter to Principals

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction at Louisiana Tech University. I am conducting research to determine what factors may be related to school performance and I am requesting your assistance. The title of my dissertation is *How Principals’ Leadership Styles Affect School Performance*. My study involves collecting data from principals and third through fifth grade teachers.

Participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. There are no risks associated with participation in this study. All information collected from schools and school districts will remain confidential. You are being asked to complete and sign the informed consent, complete the demographic information, then complete the questionnaire which will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Once you complete the questionnaire, please place all sheets back in the envelope, seal it, and sign your name across the sealed envelope and return it to the office.

Your participation will be greatly appreciated. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Doris A. Lewis
dan009@latech.edu
(318) 278-0227
APPENDIX E

LETTER TO TEACHERS
Letter to Teachers

Dear Participant,

I am a doctoral student in Curriculum and Instruction at Louisiana Tech University. I am conducting research to determine what factors may be related to school performance and I am requesting your assistance. The title of my dissertation is *How Principals’ Leadership Styles Affect School Performance*. My study involves collecting data from principals and third through fifth grade teachers.

Participation is voluntary, and you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. There are no risks associated with participation in this study. All information collected from schools and school districts will remain confidential. You are being asked to complete and sign the informed consent, complete the demographic information, then complete the questionnaire which will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. Please fill out the questionnaire with your leader (your principal) in mind. Once you have completed the questionnaire, please place all sheets back in the envelope, seal it, and sign your name across the sealed envelope and return it to the office.

Your participation will be greatly appreciated. Please contact me if you have any questions.

Doris A. Lewis
dan009@latech.edu
(318) 278-0227
APPENDIX F

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS II SELF
Leadership Behavior Analysis II Self
(Principal Questionnaire)*

*This instrument was used with permission by Dr. Drea Zigarmi C/O The Ken Blanchard Companies located at 125 State Place, Escondido, CA 92029 USA.
LBAII* Self Questionnaire

The LBAII* provides feedback on self and others' perceptions of your leadership style.

DIRECTIONS

This questionnaire consists of 20 typical work situations involving a leader and one or more direct reports.

Assume you are the leader. Circle the one response (A, B, C, or D) that best describes the action you would take in each situation.
1. You have asked a new employee to write a proposal to buy new equipment for the division. She needs to learn more about this equipment to make a sound decision about options and costs. She feels this assignment will stretch her already-full schedule. You would ...

A. Tell her when you want the proposal and explain what you want in the proposal. Outline the steps she should take to become knowledgeable about the new equipment. Set daily meetings with her to track progress.

B. Ask her to produce the proposal and discuss its importance. Ask her to set a deadline for completion. Give her the resources she needs. Ask her to provide periodic progress reports.

C. Tell her when you want the proposal and discuss its importance. Explain what you want in the report. Outline steps she should take to learn more about the equipment. Listen to her concerns and use her ideas when possible. Set weekly meetings to track her progress.

D. Ask her to produce the proposal and discuss its importance. Explore the barriers she foresees and strategies for removing them. Ask her to set a deadline for completion and periodically check with her to track progress.

2. Your task force has been working hard to complete its division-wide report. A new member has joined the group. He must present cost figures at the end of next week, but he knows nothing about the report requirements and format. He is eager to learn more about his role in the group. You would ...

A. Tell him exactly what is needed. Specify the requirements and format. Introduce him to other task force members. Check with him frequently during the week to monitor progress and to specify corrections.

B. Ask him if there is anything you can do to help. Introduce him to other task force members. Explore his ideas for “getting up to speed” on the report. Check with him during the week to see how he is doing.

C. Specify the report format and required information and solicit his ideas. Introduce him to each task force member. Check with him frequently during the week to see how the report is progressing and to help with any modifications.

D. Welcome him and introduce him to members of the task force who could help him. Ask him to check back if he has any problems.
3. You have recently noticed a performance problem with one of your people. He demonstrates an “I don’t care” attitude. Only your constant prodding has brought about task completion. You suspect he may not have enough expertise to complete the high-priority task you have given to him. You would …

A. Specify the steps he needs to take and the outcomes you want. Clarify timelines and paperwork requirements. Frequently check to see if the task is progressing as it should.

B. Specify the steps he needs to take and the outcomes you want. Ask for his ideas and incorporate them if appropriate. Ask him to share his feelings about the assignment. Check to see that the task is progressing as it should.

C. Involve him in problem solving for this task. Offer your help and encourage him to use his ideas to complete the project. Ask him to share his feelings about the assignment. Periodically check in to see how things are going.

D. Let him know how important this task is. Ask him to outline his plan for completion and to send you a copy. Ask him to check back if he has any problems.

4. Your work group’s composition has changed because of company restructuring. Performance levels have dropped. Deadlines are being missed and your boss is concerned. Group members want to improve their performance but need more knowledge and skills. You would …

A. Ask them to identify their training needs and develop their own plan for improving performance. Give them the necessary resources. Be available to help them and ask to be kept informed.

B. Discuss your plan to solve the performance problem. Ask for their input and include their ideas in your plan if possible. Explain your rationale. Frequently check to see how the plan is carried out.

C. Outline the steps you want them to follow to solve the performance problem. Be specific about the time requirements and the skills you want them to learn. Closely monitor their progress on the plan.

D. Help them develop a plan to improve performance. Encourage them to be creative. Support their plan and periodically check performance.
Because of budget cuts, it is necessary to consolidate. You have asked a highly experienced department member to take charge of the consolidation. This person has worked in all areas of your department. In the past she has usually been eager to help. While you feel she is able to perform the assignment, she seems indifferent to the task. You would ...  

A  Reassure her. Outline the steps she should use to manage this project. Ask for her ideas and incorporate them when possible, but make sure she follows your general approach. Frequently check to see how things are going.

B  Reassure her. Ask her to handle the project as she sees fit. Be patient and available to help. Ask for frequent updates.

C  Reassure her. Ask her to determine the best way to approach the project. Help her develop options and encourage her to use her own ideas. Agree on frequent checkpoints.

D  Reassure her. Outline an overall plan and specify the steps you want her to follow. Frequently check to see how the steps are being implemented.

For the second time in a month, you are having a problem with one of your employees. His weekly progress reports have been incomplete and late. In the past year he has completed his reports accurately and submitted them on time. This is the first time you have spoken to him about this problem. You would ...  

A  Tell him to improve the quality and timeliness of his paperwork. Go over the areas that are incomplete. Make sure he knows what is expected and how to fill out each section of the report. Continue to track his performance.

B  Ask him to turn in reports that are complete and on time, without pushing him. Continue to track his performance.

C  Discuss time and completion standards with him. Listen to his concerns but make sure he knows what is expected. Go over each section of the report and answer any questions. Use his ideas if possible. Continue to track his performance.

D  Ask him why his reports are incomplete. Listen to his concerns and do what you can to help him understand the importance of timely and accurate reports. Continue to track his performance.
7. You have asked one of your senior employees to take on a new project. In the past his performance has been outstanding. The project you have given him is important to the future of your work group. He is excited about the new assignment but doesn't know where to begin because he lacks project information. You would ...

A. Explain why you think he has the skills to do the job. Ask him what problems he anticipates and help him explore alternative solutions. Frequently stay in touch to support him.

B. Specify how he should handle the project. Define the activities necessary to complete the job. Closely monitor how things are going.

C. Ask him to develop a project plan for your approval within two weeks. Give him enough time to get started. Periodically offer support.

D. Outline how the project should be handled and solicit his ideas and suggestions. Incorporate his ideas when possible, but make sure your general outline is followed. Regularly check to see how things are going.

8. One of your staff members is feeling insecure about a job you have assigned to him. He is highly competent and you know that he has the skills to successfully complete the task. The deadline for completion is near. You would ...

A. Let him know your concerns about the impending deadline. Help him explore alternative action steps and encourage him to use his own ideas. Periodically check with him to lend support.

B. Discuss your concerns about the impending deadline. Develop an action plan for him to follow and get his reactions. Include his modifications if possible, but make sure he follows your general outline. Regularly check with him to see how things are going.

C. Outline the steps you want him to follow. Specify the reasons for completing the assignment on time. Closely monitor his progress.

D. Ask him if there are any problems but let him resolve the issue himself. Without pushing him, remind him of the impending deadline. Ask him to get back with an update.
9 Your staff has asked you to consider changes in their work schedule due to an expansion in the customer base. Their changes make good sense to you. Members are very competent and work well together. You would ...

A Help them explore alternative scheduling possibilities. Be available to facilitate their group discussion. Support the plan they develop. Check to see how they implement their schedule.

B Design the work schedule yourself. Explain the rationale behind your design. Listen to their reactions, ask for their ideas, and use their recommendations when possible. Check to see that the schedule is being followed.

C Allow the staff to set a work schedule on their own. Let them implement their plan after you approve it. Check back at a later date to make sure the new schedule is working out for them.

D Design the work schedule yourself. Explain how the schedule will work and answer any questions. Frequently check to see that the schedule is being followed.

10 Due to an organizational change, you have been assigned six new people whose performance has been declining over the past three months. They do not seem to have the task knowledge and skills to do their new jobs, and their attitudes have worsened because of the change. In a group meeting, you would ...

A Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Ask them to decide what to do about it and set a deadline for implementing their solution. Check on their progress at some point.

B Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Specify the action steps you want them to follow. Give them constructive feedback on how to improve performance. Closely monitor their progress.

C Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Outline the steps you want them to follow, explain why, and seek their feedback. Use their ideas when possible, but make sure they follow your general approach. Regularly monitor their progress.

D Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Ask them why their performance is declining. Listen to their concerns and ideas. Help them create their own plan for improving performance. Periodically check on their progress.
11. A member of your department has had a fine performance record over the last 22 months. He is excited by the challenges of the upcoming year. Budgets and unit goals have not changed much from last year. In a meeting with him to discuss goals and an action plan for next year, you would ...

A. Ask him to submit an outline of his goals and an action plan for your approval. Tell him you will call him if you have any questions.
B. Prepare a list of goals and an action plan that you think he can accomplish next year. Send it to him and meet with him to see if he has any questions.
C. Prepare a list of goals and an action plan that you think he can achieve next year. Meet with him to discuss his reactions and suggestions. Modify the plan as you listen to his ideas but make the final decisions.
D. Ask him to send you an outline of his goals and an action plan for next year. Review the goals and plan with him. Listen to his ideas and help him explore alternatives. Let him make the final decisions on his goals and plan.

12. Your unit members have an excellent performance record over the past two years. However, they have recently experienced three major setbacks due to factors beyond their control. Their performance and morale have drastically dropped and your boss is concerned. In a group meeting, you would ...

A. Discuss the recent setbacks. Give unit members the specific steps you want them to follow to improve their performance. Closely monitor performance.
B. Ask them how they feel about the recent setbacks. Listen to their concerns and encourage and help them explore their ideas for improving performance. Periodically check on performance.
C. Discuss the recent setbacks. Clarify the steps you want unit members to take to improve performance. Listen to their ideas and incorporate them if possible. Emphasize results. Encourage them to keep trying. Frequently check their performance.
D. Discuss the recent setbacks without pressuring unit members. Ask them to set a deadline to improve performance and to support each other along the way. Continue to track performance.
13 You were recently assigned a new employee who will perform an important job in your unit. Even though she is inexperienced, she is enthusiastic and feels she has the confidence to do the job. You would ...

A Allow her time to determine what the job requires and how to do it. Let her know why the job is important. Ask her to contact you if she needs help. Track her performance.

B Specify the results you want and when you want them. Clearly define the steps she should take to achieve results. Show her how to do the job. Closely monitor her progress.

C Discuss the results you want and when you want them. Clearly define the steps she can take to achieve results. Explain why these steps are necessary and get her ideas. Use her ideas if possible, but make sure your general plan is followed. Frequently check her progress.

D Ask her how she plans to tackle this job. Help her explore the problems she anticipates by generating possible solutions. Encourage her to carry out her plan. Be available to listen to her concerns. Periodically check on her progress.

14 Your boss has asked you to increase your unit’s output by seven percent. You know this can be done, but it will require your active involvement. To free your time, you must reassign the task of developing a new cost control system to one of your employees. The person you want has had considerable experience with cost control systems, but she is slightly unsure of doing this task on her own. You would ...

A Assign her the task and listen to her concerns. Explain why you think she has the skills to handle this assignment. Help her explore alternative approaches if she thinks it would be useful. Encourage and support her by providing needed resources. Periodically monitor her progress.

B Assign her the task and listen to her concerns. Discuss the steps to complete the task. Ask for her ideas and suggestions. After incorporating her ideas if possible, make sure she follows your general approach. Frequently monitor her progress.

C Assign her the task. Listen to her concerns but let her resolve the issue. Give her time to adjust, and avoid asking for results right away. Ask her to check in frequently.

D Assign her the task. Listen to her concerns and minimize her feelings of insecurity by telling her specifically how to handle this task. Outline the steps to be taken. Closely monitor her progress.
Your boss has asked you to assign someone to serve on a company-wide task force. This task force will make recommendations for restructuring the company's compensation plan. You have chosen a highly productive employee who knows how her coworkers feel about the existing compensation plan. She has successfully led another unit task force. She wants the assignment. You would ...

A. Give her the assignment but tell her how she should present her coworkers' point of view. Specify that she turn in a progress report within two days of each task force meeting.

B. Ask her to accept the assignment. Help her develop the point of view she will take on the task force. Periodically check with her.

C. Give her the assignment. Discuss what she should do to ensure that her coworkers' perspective is considered by the task force. Ask for her ideas, but make sure she follows your general approach. Ask her for a report after every task force meeting.

D. Give her the assignment. Ask her to give you updates as things progress.

Due to illness in your family, you have been forced to miss two meetings of a committee under your direction. Upon attending the next meeting, you find that the committee is operating well and making progress toward completing its goals. All group members come prepared, actively participate, and seem to be enthusiastic about their progress. You are unsure of what your role should be. You would ...

A. Thank the committee members for their work so far. Let the group continue to work as it has during the last two meetings.

B. Thank the committee members for their work so far. Set the agenda for the next meeting. Begin to direct the group's activities.

C. Thank the committee members for their work so far. Try to solicit alternative ideas and suggestions. Do what you can to make the members feel important and involved.

D. Thank the committee members for their work so far. Set the agenda for the next meeting but make sure to solicit their ideas and suggestions.
17 Your staff is very competent and works well on their own. Their enthusiasm is high because of a recent success. Their performance as a group is outstanding. Now, you must set unit goals for next year. In a group meeting, you would ...  

A Praise them for last year's results. Involve the group in problem solving and goal setting for next year. Encourage them to be creative and help them explore alternatives.  

B Praise them for last year's results. Challenge them by setting the goals for next year. Outline the action steps necessary to accomplish these goals.  

C Praise them for last year's results. Ask them to set the goals for next year and to define their action plan to accomplish these goals. Be available to contribute when asked.  

D Praise them for last year's results. Set the goals for next year and outline the action steps necessary to accomplish these goals. Solicit the group's ideas and suggestions and incorporate them if possible.

18 You and your boss know that your department needs a new set of work procedures to improve long-term performance. Department members are eager to make some changes; but because of their specialized functions, they lack the knowledge and skills for understanding the "big picture." You would ...  

A Outline the new procedures and your plan for implementation. Involve the group in a discussion of alternatives. Use their suggestions when possible, but make them follow your general approach. Frequently check on the use of the new procedures and monitor their results.  

B Outline and demonstrate the new procedures. Instruct the group on the initial use of the procedures and closely monitor results.  

C Involve the group in a discussion to explore new work procedures. Encourage their initiative and creativity in developing the new procedures. Help them examine possible alternatives. Periodically check on the use of the new procedures and monitor their performance.  

D Ask the group to formulate and implement a set of new procedures. Answer any informational concerns but give department members the responsibility for the task. Periodically monitor their performance.
19 You were recently appointed head of your division. Since taking over, you have noticed a drop in performance. There have been changes in technology, and your staff has not mastered the new skills and techniques. Worst of all, they do not seem to be motivated to learn these skills. In a group meeting, you would...

A Discuss the staff's drop in performance. Listen to their concerns. Ask for their solutions for improving performance. Express your faith in their strategies. Emphasize their past efforts but periodically check on performance as they carry out their strategies.

B Outline the necessary corrective actions you want them to take. Explore alternatives and incorporate their ideas. Modify the plan if appropriate but see that they implement it. Frequently check on their performance.

C Tell them about the drop in performance. Ask them to analyze the problem and draft a set of action steps for your approval. Set a deadline for the plan. Track their performance.

D Outline and direct the necessary corrective actions you want them to take. Define roles, responsibilities, and standards. Closely monitor their performance for improvement.

20 You have noticed that one of your inexperienced employees is not properly completing certain reports. These reports are inaccurate and incomplete. She is not enthusiastic about this task and often thinks paperwork is a waste of time. You would...

A Let her know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Discuss the steps she should take and clarify why these steps are important. Ask for her suggestions but make sure she follows your general outline. Frequently check her paperwork.

B Let her know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Ask her to come up with a plan to improve their quality. Give her more time to do the job properly. Check her paperwork.

C Let her know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Ask her what she plans to do about it. Help her develop a plan for solving her problems. Periodically check her paperwork.

D Let her know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Show her how to complete the reports. Specify the steps she should take to improve their quality. Closely monitor her paperwork.
Determining Style Flexibility

1. Circle the letter that matches your response for each of the 20 situations on the LABI® Self.
2. Add up the circled letters in the S1, S2, S3, and S4 columns and record the sums in the Totals boxes at the bottom of the grid.
3. Subtract 5 from the S1, S2, S3, and S4 column totals and record the difference in the shaded boxes at the bottom of the grid. Disregard the plus or minus sign. Example: If the total of the S2 column is 2, 2 subtracted from 5 is 3. Record a 3 in the shaded box below the S2 column.
4. Add the four numbers in the shaded boxes and record the sum in the Subtotal box.
5. Subtract the subtotal from 30 and record this number in the Style Flexibility Score box.

Identifying Leadership Styles

Primary Leadership Style
Record the highest total from the Style Flexibility Grid in the appropriate circle on the matrix.

Example: If the highest total is 8 in the S3 column, record an 8 in the S3 circle. (If you have a tie for your primary style, record the totals in the appropriate circles.)

Secondary Leadership Style
Record totals of 4 or more, other than your primary style, in the appropriate triangle(s) on the matrix.

Developing Leadership Style
Record totals of 3 or less in the appropriate square(s) on the matrix.
Determining Style Effectiveness

DIRECTIONS

1. Transfer your answers from the Style Flexibility Grid by circling the matching letter in each of the 20 situations.
2. Add up the circled letters in the P, F, G, and E columns and record the sums in the Totals boxes at the bottom of the grid.
3. Multiply each total in the P, F, G, and E columns by the number directly below it and record the results in the shaded boxes at the bottom of the grid.
4. Add the four numbers in the shaded boxes and record the sum in the Style Effectiveness Score box.

INTERPRETATION

Style Flexibility Scores

Style flexibility scores range from 0-30. The mean score is 17.
Below 14—Low Flexibility (You tended to select the same one or two styles for every situation.)*
Above 20—High Flexibility (You tended to select all four styles more or less equally.)*

Style Effectiveness Scores

To score high on style effectiveness, you must not only show a high level of flexibility in style selection, but you must also choose the most appropriate leadership style for the situation. The totals at the bottom of the style effectiveness columns indicate how often you chose a poor, fair, good, or excellent answer.
Style effectiveness scores range from 20-80. The mean score is 54.
Below 50—Low Effectiveness (You selected more fair and poor leadership style choices.*)
Above 58—High Effectiveness (You selected more good and excellent leadership style choices.*)

* ... compared to others taking this assessment. Norms fall between the low and high scores.
Scoring

Improving Style Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTIONS</th>
<th>INTERPRETATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style Effectiveness Grid</td>
<td>Four or more fair and poor answers in one style indicate that you may not be diagnosing development level before choosing a leadership style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number in subscript next to each letter in the P and F columns indicates the leadership style of that response.</td>
<td>Review the situations on your LBAl! Self to determine why you may be using those styles inappropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style Effectiveness Grid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style Diagnosis Matrix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Add the number of times you selected a fair and poor response for Style 1 and record the total in the ST quadrant on the matrix.

2. Repeat this process for Style 2, Style 3, and Style 4.
Doris, here is a PDF of the LBAII self and scoring. I am not sure what from you wanted. Are you putting it on line or are doing the survey through the mail? If it is going to be mailed you may duplicate this PDF. Please advise what your needs are. Warmly, Drea

-----Original Message-----
From: Doris Ann Lewis [mailto:dan009@LaTech.edu]
Sent: Thursday, February 20, 2014 4:59 PM
To: drea.zigarmi@mindspring.com
Subject: LBAII instrument

Hi Dr. Drea,
I was checking to see when the instrument would be mailed for use in my dissertation. I mailed the appropriate signatures back, and someone from your office (K. McDeritt) signed for it on 1/13/14.

I am waiting to hear back from you.
Again, thank you for allowing me to use this instrument for my dissertation.

Doris Lewis

This message was sent using IMP, the Internet Messaging Program.
Here you go Doris. Sorry this took so long. Warmly, Drea

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

LBAII Other Hand.pdf

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.
APPENDIX G

LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS II OTHER
Leadership Behavior Analysis II Other

(Teacher Questionnaire)*

*This instrument was used with permission by Dr. Drea Zigarmi C/O The Ken Blanchard Companies located at 125 State Place, Escondido, CA 92029 USA.
Leader Behavior Analysis II

Questionnaire

Leader Name:
Organization Name:

My relationship to this leader:
⊙ Direct Report  ⊙ Peer  ⊙ Boss

Date:

KEN BLANCHARD
RONALD HAMBLETON
DREA ZIGARMI
DOUGLAS FORSYTH
Other

LBAII' Other Questionnaire

The LBAII provides feedback on self and others' perceptions of the participant's leadership style.

DIRECTIONS

This questionnaire consists of 20 typical work situations involving a leader and one or more direct reports.

Assume the person named on the cover is the leader. Circle the one response (A, B, C, or D) that best describes the action he or she would take in each situation.

A
Other

1 A new employee has been asked to write a proposal to buy new equipment for the division. She needs to learn more about this equipment to make a sound decision about options and costs. She feels this assignment will stretch her already-full schedule. This manager would ...

A Tell her when the proposal is needed and explain what should be included. Outline the steps the employee should take to become knowledgeable about the new equipment. Set daily meetings with her to track progress.

B Ask her to produce the proposal and discuss its importance. Ask her to set a deadline for completion. Give her the resources she needs. Ask her to provide periodic progress reports.

C Tell her when the proposal is needed and discuss its importance. Explain what the report should include. Outline steps the employee should take to learn more about the equipment. Listen to her concerns and use her ideas when possible. Set weekly meetings to track her progress.

D Ask her to produce the proposal and discuss its importance. Explore the barriers the employee foresees and strategies for removing them. Ask her to set a deadline for completion and periodically check with her to track progress.

2 This manager’s task force has been working hard to complete its division-wide report. A new member has joined the group. He must present cost figures at the end of next week, but he knows nothing about the report requirements and format. He is eager to learn more about his role in the group. This manager would ...

A Tell him exactly what is needed. Specify the requirements and format. Introduce him to other task force members. Check with him frequently during the week to monitor his progress and to specify corrections.

B Ask him if there is anything he or she can do to help. Introduce him to other task force members. Explore his ideas for “getting up to speed” on the report. Check with him during the week to see how he is doing.

C Specify the report format and required information and solicit his ideas. Introduce him to each task force member. Check with him frequently during the week to see how the report is progressing and to help with any modifications.

D Welcome him and introduce him to members of the task force who could help him. Ask him to check back if he has any problems.
This manager has recently noticed a performance problem with an employee. He demonstrates an “I don’t care” attitude. Only this manager’s constant prodding has brought about task completion. The manager suspects this employee may not have enough expertise to complete the high-priority task that has been given to him. This manager would ...

A Specify the steps this employee needs to take and the desired outcomes. Clarify timelines and paperwork requirements. Frequently check to see if the task is progressing as it should.

B Specify the steps this employee needs to take and the desired outcomes. Ask for his ideas and incorporate them if appropriate. Ask him to share his feelings about the assignment. Check to see that the task is progressing as it should.

C Involve this employee in problem solving for this task. Offer help and encourage him to use his ideas to complete the project. Ask him to share his feelings about the assignment. Periodically check in to see how things are going.

D Let this employee know how important this task is. Ask him to outline his plan for completion and to send the manager a copy. Ask him to check back if he has any problems.

The composition of this manager’s work group has changed because of company restructuring. Performance levels have dropped. Deadlines are being missed and the manager’s boss is concerned. Group members want to improve their performance but need more knowledge and skills. This manager would ...

A Ask the group members to identify their training needs and develop their own plan for improving performance. Give them the necessary resources. Be available to help them and ask to be kept informed.

B Discuss his plan to solve the performance problem. Ask the group members for their input and include their ideas in the plan if possible. Explain the manager’s rationale. Frequently check to see how the plan is being carried out.

C Outline the steps the group should follow to solve the performance problem. Be specific about the time requirements and the skills they need to learn. Closely monitor their progress on the plan.

D Help them develop a plan to improve performance. Encourage them to be creative. Support their plan and periodically check their performance.
Because of budget cuts, it is necessary to consolidate. A highly experienced department member has been asked to take charge of the consolidation. This person has worked in all areas of this manager's department. In the past she has usually been eager to help. While this manager feels she is able to perform the assignment, the employee seems indifferent to the task. This manager would ...

A. Reassure her. Outline the steps she should use to manage this project. Ask for her ideas and incorporate them when possible, but make sure she follows the manager's general approach. Frequently check to see how things are going.

B. Reassure her. Ask her to handle the project as she sees fit. Be patient and be available to help. Ask for frequent updates.

C. Reassure her. Ask her to determine the best way to approach the project. Help her develop options and encourage her to use her own ideas. Agree on frequent checkpoints.

D. Reassure her. Outline an overall plan and specify the steps she should follow. Frequently check to see how the steps are being implemented.

For the second time in a month, an employee's weekly progress reports have been incomplete and late. In the past year he has completed his reports accurately and submitted them on time. This is the first time this manager has spoken to him about this problem. This manager would ...

A. Tell him to improve the quality and timeliness of his paperwork. Go over the areas that are incomplete. Make sure he knows what is expected and how to fill out each section of the report. Continue to track his performance.

B. Ask him to turn in reports that are complete and on time, without pushing him. Continue to track his performance.

C. Discuss time and completion standards with him. Listen to his concerns but make sure he knows what is expected. Go over each section of the report and answer any questions. Use his ideas if possible. Continue to track his performance.

D. Ask him why his reports are incomplete. Listen to his concerns and do what can be done to help him understand the importance of timely and accurate results. Continue to track his performance.
A senior employee has been asked to take on a new project. In the past his performance has been outstanding. The project he has been given is important to the future of this manager's work group. He is excited about the new assignment but doesn't know where to begin because he lacks project information. This manager would ...

A Explain to this employee why he has the skills to do the job. Ask him what problems he anticipates and help him explore alternative solutions. Frequently stay in touch to support him.

B Specify how this employee should handle the project. Define the activities necessary to complete the job. Closely monitor how things are going.

C Ask this employee to develop a project plan for approval within two weeks. Give him enough time to get started. Periodically offer support.

D Outline how the project should be handled and solicit the employee's ideas and suggestions. Use his ideas when possible, but make sure the manager's general outline is followed. Regularly check to see how things are going.

A staff member is feeling insecure about a job that has been assigned to him. He is highly competent, and this manager knows that this employee has the skills to successfully complete the task. The deadline for completion is near. This manager would ...

A Let the employee know of his or her concerns about the impending deadline. Help him explore alternative action steps and encourage him to use his own ideas. Periodically check with him to lend support.

B Discuss his or her concerns about the impending deadline. Develop an action plan for the employee to follow and get his reactions. Include the employee's modifications if possible, but make sure he follows the general outline. Regularly check with him to see how things are going.

C Outline the steps the employee should follow. Specify the reasons for completing the assignment on time. Closely monitor his progress.

D Ask the employee if there are any problems but let him resolve the issue himself. Without pushing him, remind him of the impending deadline. Ask him to get back with an update.
9. The staff has asked this manager to consider changes in their work schedule due to an expansion in the customer base. Their changes make good sense. Members are very competent and work well together. This manager would ...

A. Help them explore alternative scheduling possibilities. Be available to facilitate their group discussion. Support the plan they develop. Check to see how they implement their schedule.

B. Design the work schedule and explain the rationale behind the design. Listen to their reactions, ask for their ideas, and use their recommendations when possible. Check to see that the schedule is being followed.

C. Allow the staff to set a work schedule on their own. Let them implement their plan after the manager has approved it. Check back at a later date to make sure the new schedule is working out for them.

D. Design the work schedule. Explain how it will work and answer any questions. Frequently check to see that the schedule is being followed.

10. Due to an organizational change, this manager has been assigned six new people whose performance has been declining over the past three months. They do not seem to have the task knowledge and skills to do their new jobs, and their attitudes have worsened because of the change. In a group meeting, this manager would ...

A. Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Ask them to decide what to do about it and set a deadline for implementing their solution. Check on their progress at some point.

B. Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Specify the action steps they should follow. Give them constructive feedback on how to improve their performance. Closely monitor their progress.

C. Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Outline the steps they should follow, explain why, and seek their feedback. Use their ideas when possible, but make sure they follow the general approach. Regularly monitor their progress.

D. Make them aware of their three-month performance trend. Ask them why their performance is declining. Listen to their concerns and ideas. Help them create their own plan for improving performance. Periodically check on their progress.
A department member has had a fine performance record over the last 22 months. This employee is excited by the challenges of the upcoming year. Budgets and unit goals have not changed much from last year. In a meeting with him to discuss goals and an action plan for next year, this manager would ...

A Ask this employee to submit an outline of his goals and an action plan for the manager's approval. Tell the employee to expect a call if there are any questions.

B Prepare a list of goals and an action plan for the employee to accomplish next year. Send it to him and meet with him to see if he has any questions.

C Prepare a list of goals and an action plan for the employee to achieve next year. Meet with him to discuss his reactions and suggestions. Modify the plan while listening to his ideas but make the final decisions.

D Ask this employee to submit an outline of his goals and an action plan for next year. Review the goals and plan with him. Listen to his ideas and help him explore alternatives. Let him make the final decisions on his goals and plan.

This manager's unit has had an excellent performance record over the past two years. However, they have recently experienced three major setbacks due to factors beyond their control. Their performance and morale have drastically dropped and this manager's boss is concerned. In a group meeting, this manager would ...

A Discuss the recent setbacks. Give unit members the specific steps they should follow to improve their performance. Closely monitor performance.

B Ask them how they feel about the recent setbacks. Listen to their concerns, and encourage and help them explore their ideas for improving performance. Periodically check on performance.

C Discuss the recent setbacks. Clarify the steps the unit members should take to improve performance. Listen to their ideas and incorporate them if possible. Emphasize results. Encourage them to keep trying. Frequently check their performance.

D Discuss the recent setbacks without pressuring unit members. Ask them to set a deadline to improve performance and to support each other along the way. Continue to track performance.
13 This manager was recently assigned a new employee who will perform an important job in the unit. Even though this employee is inexperienced, she is enthusiastic and feels she has the confidence to do the job. This manager would ...

A. Allow her time to determine what the job requires and how to do it. Let her know why the job is important. Ask her to be in touch if she needs help. Track her performance.

B. Specify the desired results and timelines. Clearly define the steps the employee should take to achieve results. Show her how to do the job. Closely monitor her progress.

C. Discuss the desired results and timelines. Clearly define the steps she can take to achieve the results. Explain why these steps are necessary and get her ideas. Use her ideas if possible, but make sure the manager's general plan is followed. Frequently check her progress.

D. Ask her how she plans to tackle this job. Help her explore the problems she anticipates by generating possible solutions. Encourage her to carry out her plan. Be available to listen to her concerns. Periodically check on her progress.

14 This manager's boss has requested a seven percent increase in the unit's output. This manager knows this can be done, but it will require his or her active involvement. To free the manager's time, the task of developing a new cost control system must be reassigned. The person chosen has had considerable experience with cost control systems, but she is slightly unsure of doing this task on her own. This manager would ...

A. Assign her the task and listen to her concerns. Express confidence in her skills to handle this assignment. Help her explore alternative approaches if she thinks it would be useful. Encourage and support her by providing needed resources. Periodically monitor her progress.

B. Assign her the task and listen to her concerns. Discuss the steps she should follow to complete the task. Ask for her ideas and suggestions. After incorporating her ideas if possible, make sure she follows the manager's general approach. Frequently monitor her progress.

C. Assign her the task. Listen to her concerns but let her resolve the issue. Give her time to adjust, and avoid asking for results right away. Ask her to check in frequently.

D. Assign her the task. Listen to her concerns, and minimize her feelings of insecurity by telling her specifically how to handle this task. Outline the steps to be taken. Closely monitor her progress.
**Other**

**15** This manager's boss has asked to have someone assigned to serve on a company-wide task force. This task force will make recommendations for restructuring the company's compensation plan. This manager has chosen a highly productive employee who knows how her coworkers feel about the existing compensation plan. She has successfully led another unit task force. She wants the assignment. This manager would ...

A Give this employee the assignment but tell her how she should present her coworkers' point of view. Specify that she turn in a progress report within two days of each task force meeting.

B Ask this employee to accept the assignment. Help her develop the point of view she will take on the task force. Periodically check with her.

C Give this employee the assignment. Discuss what she should do to ensure that her coworkers' perspective is considered by the task force. Ask for her ideas but make sure she follows the manager's general approach. Ask her for a report after every task force meeting.

D Give this employee the assignment. Ask to be given updates as things progress.

**16** Due to a family illness, this manager has been forced to miss two meetings of a committee he or she directs. Upon attending the next meeting, this manager finds that the committee is operating well and making progress toward completing its goals. All group members come prepared, participate, and seem to be enthusiastic about their progress. This manager is unsure of what his or her role should be. This manager would ...

A Thank the committee members for their work so far. Let the group continue to work as it has during the last two meetings.

B Thank the committee members for their work so far. Set the agenda for the next meeting. Begin to direct the group's activities.

C Thank the committee members for their work so far. Try to solicit alternative ideas and suggestions. Make the members feel important and involved.

D Thank the committee members for their work so far. Set the agenda for the next meeting but make sure to solicit their ideas and suggestions.
This manager's staff is very competent and works well on their own. Their enthusiasm is high because of a recent success. Their performance as a group is outstanding. Now, this manager must set unit goals for next year. In a group meeting, this manager would ...

A  Praise them for last year's results. Involve the group in problem solving and goal setting for next year. Encourage them to be creative and help them explore alternatives.

B  Praise them for last year's results. Challenge them by setting the goals for next year. Outline the action steps necessary to accomplish these goals.

C  Praise them for last year's results. Ask them to set the goals for next year and to define their action plan to accomplish these goals. Be available to contribute when asked.

D  Praise them for last year's results. Set the goals for next year and outline the action steps necessary to accomplish these goals. Solicit the group's ideas and suggestions and incorporate them if possible.

This manager and his or her boss know that the department needs a new set of work procedures to improve long-term performance. Department members are eager to make some changes; but because of their specialized functions, they lack the knowledge and skills for understanding the "big picture." This manager would ...

A  Outline the new procedures and his or her plan for implementation. Involve the group in a discussion of alternatives. Use their suggestions when possible, but see that they follow the general outline. Frequently check on the use of the new procedures and monitor their results.

B  Outline and demonstrate the new procedures. Instruct the group on the initial use of the new procedures and closely monitor results.

C  Involve the group in a discussion to explore new work procedures. Encourage their initiative and creativity in developing the new procedures. Help them examine possible alternatives. Periodically check on the use of the new procedures and monitor their performance.

D  Ask the group to formulate and implement a set of new procedures. Answer any informational concerns but give department members the responsibility for the task. Periodically monitor their performance.
Other

This manager was recently appointed head of the division. Since taking over, there has been a drop in performance. There have been changes in technology, and this manager's staff has not mastered the new skills and techniques. Worst of all, they do not seem to be motivated to learn these skills. In a group meeting, this manager would ...

A Discuss the staff's drop in performance. Listen to their concerns. Ask for their solutions for improving performance. Express faith in their strategies. Emphasize their past efforts but periodically check on performance as they carry out their strategies.

B Outline the necessary corrective actions they should take. Explore alternatives and incorporate their ideas. Modify the plan if appropriate, but see that they implement it. Frequently check on their performance.

C Tell them about the drop in performance. Ask them to analyze the problem and draft a set of action steps for approval. Set a deadline for the plan. Track their performance.

D Outline and direct the necessary corrective actions they should take. Define roles, responsibilities, and standards. Closely monitor their performance for improvement.

This manager has noticed that an inexperienced employee is not properly completing certain reports. These reports are inaccurate and incomplete. She is not enthusiastic about this task and often thinks paperwork is a waste of time. This manager would ...

A Let the employee know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Discuss the steps she should take and clarify why these steps are important. Ask for her suggestions but make sure she follows the manager's general outline. Frequently check her paperwork.

B Let the employee know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Ask her to come up with a plan to improve the quality of the reports. Give her more time to do the job properly. Check her paperwork.

C Let the employee know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Ask her what she plans to do about it. Help her develop a plan for solving her problems. Periodically check her paperwork.

D Let the employee know that she is submitting inaccurate and incomplete reports. Show her how to complete the reports. Specify the steps she should take to improve their quality. Closely monitor her paperwork.
APPENDIX H

BLANCHARD REQUIREMENTS
Blanchard Requirements*

*The assessment used for research to support this dissertation represents the proprietary copyrighted intellectual property of The Ken Blanchard Companies, and is used herein with permission. The following tables are included as part of the guidelines for using the Leader Behavior Analysis II Self and Other Questionnaires.

Average Flexibility Score and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>19.97</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Blanchard requirement f (Minimums and Maximums) is included within table.

The mean for principals' flexibility was 18.90. The standard deviation was 4.78. The minimum flexibility was 8, and the maximum flexibility was 26. Flexibility scores can range from 0 to 30, with 17 being the mean score as determined by Blanchard, Hambleton, Zigarmi, and Forsyth (1991a, 1991b).

The mean for teachers' perceptions of principals' flexibility was 20.01. The standard deviation was 4.59. The minimum flexibility was 1, and the maximum flexibility was 30.

Average Effectiveness Score and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>50.53</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>47.98</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Blanchard requirement f (Minimums and Maximums) is included within table.
The mean for principals' effectiveness was 50.53. The standard deviation was 5.56. The minimum effectiveness was 39, and the maximum effectiveness was 60. The mean for teachers' perceptions of principals' effectiveness was 47.98. The standard deviation was 6.63. The minimum effectiveness was 32, and the maximum effectiveness was 60.

**Average Primary Leadership Style Score Means and Standard Deviation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Style Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Blanchard requirement (Minimums and Maximums) is included within table.

The mean score for principals using style S1 was 2.21; the standard deviation was 1.27; the minimum was 0; and the maximum was 4. The mean score for principals' using style S2 was 6.16; the standard deviation was 3.44; the minimum was 1; and the maximum was 14. The mean score for principals using style S3 was 7.63; the standard deviation was 3.40; the minimum was 2; and the maximum was 16. The mean score for principals using style S4 was 4.00; the standard deviation was 3.00; the minimum was 0; and the maximum was 12.

The mean for teachers' perceptions of principals using style S1 was 3.30; the standard deviation was 2.12; the minimum was 0; and the maximum was 10. The mean for teachers' perceptions of principals using style S2 was 6.59; the standard deviation was 3.29; the minimum was 1; and the maximum was 16. The mean for teachers' perceptions
of principals using style S3 was 6.14; the standard deviation was 3.18; the minimum was 0; and the maximum was 14. The mean for teachers’ perceptions of principals using style S4 was 3.97; the standard deviation was 2.81; the minimum was 0; and the maximum was 15.

Percent of Primary Leadership Styles 1 Through Styles 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some principals and teachers had more than one primary leadership style.

The percent of principals using style S1 was 0.00. The percent of principals using style S2 was 35.29. The percent of principals using style S3 was 64.71. The percent of principals using style S4 was 0.00. According to the table above, principals used styles S2 and S3 more than the other two leadership styles.

The percentage of principals using style S1 as perceived by the teachers was 6.47. The percentage of principals using style S2 as perceived by the teachers was 29.41. The percentage of principals using style S3 as perceived by the teachers was 23.53. The percent of principals using style S4 as perceived by teachers was 11.18. According to the table above, teachers also perceived principals as using styles S2 and S3 more than the other leadership styles.
Percent of Developing Leadership Styles 1 Through Styles 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34.48</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some principals and teachers did not have a developing leadership style.

The percentage of principals using S1 as their developing leadership style was 41.38. The percentage of principals using S2 as their developing leadership style was 17.24. The percentage of principals using S3 as their developing leadership style was 6.90. The percentage of principals using S4 as their developing leadership style was 34.48.

The percentage of principals using S1 as their developing leadership style as perceived by teachers was 33.54. The percentage of principals using S2 as their developing leadership style as perceived by teachers was 11.18. The percentage of principals using S3 as their developing leadership style as perceived by teachers was 25.47. The percentage of principals using S4 as their developing leadership style as perceived by teachers was 29.81.
APPENDIX I

DATA FROM STUDY
### Self-Reported and Perceived Flexibility and Effectiveness by Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School O</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School P</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Q</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School R</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School S</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Individual School Scores for Flexibility and Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Teacher 10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Teacher 10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Teacher 16</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School G</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School H</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School I</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School J</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School L</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School N</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School O</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School P</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Teacher 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Q</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School R</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School S</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>51</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>