



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

5-2015

A Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory and The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire

Kimberly D. Graybeal
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Graybeal, Kimberly D., "A Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory and The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire" (2015). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2482. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/2482>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

A Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Scores on the
Leadership Practices Inventory and The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

A dissertation

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

by

Kimberly Dawn Parton Graybeal

May 2015

Dr. James Lampley, Chair

Dr. Cecil Blankenship

Dr. Virginia Foley

Dr. Pamela Scott

Keywords: Principal Leadership, Leadership Practices Inventory, Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

ABSTRACT

A Comparison of Principals' and Teachers' Scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory and The Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

by

Kimberly Graybeal

Most research indicates that effective principals usually involve teachers in some of the decision-making processes that take place in a school. When teachers feel they have a voice in decisions, they are more likely to take ownership in their school. Great leaders have the power to change their school either for the advancement of the establishment, or they can bring about negativity in the workplace.

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences on the 5 dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner Leadership Practices Inventory (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score for participants in this study, and to determine if a relationship existed between teachers' scores on the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire and their principal's Leadership Practices Inventory score.

For this research data were collected from 10 schools in a school system in East Tennessee that contained kindergarten through eighth grade. These schools are classified in 3 categories: kindergarten through eighth grade, third through fifth grade, or sixth through eighth grade.

There were 208 participating teachers in the school system who teach kindergarten through eighth grade. One-sample t-tests were used to compare the principal's Leadership Practice Inventory score to teachers' Leadership Practice Inventory scores at each of the 10 participating schools. Scores for teachers and their principal were not significantly different for any of the 5 dimensions for Schools 1, 2, 9, and 10. School 8 displayed a significant difference for 3 of the 5 dimensions. The means were significantly different for Schools 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 on all 5 of the dimensions. The relationship as measured by Pearson correlation coefficients between the Leadership Practices Inventory and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire for teachers at the 10 participating schools displayed similar mixed results.

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my grandparents, Reverend Glenn and Jimmie Louise Parton. You are the foundation that holds our family together. You have always been there for me and supported me all my life. You believed in me when at times I did not believe in myself. I have the utmost respect for both of you. I only hope that I can be half the person you both are. If so, I will consider I have done a great job. Thank you for instilling in me Christ. I know He is my rock through any storm. Thank you also for instilling in me a desire to work hard and pursue my dreams. You have taught me more about life than any amount of schooling ever will. Thank you for all the encouragement and selflessness you have always shown. Your love for others has always left an impression on me. I am so blessed to have you in my life. I love you nanny and papaw more than words can express.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first like to give all thanks to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Through Him, I know I can do all things but without Him, I am nothing. I would like to acknowledge my best friend and husband, Bryan Keith Graybeal. You have stood by me through every endeavor of my career and through every dream I have attempted in life. You are always there to encourage me and support me. Thank you for weathering the storms with me. Thank you for all the “pick me up” talks. I could not have gone through this process without your love and support. I love you more than you can ever imagine. Thank you for the greatest gift possible; you made me a mommy. I look forward to a lifetime with you.

To my daughter, Briley Louise Graybeal, you truly are what makes my heart beat. I love you more than the depths of the ocean. I hope to be a good role model for you and to instill in you a desire to live for Jesus. I hope that through my life you realize the importance of a good education. The sky is the limit for you. You have a mommy and daddy who love you more than life itself. Reach for the stars baby girl. I will always be your biggest fan. Remember, you are Mommy’s Miracle.

I would like to say a special thanks to my daddy, Revered Timothy Glenn Parton. You sacrificed so much when I was little so that I could have a bright future. If I worked a lifetime, I could never repay you and Mimi. You have constantly loved and supported me in all my hopes and dreams. Thank you for instilling in me a desire to better myself, and thank you daddy for always being “The Wind beneath My Wings”. I love you.

My sister Pam is my lifeline. She is always there for me in good times and bad times. Thank you for all your encouragement and pep talks. I love you more than you will ever know. Remember, life made us sisters, but God made us best friends. Thank you for sharing Jacob and Elexa with me. Jacob, you have given KoKo a lifetime of happiness. I love you bigger than the whole world.

A special thank you to Dr. Lampley for all the edits and help during this process. Thank you for guiding me into making my dissertation better. I would like to thank Dr. Scott, Dr. Blankenship, and Dr. Foley for taking their time to serve on my committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	2
DEDICATION	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
LIST OF TABLES	9
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	10
Background of the Study	11
Purpose of the Study	12
Research Questions	13
Significance of the Study	14
Definition of Terms	14
Limitations	15
Organization of the Study	15
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	16
Shared Decision-Making	16
Effective Teachers	18
The Principal as a Leader	20
Leading and Managing	21
Effective Principals	24
Leadership Theories	25
Great Man Theory	25
Trait Theory	25
Behavior Theory	26

Autocratic, Democratic, and Laissez-Faire Leader	26
Contingency Theory	27
Situational Leadership	27
Power and Influence Theory	28
Leadership Styles	29
Servant Leadership	29
Transactional Leadership	30
Charismatic Leadership	31
Transformational Leadership	31
Leadership Practices Inventory	33
Challenge the Process	33
Inspiring a Shared Vision	34
Enabling Others to Act	35
Modeling the Way	35
Encouraging the Heart	36
Teacher Morale	37
3. RESEARCH METHOD	40
Research Design	41
Population	42
Instrumentation	42
Research Questions and Hypotheses	44
Data Collection Procedures	47
Data Analysis	48
Summary	48
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA	49
Research Question #1	50
Research Question #2	57

Research Question #3	61
Research Question #4	65
5. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	75
Summary of Findings	76
Conclusions	87
Recommendations	87
REFERENCES	89
APPENDICES	95
Appendix A: Letter to Director of Curriculum and Instruction	95
Appendix B: Permission Letter from Kouzes Posner International.....	96
Appendix C: Letter to Principals	97
Appendix D: Letter to Teachers	98
Appendix E: Leadership Practices Inventory-Observer Form.....	99
Appendix F: Leadership Practices Inventory-Self Form	102
Appendix G: Purdue Teacher Opinionaire	105
Appendix H: Demographic Information Teacher Form	109
Appendix I: Demographic Information Principal Form	110
Appendix J: IRB Paperwork	111
Appendix K: Leadership Practices Inventory Categories.....	112
Appendix L: Purdue Teacher Opinionaire Categories.....	113
VITA	114

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Participant’s Demographics	50
2. Model the Way Summary	77
3. Inspire a Shared Vision Summary	78
4. Challenge the Process Summary.....	79
5. Enable Others to Act Summary	80
6. Encourage the Heart Summary	81
7. Model the Way & PTO Summary	82
8. Inspire a Shared Vision & PTO Summary.....	83
9. Challenge the Process & PTO Summary	84
10. Enable Others to Act & PTO Summary.....	85
11. Encourage the Heart & PTO Summary	86

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Effective leaders should have a vision and a goal as to where they are taking their organizations. Although there are many opinions of what defines a true leader, researchers generally agree there are certain characteristics that distinguish a good leader from a great leader (Hoy & Miskel, 2008; Northhouse, 2004). However, leaders often perceive their own leadership styles and abilities differently from the way their professional staff members recognize them.

There are numerous leadership styles and each one is based on a different theory. Leadership style is determined by defining beliefs, preferences, and values. Leaders must consider the culture of the organization in which they are working. Some of the main leadership styles are charismatic leaders, situational leaders, transactional leaders, transformational leaders, autocratic leaders, democratic leaders, laissez-faire leaders, and servant leaders (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Some of the leadership theories are the great man theory, trait theory, behavior theory, contingency theory, and power and influence theory (Northhouse, 2004). There are certain traits that are associated with an effective leader.

Researchers have linked the morale of followers to the leadership style of their leader (Adams, 1992; Mendel, 1987). Principals affect the morale of their staff in many ways. According to Mendel (1987), “Morale can be defined as a feeling, a state of mind, a mental attitude, or an emotional attitude” that an employee feels about his or her job (p. 106). Principals have the ability to create a positive or a negative working environment for their staff. In past studies teacher morale and school environment have been shown to be closely related (Adams, 1992). Hoy and Miskel (1982) wrote that when a positive school environment is present, teachers feel good about their coworkers and feel success from their employment. The morale of

the teacher can be important to the daily function of a school. Miller (1981) stated that teacher morale could have a positive outcome on the overall academic achievement of students.

Teachers have the power to influence a school's environment both positively and negatively.

Teachers and staff members who feel empowered tend to have increased morale. As Maehr, Midgley, and Urdan (1991) stated, "People are more personally invested in their work with an organization when they have a voice in what happens to them and [when] their work has meaning and significance in contributing to a higher purpose or goal" (p. 115). According to Blasé and Kirby (1992) principals with certain leadership styles strive to protect the instructional time of teachers, aid teachers in discipline, permit them to create their own discipline procedures, and help them maintain their authority in implementing policies. On the other hand, decreased contentment and morale might lead to diminished teacher efficiency and burnout. Low morale can cause a decrease in concern for coworkers and quality of teaching and an increase in depression. This, in turn, could lead to increasing absenteeism, job changes, and lack of interest in students (Mendel, 1987). Blasé, Dedrick, and Strathe (1986) discovered that when teachers observed their principals demonstrating helpful traits there was a higher level of job satisfaction.

Background of the Study

Education has changed over the past several decades. Kindergarten-through 12th-grade education has moved from one-room schoolhouses to classrooms that have more diverse academic and social issues. More demands are placed on teachers each year. There are pressures to raise test scores, to reach all students, and to maintain positive educational environments in the classroom. When teachers have low morale, the success of students can suffer. Teachers need to

know their principal is supportive of them. When a principal provides praise for teachers they will have increased self-esteem, increased efficacy, and have an overall higher motivation level (Blasé & Blasé, 2001). According to Weiss (1999) the U.S. Department of Education studied the subject of teacher morale. It was found that workplace conditions had a tremendous effect on teachers' self-esteem and retention. The researchers stated that when teachers perceived their workplace as supportive, collaborative, and empowering, the turnover and dropout rates were reduced (Weiss, 1999). Classroom teachers comprise the majority of the educational profession. Therefore teachers have a major influence on the climate of the school.

Purpose of the Study

The Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) developed by Kouzes and Posner (2003a) is a survey-type leadership assessment tool based on five practices of exemplary leadership: (a) model the way, (b) inspire a shared vision, (c) challenge the process, (d) enable others to act, and (e) encourage the heart. The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner (Appendix E) *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) (model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score for participants in this study, and to determine if a relationship existed between teachers' PTO scores and their LPI scores. The researcher sought to find if a correlation existed between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership behaviors and the principals' perceptions of their own leadership behaviors as outlined by the *Leadership Practices Inventory* (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a). The researcher also studied the correlation between the teachers' leadership score for their principal measured by the LPI and the teacher's morale score as measured by the Purdue

Teacher Opinionaire (PTO). Data were also collected on gender of participant, gender of principal, highest degree earned, number of years of experience, age, and whether the participant had worked at other schools.

Research Questions

This research was guided by the following research questions:

1. Are there significant differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* (model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a kindergarten- to eighth-grade configuration?
2. Are there significant differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* (model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a third- to fifth-grade configuration?
3. Are there significant differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* (model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a sixth-to eighth-grade configuration?
4. Is there a relationship between teachers' LPI scores (model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart) and teachers' Purdue Teachers Opinionaire (PTO) scores?

Significance of the Study

In the field of education teachers and principals are vital to the overall success of the school. Some school systems are experiencing increased enrollment and teacher turnover at the same time. It is very important to retain effective classroom teachers, and with the teacher turnover, this can prove to be a challenging task. Moreover, teachers need to have a high morale to maintain effectiveness in the classroom. There have also been studies linking teacher morale and principal leadership. This study is significant because it is not known if the morale of participating teachers in this study as measured by the PTO is related to the leadership of the principal (Ingersoll, 2001). Information about the similarity of teachers' perceptions of leadership styles to their principal's perception of leadership style will be an important part of this study.

Definitions of Terms

1. *Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)*: The LPI is a tool for leaders and managers at all levels in any organization. The LPI uses self-assessment as a way of measuring leadership behaviors. Kouzes and Posner (2003a) developed the LPI survey.
2. *Leadership*: a course of action where an individual influences a group of individuals to accomplish a universal goal (Northouse, 2004).
3. *Morale*: Morale is a feeling, a state of mind, a mental attitude, or an emotional attitude that an employee feels about his or her job (Mendel, 1987).
4. *Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire*: This instrument is a measure of teacher morale and the teacher's acceptance of his or her principal's authority (Bentley & Rempel, 1980).

Limitations

This study was limited to participating teachers who chose to complete the surveys. This study includes perceptions of teachers and principals in one county in East Tennessee. This study may not be generalizable to other groups.

Organization of the Study

Chapter 1 contains an introduction to the study, background information on the study, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, definitions, and limitations. Chapter 2 is the review of literature. Chapter 3 presents a comprehensive examination of the methodology used in this study. Chapter 4 presents the results of the research relating to the four research questions. Chapter 5 contains a summary, discussion of the findings, and recommendations for future studies.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Communication between teachers and principals is necessary for the overall effectiveness of schools. Effective school leaders usually involve teachers in some of the decision-making processes that take place in a school. Generally, when teachers feel they have a voice in decisions, they are more likely to be vested in their school. Researchers have shown that when principals share some of the decision making with their teachers, teacher effectiveness is increased (Liontos, 1993). There are many demands placed on teachers from state and local sources to perform in classrooms and more demands are being placed on principals to have their schools perform at certain achievement levels (Blanchard, 1999).

Shared Decision-Making

Shared-decision making can sometimes be a difficult concept for principals to accept. According to Liontos (1993) shared decision-making does not eliminate the need for a principal and his or her leadership abilities; rather, it allows decisions to be made in a mutual way. Shared decision-making gives principals and teachers equal opportunities and privileges (Allen & Glickman, 1992). This method of making decisions has been shown to increase staff morale and help build trust in organizations (Liontos, 1993). One of the most important components of shared decision-making is communication. Allen and Glickman (1992) asserted that shared decision-making includes important modifications in the way schools are managed. When a principal decides he or she is going to involve the professional staff in shared decision-making, it is usually an on-going process. The overall goal of shared decision-making is to increase student learning and improve the effectiveness of the school (Liontos, 1993). Shared decision-making has advantages as well as disadvantages. One disadvantage is that it creates more

demands on already busy teachers. Sometimes this new set of responsibilities creates frustration in teachers (Weiss, Cambone, & Wyeth, 1992). Often teachers are thought to make decisions that affect only their classroom; however, if given the opportunity, many teachers are willing and capable of aiding in decisions that will affect the entire school (Martin, 1983). Some teachers prefer working alone and when involved in shared decision-making, they are forced to work with others. This can create conflicts. There are many advantages to shared decision-making. Shared decision-making may lead to better quality of decisions being made and affect how decisions are accepted and implemented. Lontos (1993) found that shared decision-making can increase teacher morale and help build teamwork, trust, and commitment within the school.

Bauer (1992) wrote that shared decision-making does not eliminate the principal as a decision maker but rather involves the principal on a team. The principal has a vital part in starting and implementing shared decision-making. There are things a principal can do to help the school implement shared decision-making. The principal can create a climate where there is trust, give opportunities for teachers to express ideas, give professional development top priority, and promote a noncompetitive atmosphere (Bauer, 1992).

Implementing shared decision-making can be difficult for a school. Allen and Glickman (1992) asserted that schools should find a relatively small issue before trying to tackle a larger issue. Leech and Fulton (2008) wrote that shared decision-making correlates with the challenge the process dimension of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) that was developed by Kouzes and Posner (2003a&b).

Sergiovanni (1994) wrote that the principal might foster a sense of ownership and influence by sharing power. This helps to create commitment to the school. Sergiovanni (1990)

stated, “The successful leader is one who builds-up the leadership of others and strives to become a leader of leaders” (p. 27).

Effective Teachers

Teachers manage many different roles in classrooms. The difficulty comes in finding how to manage all of those roles effectively (Martin, 1983). The teacher in the 21st Century classroom has many roles to fulfill, and a teacher must be flexible and willing to switch to the role that is needed. Flexibility is essential in today’s American classroom. With the implementation of new standards and increasing rigor in the classroom, the teacher must be a facilitator of learning, a manager of the classroom climate, a positive re-enforcer, and a self-motivator (Ryan & Cooper, 2008). Effective teachers seem to understand how to manage all these roles to construct a creative, inspiring, and challenging classroom. Accountability in the form of high stakes testing is a way of life for teachers. There is pressure from parents, school districts, principals, and states for students to do well on state standardized tests. Gone are the days of a one-room schoolhouse where the students were from the community that surrounded the school. There is more diversity in classrooms than in past decades. According to Glasser (1993) being an effective teacher is not an easy task. Glasser (1993) stated that an effective, quality teacher always leads but never bosses. Effective teachers demonstrate certain qualities that set them apart from others. Student achievement and learning are extremely interrelated with the quality of the teacher in the classroom (Fisher, 2003). According to Ryan and Cooper (2008), “The mediocre teacher tells; the good teacher explains; the superior teacher demonstrates; the great teacher inspires” (p. 165). Effective teachers find ways to reach all students and help them excel to their fullest potential. An effective teacher creates a classroom conducive to learning yet inviting to all students.

Whitaker (2004) listed 14 things effective teachers do that set them apart from others. According to Whitaker great teachers realize it is people, not programs, who define the quality of a school. Teachers who demonstrate effectiveness hold high expectations for their students and for themselves from the beginning. They are consistent in following through with rules and procedures established to help manage their classroom and handle disciplinary issues. Effective teachers are able to make decisions and respond to differing situations appropriately. They demonstrate hours spent in lesson planning that becomes evident in their delivery of each lesson. They self-reflect for improvement. Effective teachers know the importance of each student being treated fairly. Their classroom demonstrates that respect is given for all. Effective teachers have a positive classroom environment where all are welcomed and valued. In an effective teacher's classroom, the standards are covered but he or she does not allow pressure from the state standardized test to capture the lessons (Whitaker, 2004). Johnson (1980) defined four main characteristics that designate effective teachers. Effective teachers have a personal concern for each student. They are very knowledgeable in the subject they teach. Effective teachers create a kind and caring atmosphere in their classroom and they greet their students with enthusiasm. Polk (2006) asserted that effective teachers are always searching for professional development opportunities, and they are excellent communicators with their students and colleagues. Pillsbury (2005) pointed out that highly effective teachers demonstrate great motivation and they have a profound passion for the profession. They want to help children grown and learn, and they want all children to know they are valued. Effective teachers help students find their strengths as well as areas to strengthen. According to Pillsbury (2005) effective teachers believe that all students, regardless of their ability levels, have a right to learn.

The Principal as a Leader

Principals are by position the leaders of their school. They are the ultimate authority in that school. A superintendent or director of schools entrusts principals to maintain and carry out the daily functions of their particular school. It is hard to imagine a school in today's society not having an administrator, but the position of school principal has been around only since the beginning of the 20th century (Sergiovanni, 1984). When the school setting grew from the traditional one-room schoolhouse to a school with multiple grades and personnel, the need for a manager emerged.

The administrative position was, at first, filled by a teacher who assumed the responsibility in addition to teaching in a classroom. These particular teachers were labeled principal teachers (Jenlink, 2001,). As schools began to increase enrollment, the principal-teacher position faded and a new role emerged. The principal assumed the role of overseeing the daily operation of a school. There are differing views on the role of the principal in the school setting. A principal is a person who is in charge of the daily operations that take place in a school setting. A principal has to be a manager and a leader. There are certain aspects of the job that blend management and leadership. A manager is someone who controls resources and expenditures and a leader is a person who guides and inspires others (Meriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 2003).

Leading and Managing

As a manager the principal is responsible for the finances of the school, overseeing the daily maintenance, teachers' and students' scheduling, discipline, parents, hiring and firing of teachers (in some cases), teachers' concerns and issues, and for any other area that directly affects the daily operation of the school. As a leader the principal needs to motivate and inspire the staff and students (Rye, 2009). The principal must lead by example as well as share and communicate the vision with all stakeholders involved. Being a leader means being a team player and not doing everything alone. Effective leaders know how to delegate tasks. Leaders need to know their staff members and they need to recognize how to motivate them. Leaders need to know their own strengths and weaknesses. According to Rye (2009) leaders must know what personality type they are in order to avoid conflicts and confrontation with those they are trying to lead. Leaders must coach their followers. In a management position, coaching revolves around some kind of plan, but in leadership coaching is more about helping followers find their unique strengths and understanding their weaknesses.

Leading is more than managing. It calls for stepping outside of a comfort zone and sometimes tackling difficult circumstances or situations. Leaders cannot build relationships sitting behind a desk all day, and relationships are the cornerstones of organizations. Rye (2009) wrote that the relationship a leader develops should be the bond that holds the leadership position and others together. First impressions often create an immediate relationship between a leader and a follower. A leader must sell himself or herself so that others gain inspiration. Sanborn (2004) listed four principles that could apply to anyone in any profession at anytime. The first principle is "Everyone makes a difference" (p. 8). Sanborn maintained that leaders must realize that all members of the organization can make a difference. The second principle is "Success is

built on relationships” (p. 11). Sanborn stated that strong relationships create loyalty and success and this, in turn, becomes the foundation for lasting successful relationships. The third principle is “You must continually create value for others, and it doesn’t have to cost a penny” (p. 12). He suggested that this can be achieved by providing opportunities for enthusiasm, humor, and enjoyment throughout the workday for others and by letting the staff know they have value and that as a leader you appreciate them. The final principle is “You can reinvent yourself regularly” (p. 15). Sanborn also stated that the best way for a leader to increase value of staff members is to teach them how to grow into leaders. The principal should become a lifelong learner and take every opportunity to learn and get new ideas (Sanborn, 2004).

Blanchard (2002) maintained the importance of establishing relationships. He pointed out that both parties must be willing to work on building a positive relationship, and everyone involved in the relationship must make every effort to encourage and motivate others. Blanchard listed four steps for encouraging and motivating others. The first step was to give immediate praise to people--let them know right away when they have done something right. The second step was to praise people with specific praise--let them know what they did correctly. The third step was being willing to share positive words and feelings with them about what they did right--praising others shows strength and dedication. The final step was to constantly encourage them and keep trying to find new ways to motivate them to do the right thing.

Blanchard (2001) listed four ways a leader could help others work as a team. A leader must provide clear purposes and values to his or her followers. Leaders must be clear on what they are expecting others to do. Leaders must start with some basic skills that they know will increase confidence in order to build the overall team. Blanchard asserted, “None of us is as smart as all of us” (p. 60). If principals and teachers work together the results of their hard work

and dedication will be astonishing. Blanchard stated that leaders must always focus on the positive side of things. He pointed out that you must strive to catch people doing something right and praise them for their appropriate behavior.

Leaders must have the ability to work well with others for their organization to excel. McEwan (2003) reported, “Relationships drive school improvement” (p. 54). Principals in any given school must learn how to build a relationship with staff members. Some relationships come easier than others do. Certain types of people are intrinsically motivated and do not require a leader to be cheering them on daily. Other people want that reassurance on a continuous basis. A leader must learn how to adapt to meet the needs of all people involved in his or her organization. Whitaker (2003) wrote that when principals are effective, they realize that people are more important than are the programs in a school. Effective principals demonstrate certain behaviors that enable them to create lasting relationships with those they are leading (Marzano, 2003).

Effective Principals

Certain qualities define an effective principal. Whitaker (2003) detailed the 14 most important requirements for principals to ensure they have the respect of their staff. According to Whitaker, effective principals realize that it is people instead of programs that make their schools effective. Effective principals set the tone for the school day. They must filter all the good and the bad that takes place. Teachers need examples of what they should and should not do. Effective principals must teach the teachers. Effective principals always strive to hire effective and competent teachers. It is thought that effective principals realize it is hard to change someone's beliefs; therefore, they should focus on changing behaviors. Effective principals make decisions based on the best teachers, and they realize that some people will complain regardless of circumstances. Effective principals should recognize high achieving teachers and learn to maximize their potential. According to Whitaker relationships are the cornerstones of organizations, and effective principals must strive to build and repair them. Effective principals must let their staff members know they appreciate and care for them.

Effective principals have a task each day of meeting the challenges and issues that arise with staff and students. Marzano (2003) asserted that effective principals must strive for behaviors that improve interpersonal relationships in order to bring about change. Blasé and Kirby (1992) noted three main characteristics that more than 1,200 teachers reported were vital to building interpersonal relationships. These characteristics were optimism, honesty, and consideration. According to Blasé and Kirby, when principals employ optimism while bringing about or carrying out change, teachers develop an increased amount of self-esteem and motivation. Honesty is an important trait for administrators to possess. Marzano pointed out that if leaders are not honest with others then no one will ever take them seriously or believe

what they say. Their words and actions will not hold any credibility with those they are trying to lead. Teachers want to know that what their principal tells them is the truth (Marzano, 2003).

Leadership Theories

There are many leadership styles and each one is based on a different theory. There are also numerous definitions of leadership. Chemers (1997) defined leadership as “a process of social influence in which one person is able to enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task” (p. 1). Northouse (2004) defined leadership as a course of action where an individual influences a group of individuals to accomplish a universal goal. Leaders have influence over others to achieve a common goal. Individuals choose how to handle this influence by using a variety of leadership styles and theories.

Great Man Theory

According to Northouse, the great man theory states that the ability to lead comes naturally--meaning that great leaders are born rather than made. The great man theory evolved from studying people who were already leaders. Most of these people were from the upper classes because the lower classes were not afforded opportunities to lead. Women were not on an equal playing field in leadership. This theory is mostly associated with Thomas Carlyle (Northouse, 2004).

Trait Theory

The trait theory is somewhat similar to the great man theory. The trait theory is based on the concept that people inherit traits that enable them to be better candidates for leadership. The trait leadership theory contends some people are just born with specific traits that make them suitable for leadership positions. Stogdill (1974) identified 13 traits and 9 skills that are vital to leaders. According to Stogdill, effective leaders have certain traits. Effective leaders can adapt

to any situation and they are observant of social situations. They are achievement focused and they are determined, assertive, decisive, dependable, and cooperative. Effective leaders are very dominant and they have a yearning to influence others. They are energetic people who are persistent and self-confident. Effective leaders are able to handle stress and are always willing to assume responsibilities. Stogdill also found that effective leaders are intelligent, skillful, and clever. They are tactful in the way they handle themselves, they are creative, and they are very fluent speakers. Effective leaders are knowledgeable about group tasks and they can be rather persuasive. They are also very structured in administrative topics (Stogdill, 1974).

Behavior Theory

The behavior theory of leadership is the opposite of the great man and trait theories. The behavior leadership theory holds that leaders can be made based on certain behaviors rather than being born with those behaviors. The behavior theory evaluates how a leader performs. This theory opens leadership to anyone who is willing to work and learn what it takes to be an effective leader. Unlike the trait theory and the great man theory, the behavior theory allows almost anyone the opportunity to excel in leadership (Northouse, 2004).

Autocratic, Democratic, and Laissez-Faire Leaders

Lewin, Lippit, and White (1939) developed a leadership framework focusing on a leader's decision-making behavior to devise three types of leadership. According to Lewin et al. leaders can be classified as autocratic leaders, democratic leaders, and laissez-faire leaders. Autocratic leaders are those leaders who make decisions solely on their own. They do not consult others in the organization. Sometimes this is acceptable because certain decisions have to be made quickly. Lewin et al. indicated that this type of leadership caused the most problems among staff members. The democratic leader seeks input from the teams or organizations before

making any kind of decision. The principal or leader has the final say, but this type of leadership allows others to feel like their voice has been heard. This type of leadership can sometimes be hard to control because opinions about the right decision will vary greatly. The laissez-faire leader is one who does not interfere with decisions but allows the groups within the organization to make the decisions. This type of leadership works well when people are motivated (Lewin et al., 1939).

Contingency Theory

The contingency theory is another theory of leadership but it is different from the trait, great man, or behavior theories. The contingency theory maintains that a leader's capacity to lead others is contingent on certain factors such as the leader's approach, abilities and behaviors of followers, and other diverse situational factors (Northouse, 2004). This theory is built on the concept that there are many ways a leader can lead but that decisions should be based upon the situations.

Situational Leadership Theory

One of the most popular contingency theory models has been the Hersey-Blanchard situational leadership theory (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). The situational leadership theory states there is no one best way to lead an organization. Leaders should adapt their leadership style to the task and to the maturity of the followers.

Hersey and Blanchard (1988) introduced an approach to leadership called the situational approach. Just as the name implies, situational approach allows leaders to act according to a situation. Situational leadership maintains that in order for leaders to understand what is needed in any organization, they must assess their followers and determine how devoted they are to carrying out a task (Northouse, 2004). The situational leadership approach comprises both

directive and supportive behaviors. Directive behaviors are those that help followers accomplish a task by providing directions and goals. Supportive behaviors include those that enable followers to feel good about the people they are working with, the organization, and the situation. Hersey and Blanchard characterized this leadership into four leadership styles in terms of behavior and relationships for each task. The four leadership styles are telling, selling, participating, and delegating (Hersey, 1984). In the telling leadership style, leaders will tell their followers precisely what to do and how it needs to be done. In the selling leadership style leaders will give directions, but they communicate with their followers. They try to sell their decision to get everyone involved. In the participating leadership style the leader builds on relationships and focuses less on directions. Shared decision-making is part of this style. The delegating leadership style is where leaders share some of the responsibility with a follower or a particular group. The leader is still there to facilitate but he or she is not as involved with decisions to be made (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Power and Influence Theory

The power and influence theory developed by French and Raven (1960) documented five bases of power. The five bases of power and the definitions for each are legitimate, reward, expert, referent, and coercive. Legitimate power comes from the belief that a person has the right to make demands and expect compliance and obedience from others. Reward power results from one person's ability to compensate another for compliance. Expert power is based on a person's superior skill and knowledge. Referent power is the result of a person's perceived attractiveness, worthiness, and right to get respect from others. Coercive power comes from the belief that a person can punish others for noncompliance (French & Raven, 1960). Legitimate,

reward, and coercive power are positional types of power, whereas expert and referent are personal types of power.

Leadership Styles

With all the different theories, it can be tough for principals to pinpoint their type of leadership. There are many different styles of leadership, and each person must discover his or her own style. An effective leader is one who inspires followers and creates a vision in which others desire to follow (Maxwell, 2006). According to Maxwell being an effective leader means choosing the right type of leadership style for any given situation. There are certain criteria to be considered when a leader chooses how to handle a particular issue. The leader has to know background, prior experiences, and particulars of a given situation. The leader also has to consider the individuals whom he or she is trying to lead. This is why it is important to build relationships. The leader must also consider the organization as a whole and all the stakeholders (Maxwell, 2006). According to Useem (1998) every organization has certain customs and beliefs that must be considered. Every leader has desirable and undesirable habits. Leaders must find ways to manage these habits. Covey (2004) stated that habits are very influential factors in our lives. He stated that changing how we perceive our organization will help achieve effectiveness.

Servant Leadership

Greenleaf (1977) developed an approach to leadership called “servant leadership” in the 1970s. Servant leadership has grown in recognition in the past few years. The basis of servant leadership is that leaders should take care of their followers and nurture them. Greenleaf explained, “A servant leader focuses on the needs of followers and helps them to become more knowledgeable, more liberated, more autonomous, and more like servants themselves” (pp. 11-

12). The philosophy of servant leadership points out the leader's roles as well as the follower's roles. According to Greenleaf servant leadership maintains that if leaders meet their follower needs and allow the followers a chance to aid in the decision making process, leaders will be able to handle many tasks and problems that organizations encounter.

Transactional Leadership

Burns (1978) has been a foremost authority on leadership. Burns wanted to understand the behaviors that leaders were using to motivate their followers and eventually he presented two categories of leadership: transformational and transactional. Burns developed the following description of leadership:

Leadership is acting – as well as caring, inspiring and persuading others to act – for certain shared goals that represent values – the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations – of themselves and the people they represent. And the genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders care about, visualize, and act on their own and their followers' values and motivations. (p. 11)

According to Laohavichien, Fredendall, and Cantrell (2009) transactional leadership is a form of leadership in which followers are motivated by rewards and punishment. The transactional leader has a structured way to do something and followers are rewarded if the task is completed. Some transactional leaders do not always tell the subordinates what the punishment will be for not completing a task, but it is usually understood. Transactional leadership is based on contingency because punishments and rewards are dependent upon completion of the assigned task. When comparing leadership to management, transactional leadership leans toward the management end. Transactional leadership takes place when a leader asks or demands something of his or her followers. The transaction is often in a monetary form (Laohavichien et al., 2009). Autocratic leadership is an intense type of transactional leadership in which the leader uses excessive levels of power over the followers under autocratic leaders. Followers are not able to voice concerns, opinions, or ideas. This type of leadership may lend

itself to considerable staff turnover and faculty resentment. Relationships are usually not formed by using transactional leadership (Northouse, 2004).

Charismatic Leadership

Charismatic leaders are full of energy and bring a positive attitude to the organization. Northouse (2004) pointed out that a charismatic leader is often the piece that holds a team together. This has many advantages as well as some disadvantages. If the charismatic leader leaves before the project is completed, the group usually loses focus. Many famous leaders have been charismatic. Martin Luther King Jr. delivered a powerful speech, "I Have a Dream" that showed charismatic behavior (Gardner & Laskin, 1995). Transformational leaders are often charismatic (Northouse, 2004).

Transformational Leadership

According to Burns (1978) Downton was the first person to identify this type of leadership, although Burns has often been credited with introducing the idea of transformational leadership. Burns described transformational leadership not as behavioral but as a continuing practice where leaders and followers raise one another to advanced levels of morals and inspiration. Maslow's Theory of Human Needs had an influence on Burns. Maslow's theory maintains that all humans have needs and they will perform in the workplace according to how these needs are met. Burns developed three behaviors wherein leaders can transform followers. The first is to enhance the followers' understanding of the significance and worth of any given task. The second is to get followers to be attentive to goals for their team or the organization instead of focusing on their own needs. The third is to transform followers to stimulate their higher-order needs (Burns, 1978).

According to Northouse (2004) Bass extended Burns's ideas and advanced the idea of transformational leadership. Bass (1985) expanded Burns's (1978) work by giving more concentration to the follower's needs rather than to the leader's. Bass stated that transformational leadership encourages followers to do more work than is anticipated by: (a) raising followers' levels of awareness about the significance and worth of a specific goal, (b) encouraging followers to focus on the needs of the team or organization instead of their own, and (c) stirring followers to attend to higher-level needs. Transformational leadership concerns itself with helping followers excel to their fullest potential. Covey (2004) described the objective of transformational leadership:

. . . to transform people and the organization in a literal sense, change their mind and heart, enlarge vision, insight, and understanding, clarify purposes, make behavior congruent with beliefs, principles and values; and bring about changes that are permanent, self-perpetuating, and momentum building. (p. 222)

Bass's (1985) model of leadership is divided into three parts: transformational, transactional, and nonleadership factors. Transformational factors include idealized influence and charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. The first factor, idealized influence and charisma, is when leaders act as role models to followers (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Followers seem to be able to identify with these leaders and want to be like them in some way. These leaders usually are charismatic and they inspire others to follow the vision they have. The second transformational factor, inspirational motivation, describes leaders who communicate high expectations to their followers. This type of leadership helps to build team character. The third transformational factor, intellectual stimulation, is when leaders inspire followers to be creative and encourage them to develop new habits of coping with issues in the organization. The fourth factor, individualized consideration, is when leaders provide followers with the opportunity to share their needs and concerns. Leaders often act as coaches.

Dungy and Whitaker (2007) stated, “We are all role models to someone in this world and we can all have an impact for good” (p. 301). Transformational leadership embodies the basic belief that people will follow those who inspire them.

Two other groups of researchers have added to the knowledge about transformational leadership. In 1985 Bennis and Nanus polled leaders using a 90-question survey. They discovered four characteristics that were universal in transformational leaders. Transformational leaders had a vision for their organization. Bennis and Nanus were social architects for their organization and were able to communicate and bring about change to their followers. They established trust by standing for what they said they believed in. Bennis and Nanus (1985) recommended leaders know their strengths instead of worrying about their weaknesses. The second set of contributors was Kouzes and Posner (1987).

Leadership Practices Inventory

Kouzes and Posner (1987) conducted their research by interviewing leaders about their ideas on leadership. They developed The *Leadership Practices Inventory* (Appendix E) that consists of five practices: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). For each of the five dimensions, Kouzes and Posner (1995) developed two commitments that provided a guide for working to achieve commendable leadership.

Challenging the Process

Commitment 1: Leaders search out challenging opportunities to change, grow, innovate, and improve (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Leaders must set examples with behaviors consistent with shared values. Principals must bring enthusiasm, confidence, and assurance to the schools they are trying to lead. Principals must find answers to problems that occur in the schools.

Principals must find challenges for their followers as well as for themselves (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

Commitment 2: Leaders experiment, take risks, and learn from their accompanying mistakes (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Leaders must experiment and allow others to experiment without risks. Kouzes and Posner pointed out that leaders must be willing to admit when they have made a mistake. They cannot be afraid to admit they were wrong. Fullan (2008) agreed saying that effective principals should practice fearlessness and other forms of risk taking.

Inspiring a Shared Vision

Commitment 1: Leaders envision an uplifting and ennobling future. Leaders must have a vision in order for their organization to grow (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). The principal must be able to see past any problems the school might be experiencing. Kouzes and Posner (1995) asserted that a leader should practice affirmations. This practice allows principals to see past the present and look to the future. Leaders sometimes fail to model the vision for their followers (Jones, 2010).

Commitment 2: Leaders enlist others in a common vision by appealing to their values, interests, hopes, and dreams (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Leaders must be able to communicate the vision they have to their followers. Gabriel (2005) claimed that an effective leader was a communicative leader. If a leader cannot communicate the vision with his or her staff, the mission may never be accomplished. Vision gives guidance and direction to all who are involved. Principals must set goals and prioritize these goals for the overall good of the organization.

Enabling Others to Act

Commitment 1: Leaders foster collaboration by promoting cooperative goals and building trust (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Leaders must encourage others to collaborate regularly. Leaders must provide opportunities for team spirit to grow. Leaders must allow teams to set goals and provide opportunities to work on achieving those goals. Principals enable others to act by allowing teachers to share in the decision-making process. Leaders must build trust in their organizations. Trust is essential in building positive relationships. People pursue, accomplish, and persevere with leaders they trust (Shelton, 2010).

Commitment 2: Leaders strengthen people by giving power away, providing choice, developing competence, assigning critical tasks, and offering visible support (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Successful delegation is vital to the organization's success for anyone who wants to be an effective leader (Lemberg, 2008). Principals should give teachers the opportunity to build a team, plan a task, and provide opportunities for them to participate in professional development. They allow teachers to succeed as leaders (Gabriel, 2005). Fullan (2008) maintained that principals must learn to give up absolute control.

Modeling the Way

Commitment 1: Leaders set examples by behaving in ways that are consistent with shared values (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Leaders set examples with behaviors dependable with common principles. Principals must bring enthusiasm, confidence, and assurance to the school personnel they are trying to lead. Principals must find answers to problems that occur in the school. Principals must find challenges for their followers as well as for themselves (Kouzes & Posner, 1995).

Commitment 2: Leaders achieve small wins that promote consistent progress and build commitment (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Leaders must experiment and allow others to experiment without risks. Kouzes and Posner alleged leaders must be willing to admit when they have made a mistake. They cannot be afraid to admit they were wrong. Leaders give others opportunities to achieve success in small increments. According to Maxwell (2002) the goal is about building solid relationships and empowering others.

Encouraging the Heart

Commitment 1: Leaders recognize individual contributions to the success of every project (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Leaders must show appreciation for their followers. Teachers often become discouraged and principals must find ways to boost their morale. Effective principals create a work environment where every individual feels valued and knows that his or her contributions are appreciated. Sanborn (2004) agreed that the quality of a relationship depends on the time invested in the relationship.

Commitment 2: Leaders celebrate team accomplishments regularly (Kouzes & Posner, 1995). Leaders must acknowledge the accomplishments of everyone in the organization. If a leader recognizes the contributions of only a few, tension will mount in the workplace (Kouzes & Posner, 1999). Effective leaders strive to create a community in the workplace. Effective leaders have "learned how to learn" (McNamara, 2009, p. 1). Being a good team leader means being a good communicator. Effective leaders build emotional character that allows the best in others to be seen (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2009). Sergiovanni (2005) asserted, "Strengthening the heartbeat of any organization is key to building a culture of leadership and learning" (p. 2).

Teacher Morale

With all the demands placed on teachers, administrators face a great challenge of helping to control teacher burnout, low morale, and stress while maintaining effective classroom teachers. According to Miller (1981) teacher morale "can have a positive effect on pupil attitudes and learning" (pp. 483-86). Miller also stated that when teacher morale is increased, an environment that is more favorable to learning is achieved. When teacher morale is increased the students the schools, and the teachers benefit. Teachers feel more excited about their jobs, and this excitement carries over into the classrooms (Lumsden, 1998). Mendel (1987) agreed that teacher morale could affect student learning. Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) found that if teachers' work environments improved, the morale of the staff increased and this seemed to increase teachers' retention. In a study on job satisfaction by the National Center for Education Statistics (1997), researchers found that "administrative support and leadership, good student behavior, a positive school atmosphere, and teacher autonomy" (p. 32) were the major factors linked to high teacher morale. Lumsden (1998) wrote that when teachers feel more empowered they tend to have a higher level of morale. When certain factors are in place teacher morale is not a problem. Teachers with students who behave most of the time, who have the support of their principal, and those who have parental support usually have high morale. The problem is teachers cannot choose the students and parents they get in a classroom each year. Principals can be a factor in raising teacher morale. Methods of communicating to students become more positive when teachers are being supported by their principal (Maehr et al., 1993). The relationship of the teacher and principal often improves if a line of communication exists between both parties. There are times when a principal must make a decision quickly and does

not have time to consult teachers or teams. However if a principal always makes decisions without allowing teachers to have any input, tension may surface in the work environment.

Stress of the job is a major issue affecting teacher morale. Kelehear (2005) explained that stress can occur in all areas of a school. The problem is not stress by itself because everyone has it; the difficulties arise when stressful conditions are not managed. This type of stress causes the situations to become detrimental and dysfunctional (Kelehear, 2005). When principals undergo stress they might allow their tension to filter over into relationships with their staff. Teachers begin to feel the stress and it affects their relationships with students. Kelehear (2005) also pointed out, "Principals must address their own stress to create a healthy school culture" (pp. 30-33).

Bentley and Rempel (1980) stated that the distress or enthusiasm that an individual displays towards the achievement of individual and group goals in any situation are what teacher morale is all about. When teachers feel overwhelmed, not supported and unappreciated, their morale tends to falter (Byham, Cox, & Shomo, 1992). The key to being an effective administrator is to help manage the morale of the staff. When teachers feel appreciated, supported, and empowered their morale will begin to increase. Relationships make the difference in any organization (Fullan, 2001).

Lundin, Paul, and Christensen (2000) stated that teachers always have a choice about the way they choose to do a job even if they cannot choose the actual work itself. Gonzalez, Brown, and Slate (2008) stated that many teachers left the profession because of low morale. In their study teachers cited that administrators did not motivate or encourage teachers but rather put them down. Tye and O'Brien (2002) reported that teachers stated poor working conditions and lack of administrative support were reasons for low morale and leaving the profession. Ngambi

(2011) found that being able to trust a leader led to job satisfaction and increases in performance. Teachers, administrators, and support staff choose each day what attitude they will bring to the job with them. Teachers and administrators can have a positive attitude and aid in building and maintaining morale.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHOD

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner (Appendix K) Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score for participants in this study, and to determine if a relationship existed between the morale of teachers and their LPI scores. The researcher sought to find if a correlation existed between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership behaviors and the principals' perceptions of their own leadership behaviors as outlined by the Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a). The researcher also studied the correlation between the teachers' leadership score for their principal, measured by the LPI, and the teacher's morale score, as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) (Appendix L). I sought to find if there was a relationship between the teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership behaviors and their principals' perceptions of their own leadership behaviors as outlined by the Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a). I also sought to determine if a relationship existed between the teachers' leadership score, measured by the LPI, and the teacher's morale score, as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO). The following demographics were collected: gender of participant, gender of principal, highest degree earned, number of years of experience, age, and if the participant had worked at other schools.

For this research I studied a school system in East Tennessee with 10 schools that houses grades kindergarten through eighth grade. These schools are classified in three categories:

kindergarten through eighth grade; third through fifth grade; and sixth through eighth grade. There are 309 teachers in the school system who teach grades kindergarten through eighth grade. I used two professional surveys, the LPI and the PTO. The leadership behavior of each principal was analyzed and compared to the perception the teachers had of their principal's leadership behaviors. I collected several different demographics across schools such as age, gender, education level, and years of experience. The complete methodology is explained in this chapter. This includes the framework of the study, the research design, the instruments used in the study, the population of the study, the data collection procedures, and the analysis of data.

Research Design

This quantitative study was conducted using a survey-design method. The surveys were distributed at faculty meetings. All teachers in the participating schools were given the opportunity to complete the surveys. Each teacher received the observer-form of the Leadership Practices Inventory and the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. Each principal received the self-form of the Leadership Practices Inventory. Each participant received a letter explaining the purpose of the study (Appendices C and D). Participants were reminded that they had the option of not participating in the study if they chose. I collected the surveys from each school by providing a large collection envelope. Surveys were placed in an envelope, and participants were instructed to seal the surveys upon completion. Each school was assigned a color and letter so I could keep track of each school's surveys.

The Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a), aided in answering these questions and determining the leadership score of the principal. Another survey, the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (Bentley & Rempel, 1980), aided in evaluating the morale of the teachers. Surveys were given to all participating teachers and principals in one East Tennessee school

system. Permission to conduct the survey was granted by the director of schools in the participating system (see Appendix A). Participants were given the option of not participating in the surveys. Permission was also obtained to use the professional surveys from Kouzes and Posner (see Appendix B). Permission was obtained from the ETSU IRB to conduct the research (Appendix J).

Population

The population of this study involved 10 principals and 208 teachers in one East Tennessee school system. Each principal granted me permission to conduct the study before distribution of the surveys. Each of the 10 participating schools had a full-time principal. All teachers in each school were given the opportunity to participate in the study. Each teacher received a survey with instructions for completing and returning the survey.

Instrumentation

The LPI has two surveys. One survey is the observer form (Appendix E) and was completed by the teachers. The second LPI is the self-form (see Appendix F) and was completed by each principal. The LPI (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a) was used to determine teachers' perceptions about their principals and the leadership score of the principal. The LPI was developed by Kouzes and Posner and is currently in its third edition (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a). The LPI has been used for 18 years for data collection and includes 4,000 studies with approximately 200,000 surveys (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a). Bentley and Rempel (1980) developed the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO). This survey was used to measure morale of the teachers (see Appendix G). The surveys were sent out on paper. The surveys included some demographic questions that were designed by the researcher.

The LPI contained 30 questions. The questions were set up on a 10-point Likert-type scale. The answer choices ranged from “1” (almost never) to “10” (always) (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a). The questions covered five areas that define exemplary leadership: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart (Kouzes & Posner, 2003b).

1. Model the way refers to how someone leads by example.
2. Inspire a shared vision determines if the leader can visualize where the organization is going and if he or she can convince others of that vision.
3. Challenge the process identifies if the leader is finding new and innovative ways to improve the organization.
4. Enabling others to act is allowing all members to do their part and feel as if they have a part in the organization.
5. Encourage the heart refers to how a leader celebrates the accomplishments of the organization or individuals (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a).

The observer form of the LPI was used also in this research for principals. The LPI was tested through examination of internal reliability and all five leadership practices have revealed strong internal reliability. Test and retest reliability were high (Kouzes & Posner, 2003a).

Permission to use this survey was obtained from Kouzes (see Appendix B).

The Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (see Appendix G) contained 100 questions. The answer choices ranged from “1” (agree) to “4” disagree. The questions covered 10 areas that address teacher morale: rapport with principal, satisfaction with teaching, rapport among teachers, teacher salary, teacher load, curricular issues, teacher status, community support for education, school facilities and services, and community pressures (Bentley & Rempel, 1980). Reliability was established by a test-retest (Bentley & Rempel, 1980). Permission to use the PTO survey was not necessary because it was in the public domain.

Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

1. Are there significant differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner Leadership Practices Inventory (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a kindergarten to eighth grade configuration?

Ho₁₁: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Model the Way dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a kindergarten- to eighth-grade configuration.

Ho₁₂: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a kindergarten- to eighth-grade configuration.

Ho₁₃: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Challenge the Process dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a kindergarten- to eighth-grade configuration.

Ho₁₄: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a kindergarten- to eighth-grade configuration.

Ho₁₅: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a kindergarten- to eighth- grade configuration.

2. Are there significant differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner Leadership Practices Inventory (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process,

Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a third- to fifth-grade configuration?

Ho2₁: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Model the Way dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in this study in schools with a third- to fifth-grade configuration.

Ho2₂: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a third- to fifth-grade configuration.

Ho2₃: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Challenge the Process dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's scores in schools with a third- to fifth-grade configuration.

Ho2₄: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a third- to fifth-grade configuration.

Ho2₅: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a third- to fifth-grade configuration.

3. Are there significant differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner Leadership Practices Inventory (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a sixth- to eighth-grade configuration?

Ho3₁: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Model the Way dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a sixth- to eighth-grade configuration.

Ho3₂: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a sixth- to eighth-grade configuration.

Ho3₃: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Challenge the Process dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a sixth- to eighth-grade configuration.

Ho3₄: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a sixth- to eighth-grade configuration.

Ho3₅: There is no significant difference in mean scores on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the Kouzes-Posner LPI between teachers' scores and their principal's score in schools with a sixth- to eighth-grade configuration.

4. Is there a relationship between teachers' LPI scores (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) and teachers' Purdue Teachers Opinionnaire (PTO) scores?

Ho4₁: There is no relationship between teachers' LPI scores on the Model the Way dimension and teachers' PTO scores.

Ho4₂: There is no relationship between teachers' LPI scores on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension and teachers' PTO scores.

Ho4₃: There is no relationship between teachers' LPI scores on the Challenge the Process dimension and teachers' PTO scores.

Ho4₄: There is no relationship between teachers' LPI scores on the Enable Others to Act dimension and teachers' PTO scores.

Ho4₅: There is no relationship between teachers' LPI scores on the Encourage the Heart dimension and teachers' PTO scores.

Data Collection Procedures

Before conducting this study approval was obtained from the East Tennessee State University Institutional Review Board (see Appendix A), the director of the participating school system (see Appendix B), and the principal of each participating school (see Appendix C). A list of principals and teachers for each participating school was obtained from the director of schools in the participating system.

A letter of explanation letter (see Appendices D) was provided to each participant that described the purpose of the study and how the results would be reported. The letter asked for participation from each teacher and principal. The letter also included a confidentiality statement guaranteeing that participants, schools, and principals would not be identified and that all survey responses would be kept anonymous. The explanation letter also noted that participation in this study was voluntary.

The surveys were distributed during meetings. Each school had a packet of surveys in a large envelope. Each teacher was given a letter-sized envelope that contained the surveys, a demographic page, (see Appendices H & I) and an explanation letter. The teachers were instructed to place their surveys in the envelope and seal it when they were finished. This was to help ensure confidentiality. The surveys were labeled with each school's code number for research purposes. No names were included on the envelopes to protect the anonymity of the participants. The participating schools were assigned a code. The sealed surveys were held until the researcher collected them from each school.

Data Analysis

The data for this study were analyzed using IBM-SPSS. The data came from answers based on two surveys, the Leadership Practices Inventory and the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze the differences between the variables identified in the survey. To analyze the research questions, a one-sample t test was used to compare the teachers' perceptions to their principals' perceptions on the LPI scores for research questions 1, 2, and 3. A Pearson r correlation coefficient was used to analyze research question 4. All statistical tests were conducted using an alpha level of .05.

Summary

This was a quantitative study to determine if there were differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner Leadership Practices Inventory (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score for schools participating in this study and to study if the morale of a teacher was related to his or her principal's leadership score. This chapter explained the methodology used in this research study, addressed the type of study conducted, and outlined the procedures of the study. A description of the population was presented. Chapter 4 presents the results of the data analysis from this study in full detail. Chapter 5 presents the summary of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner (Appendix E) *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) (model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score for participants in this study, and to determine if a relationship existed between the Teachers' Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) scores and their LPI scores. The data analyses are presented in this chapter. This study was conducted in one East Tennessee school system. Participating teachers taught in grades 3-5, 6-8, or K-8 schools. This study involved 10 principals and 309 teachers. Of the 309 teachers provided the opportunity to participate, 208 returned useable surveys for a return rate of 67%.

The 208 participating teachers had a mean of 13.0 years of experience. There were 169 female participants and 39 male participants. Of the 10 principals participating, four were male and six were female. Thirty of the teachers held a bachelor's degree; 72 held a master's degree; 102 held an educational specialist degree; and 4 held a doctoral degree. The teachers ranged in age from 24 to 69 years, with a mean age of 29.0 years. Ninety-seven of the teachers had taught at another school, while 111 had taught exclusively at their current school. Table 1 presents the demographics of the participants.

Table 1

Participants

Number	Demographic
	<u>Degree</u>
30	Bachelor
72	Master's
102	Ed.S.
4	Ed.D./Ph.D.
	<u>Gender</u>
39	Male Teachers
169	Female Teachers
4	Male Principals
6	Female Principals
	<u>Work History</u>
97	Taught at school other than current school – Yes
111	Taught at school other than current school – No

Research Questions

A one-sample *t*-test was used to compare the teachers' scores to their principal's score on the *LPI* for research questions 1, 2, 3, and 5. A Pearson *r* correlation coefficient was used to analyze the relationship between teachers' PTO and *LPI* scores for research question 4. All statistical tests were conducted using an alpha level of .05.

Research Question 1: Are there significant differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision,

Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score for the six schools with a kindergarten to eighth grade configuration?

H₀₁: There are no significant differences on the Model the Way dimension of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for six schools in the kindergarten to eighth grade configuration (Schools 1-6).

A one-sample *t*-test was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 1 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Model the Way score of 50. The teachers' mean score of 43.89 (SD = 10.61) was significantly different from 50, $t(18) = 2.45$, $p = .026$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 38.62 to 49.17. The effect size *d* of 0.58 indicates a medium effect. For School 2 the principal's Model the Way score was 39. The teachers' mean score of 46.40 (SD = 9.72) was significantly different from 39, $t(15) = 2.95$, $p = .011$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 41.02 to 51.78. The effect size *d* of -0.76 indicates a medium effect. For School 3 the principal's Model the Way score was 50. The teachers' mean score of 51.52 (SD = 8.10) was not significantly different from 50, $t(25) = .94$, $p = .358$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 48.18 to 54.86. The effect size *d* of .19 indicates a small effect. For School 4 the principal's Model the Way score was 10. The teachers' mean score of 41.70 (SD = 13.63) was significantly different from 10, $t(30) = 12.75$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 36.61 to 46.79. The effect size *d* of -2.33 indicates a large effect. For School 5 the principal's Model the Way score was 57. The teachers' mean score of 49.05 (SD = 10.89) was significantly different from 57, $t(19) = 3.18$, $p = .005$. The 95%

confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 43.80 to 54.30. The effect size d of .73 indicates a medium effect. For School 6 the principal's Model the Way score was 9. The teachers' mean score of 45.73 ($SD = 12.55$) was significantly different from 9, $t(11) = 9.71$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.30 to 54.16. The effect size d of -2.93 indicates a large effect. Null hypothesis H_{01} is rejected for schools 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, but retained for school 3. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI for schools 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, but not for school 3.

H_{02} : There are no significant differences on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for six schools in the kindergarten to eighth grade configuration (Schools 1-6).

A one-sample t -test was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 1 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Inspire a Shared Vision score of 58. The teacher's mean score of 43.94 ($SD = 12.20$) was significantly different from 58, $t(18) = 4.89$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.87 to 50.01. The effect size d of 1.15 indicates a large effect. For School 2 the principal's Inspire a Shared Vision score was 42. The teachers' mean score of 47.60 ($SD = 10.54$) was not significantly different from 42, $t(15) = 2.06$, $p = .059$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 41.76 to 53.44. The effect size d of -0.53 indicates a medium effect. For School 3 the Principal's mean Inspire a Shared Vision score was

58. The teachers' mean score of 51.80 (SD = 7.38) was significantly different from 58, $t(25) = 4.20$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 48.75 to 54.84. The effect size d of 0.84 indicates a large effect. For School 4 the principal's Inspire a Shared Vision score was 50. The teachers' mean score of 42.77 (SD = 13.50) was significantly different from 50, $t(30) = 2.93$, $p = .006$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.72 to 47.81. The effect size d of 0.54 indicates a large effect. For School 5 the principal's Inspire a Shared Vision score was 60. The teachers' mean score of 49.00 (SD = 13.30) was significantly different from 60, $t(19) = 3.61$, $p = .002$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 42.59 to 55.41. The effect size d of .83 indicates a large effect. For School 6 the Principal's mean Inspire a Shared Vision score was 39. The teachers' mean score of 46.00 (SD = 13.32) was not significantly different from 39, $t(11) = 1.74$, $p = .112$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.05 to 54.95. The effect size d of -.53 indicates a medium effect. Null hypothesis H_{012} is rejected for schools 1, 3, 4, and 5 and retained for schools 2 and 6. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI for schools 1, 3, 4, and 5 and there is not a significant difference for schools 2 and 6.

H_{013} : There are no significant differences on the Challenge the Process dimension of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for six schools in the kindergarten to eighth grade configuration (Schools 1-6).

A one-sample t -test was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 1 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's

Challenge the Process score of 57. The teachers' mean score of 45.72 (SD = 10.02) was significantly different from 57, $t(18) = 4.78$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 40.74 to 50.70. The effect size d of 1.13 indicates a large effect. For School 2 the principal's Challenge the Process score was 39. The teachers' mean score of 45.93 (SD = 12.19) was significantly different from 39, $t(15) = 2.20$, $p = .045$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 39.18 to 52.68. The effect size d of -0.57 indicates a medium effect. For School 3 the Principal's Challenge the Process score was 57. The teachers' mean score of 50.12 (SD = 10.17) was significantly different from 57, $t(25) = 3.38$, $p = .002$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 45.92 to 54.32. The effect size d of 0.68 indicates a medium effect. For School 4 the principal's Challenge the Process score was 58. The teachers' mean score of 42.23 (SD = 13.47) was significantly different from 58, $t(30) = 6.41$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.20 to 47.26. The effect size d of 1.17 indicates a large effect. For School 5 the principal's Challenge the Process score was 60. The teachers' mean score of 48.58 (SD = 12.74) was significantly different from 60, $t(19) = 3.99$, $p = .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 42.44 to 54.72. The effect size d of 0.90 indicates a large effect. For School 6 the principal's Challenge the Process score was 36. The teachers' mean score of 45.73 (SD = 13.02) was significantly different from 36, $t(11) = 2.48$, $p = .033$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 36.98 to 54.48. The effect size d of -0.75 indicates a medium effect. Null hypothesis H_0 is rejected for the six kindergarten to eighth grade schools (Schools 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, & 6). The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI for all six schools.

Ho1₄: There are no significant differences on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for six schools in the kindergarten to eighth grade configuration Schools 1-6).

A one-sample *t*-test was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 1 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Enable Others to Act score of 58. The teachers' mean score of 47.78 (SD = 8.43) was significantly different from 58, $t(18) = 5.15$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 43.59 to 51.97. The effect size *d* of 1.21 indicates a large effect. For School 2 the principal's Enable Others to Act score was 34. The teachers' mean score of 47.53 (SD = 12.39) was significantly different from 34, $t(15) = 4.23$, $p = .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 40.67 to 54.39. The effect size *d* of -0.93 indicates a large effect. For School 3 the principal's Enable Others to Act score was 58. The teachers' mean score of 51.16 (SD = 11.10) was significantly different from 58, $t(25) = 3.08$, $p = .005$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 46.58 to 55.74. The effect size *d* of 0.62 indicates a medium effect. For School 4 the principal's Model the Way score was 57. The teachers' mean score of 43 (SD = 13.94) was significantly different from 57, $t(30) = 5.50$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.80 to 48.21. The effect size *d* of 1.00 indicates a large effect. For School 5 the principal's Enable Others to Act score was 58. The teachers' mean score of 46.79 (SD = 12.95) was significantly different from 58, $t(19) = 3.77$, $p = .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 40.55 to 53.03. The effect size *d* of 0.87 indicates a large effect. For School 6 the principal's Enable

Others to Act score was 32. The teachers' mean score of 46.82 (SD = 13.78) was significantly different from 32, $t(11) = 3.57$, $p = .005$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.56 to 56.07. The effect size d of -1.08 indicates a large effect. Null hypothesis H_{014} is rejected for the six kindergarten to eighth grade schools. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI for all six kindergarten to eighth grade schools.

H_{015} : There are no significant differences on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for six schools in the kindergarten to eighth grade configuration Schools 1-6).

A one-sample t -test was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 1 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Encourage the Heart score of 57. The teachers' mean score of 45.83 (SD = 11.92) was significantly different from 57, $t(18) = 3.98$, $p = .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 39.90 to 51.76. The effect size d of 0.94 indicates a large effect. For School 2 the principal's Encourage the Heart score was 27. The teachers' mean score of 45.47 (SD = 13.96) was significantly different from 27, $t(15) = 5.12$, $p \hat{=} .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.74 to 53.20. The effect size d of -1.32 indicates a large effect. For School 3 the principal's Encourage the Heart score was 57. The teachers' mean score of 49.84 (SD = 13.57) was significantly different from 57, $t(25) = 2.64$, $p = .014$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 44.24 to 55.44. The effect size d of 0.53

indicates a medium effect. For School 4 the principal's Encourage the Heart score was 58. The teachers' mean score of 43.30 (SD = 14.24) was significantly different from 58, $t(30) = 5.65$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.98 to 48.62. The effect size d of 1.03 indicates a large effect. For School 5 the principal's Encourage the Heart score was 58. The teachers' mean score of 42.95 (SD = 14.11) was significantly different from 58, $t(19) = 4.65$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 36.15 to 49.75. The effect size d of 1.07 indicates a large effect. For School 6 the principal's Encourage the Heart score was 44. The teachers' mean score of 46.45 (SD = 13.95) was not significantly different from 44, $t(11) = .58$, $p = .573$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.08 to 55.82. The effect size d of -0.18 indicates a small effect. Null hypothesis H_{015} is rejected for the schools 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but retained for school 6. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI for kindergarten to eighth grade schools 1-5, but not school 6.

Research Question 2: Are there significant differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score for the two schools with a third to fifth grade configuration?

H_{021} : There are no significant differences on the Model the Way dimension of the

Kouzes- Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their

principal's score for two schools in the third through fifth grade configuration (Schools 7-8).

A one-sample *t*-test was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 7 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Model the Way score of 47. The teachers' mean score of 54.33 (SD = 4.41) was significantly different from 47, $t(18) = 7.54$, $p \hat{=} .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 52.14 to 56.52. The effect size *d* of -1.66 indicates a large effect. For School 8 the principal's Model the Way score was 49. The teachers' mean score of 32.94 (SD = 13.60) was significantly different from 49, $t(33) = 6.78$, $p \hat{=} .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 28.12 to 37.76. The effect size *d* of 1.18 indicates a large effect. Null hypothesis H_{02_1} is rejected for the third through fifth grade schools. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI for both third through fifth schools.

H_{02_2} : There are no significant differences on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for two schools in the third through fifth grade configuration (Schools 7-8).

A one-sample *t*-test was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 7 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Inspired a Shared Vision score of 55. The teachers' mean score of 54.28 (SD = 4.64) was not significantly different from 55, $t(18) = 0.66$, $p = .518$. The 95% confidence interval for

the LPI mean ranged from 51.97 to 56.59. The effect size d of 0.16 indicates a small effect. For School 8 the principal's Inspire a Shared Vision score was 48. The teachers' mean score of 35.27 ($SD = 13.93$) was significantly different from 48, $t(33) = 5.25$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 30.33 to 40.21. The effect size d of 0.91 indicates a large effect. Null hypothesis H_{02} is rejected for school 8, but retained for school 7. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI for school 8, but there is not a significant difference for school 7.

H_{03} : There are no significant differences on the Challenge the Process dimension of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for two schools in the third through fifth grade configuration (Schools 7-8).

A one-sample t -test was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 7 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Challenge the Process score of 59. The teachers' mean score of 53.67 ($SD = 5.26$) was significantly different from 59, $t(18) = 4.30$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 51.05 to 56.29. The effect size d of 1.01 indicates a large effect. For School 8 the principal's Challenge the Process score was 44. The teachers' mean score of 34.85 ($SD = 13.30$) was significantly different from 44, $t(33) = 3.95$, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 30.13 to 39.57. The effect size d of 0.69 indicates a medium effect. Null hypothesis H_{03} is rejected for the third through fifth grade schools. The results

support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI for 3-5 schools.

Ho₂₄: There are no significant differences on the Enable Others to Act dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for two schools in the third through fifth grade configuration (Schools 7-8).

A one-sample *t*-test was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 7 to determine if their mean was not significantly different from their principal's Enable Others to Act score of 55. The teachers' mean score of 54.72 (SD = 3.86) was not significantly different from 55, $t(18) = .31$, $p = .764$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 52.80 to 56.64. The effect size *d* of 0.07 indicates a medium effect. For School 8 the principal's Enable Others to Act score was 41. The teachers' mean score of 33.15 (SD = 14.21) was significantly different from 41, $t(33) = 3.17$, $p = .003$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 28.11 to 38.19. The effect size *d* of 0.55 indicates a medium effect. Null hypothesis Ho₂₄ is rejected for school 8, but retained for school 7. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI for school 8, but not school 7.

Ho₂₅: There are no significant differences on the Encourage the Heart dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for two schools in the third through fifth grade configuration (Schools 7-8).

A one-sample *t*-test was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 7 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Encourage the Heart score of 57. The teachers' mean score of 55.28 (SD = 5.62) was not significantly different from 57, $t(18) = 1.30$, $p = .211$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 52.49 to 58.07. The effect size *d* of 0.31 indicates a small effect. For School 8 the principal's Encourage the Heart score was 41. The teachers' mean score of 31.26 (SD = 15.31) was significantly different from 41, $t(33) = 3.17$, $p = .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 25.83 to 36.69. The effect size *d* of 0.64 indicates a medium effect. Null hypothesis H_{025} is rejected for school 8, but retained for school 7. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI for school 8, but not school 7.

Research Question 3: Are there significant differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score for the two schools with a sixth through eighth grade configuration?

H_{031} : There are no significant differences on the Model the Way dimension of the

Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for two schools in the sixth through eighth grade configuration (Schools 9-10).

A one-sample *t*-test was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 9 to determine if their mean was not significantly different from their principal's score of 45. The teachers' mean score of 43.06 (SD = 8.03) was not significantly different from, $t(17) = 18.52, p = <.001$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 38.93 to 47.19. The effect size *d* of .24 indicates a small effect. For School 10 the principal's Model the Way score was 57. The teachers' mean score of 46.13 (SD = 10.34) was significantly different from 57, $t(15) = 3.22, p = .005$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 40.40 to 51.86. The effect size *d* of 1.05 indicates a large effect. Null hypothesis H_{03_1} is rejected for school 10, but retained for school 9. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI for school 10, but there is not a significant difference for school 9.

H_{03_2} : There are no significant differences on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for two schools in the sixth through eighth grade configuration (Schools 9-10).

A one-sample *t*-test was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 9 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Inspire a Shared Vision score of 45. The teachers' mean score of 43.00 (SD = 10.61) was significantly different from 45, $t(17) = -.777, p = .448$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 37.54 to 48.46. The effect size *d* of 0.19 indicates a small effect. For

School 10 the principal's Inspire a Shared Vision score was 57. The teachers' mean score of 47.73 (SD=11.17) was significantly different from 55, $t(15) = -3.31$, $p = .006$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 41.54 to 53.92. The effect size d of .86 indicates a large effect. Null hypothesis H_{03_2} is rejected for both sixth through eighth grade schools. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension for both of the 6-8 schools.

H_{03_3} : There are no significant differences on the Challenge the Process dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for two schools in the sixth through eighth grade configuration (Schools 9-10).

A one-sample t -test was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 9 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Challenge the Process score of 46. The teachers' mean score of 44.29 (SD = 6.31) was not significantly different from 46, $t(17) = 1.11$, $p = .282$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 41.05 to 47.83. The effect size d of 0.27 indicates a small effect. For School 10 the principal's Challenge the Process score was 48. The teachers' mean score of 45.93 (SD = 12.24) was not significantly different from 48, $t(15) = .65$, $p = .524$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 39.15 to 52.71. The effect size d of 0.17 indicates a small effect. Null hypothesis H_{03_3} is retained for both sixth through eighth grade schools. The results

support the conclusion that there is a not a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Challenge the Process dimension for both of the 6-8 schools.

Ho3₄: There are no significant differences on the Enable Others to Act dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for two schools in the sixth through eighth grade configuration (Schools 9-10).

A one-sample *t*-test was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 9 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Enable Others to Act score of 47. The teachers' mean score of 46.35 (SD = 5.92) was not significantly different from 47, $t(17) = .45$, $p = .658$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 43.31 to 49.39. The effect size *d* of 0.11 indicates a small effect. For School 10 the principal's Enable Others to Act score was 56. The teachers' mean score of 45.87 (SD = 11.29) was significantly different from 56, $t(15) = 3.48$, $p = .004$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 39.62 to 52.12. The effect size *d* of 0.90 indicates a large effect. Null hypothesis Ho3₄ is retained for school 9, but rejected for school 10. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension for school 10, but not school 9.

Ho3₅: There are no significant differences on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* between teachers' scores and their principal's score for two schools in the sixth through eighth grade configuration (Schools 9-10).

A one-sample *t*-test was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI for teachers in School 9 to determine if their mean was significantly different from their principal's Encourage the Heart score of 46. The teachers' mean score of 43.94 (SD = 7.79) was not significantly different from 46, $t(17) = 1.09$, $p = .292$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 39.93 to 47.95. The effect size *d* of 0.26 indicates a small effect. For School 10 the principal's Encourage the Heart score was 55. The teachers' mean score of 46.07 (SD = 11.70) was significantly different from 55, $t(15) = 2.96$, $p = .010$. The 95% confidence interval for the LPI mean ranged from 39.59 to 52.55. The effect size *d* of 0.76 indicates a medium effect. Null hypothesis H_{035} is rejected for school 10, but retained for school 9. The results support the conclusion that there is a significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Encourage the Heart dimension for school 10, but not school 9.

Research Question 4: Is there a significant relationship between teachers' LPI scores (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart) and their PTO scores?

H_{041} : There is not a significant relationship between teachers' LPI scores on the Model the Way dimension and their PTO scores.

A Pearson *r* correlation coefficient was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 1 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(18) = -.04$, $p = .890$. The data show there is a weak negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the

Model the Way dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 2 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(15) = -.412$, $p = .127$. The data show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 3 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(25) = -.544$, $p = .005$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 4 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(30) = -.707$, $p \hat{=} .001$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 5 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(19) = -.753$, $p \hat{=} .001$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 6 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(11) = -.826$, $p = .003$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and the PTO for teachers in School 7 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(18) = -.559$, $p = .016$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 8 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(33) = -.363$, $p = .038$. The data show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted

on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 9 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(17) = -.081$, $p = .792$. The data show there is a weak negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 10 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(15) = -.099$, $p = .737$. The data show there is a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The relationship between teachers' scores on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and their PTO scores was significant for schools 3-8 and not significant for schools 1, 2, 9, and 10.

Ho₄₂: There is no relationship between teachers' LPI scores on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension and their PTO scores.

A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 1 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(18) = -.084$, $p = .775$. The data show there is a weak negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 2 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(15) = -.371$, $p = .174$. The data show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 3 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(25) = -.528$, $p = .007$. The data show there is a strong positive relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision

dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 4 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(30) = -.709$, $p = .001$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 5 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(19) = -.604$, $p = .006$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 6 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(11) = -.713$, $p = .021$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 7 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(18) = -.708$, $p = .001$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 8 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(33) = -.31$, $p = .076$. The data show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 9 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(17) = -.427$, $p = .145$. The data show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 10 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(15) = -.145$, $p = .620$. The data

show there is a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The relationship between teachers' scores on the Inspired a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and their PTO scores was significant for schools 3-7 and not significant for schools 1, 2, 8, 9, and 10.

Ho4₃: There is no relationship between teachers' LPI scores on the Challenge the Process dimension and their PTO scores.

A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 1 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(18) = -.060$, $p = .839$. The data show there is a weak negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 2 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(15) = -.369$, $p = .176$. The data show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 3 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(25) = -.555$, $p = .004$. The data show there is a strong positive relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 4 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(30) = -.670$, $p \hat{=} .001$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 5 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(19) = -.693$, $p = .001$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A

Pearson correlation was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 6 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(11) = -.727$, $p = .017$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and the PTO for teachers in School 7 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(18) = -.537$, $p = .022$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 8 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(33) = -.304$, $p = .086$. The data show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 9 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(17) = -.398$, $p = .178$. The data show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 10 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(15) = -.108$, $p = .713$. The data show there is weak negative relationship between the two variables. The relationship between teachers' scores on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and their PTO scores was significant for schools 3-7 and not significant for schools 1, 2, 8, 9, and 10.

Ho₄: There is no relationship between teachers' LPI scores on the Enable Others to Act dimension and their PTO scores.

A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 1 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(18) = .033$, $p = .910$. The data show there is a weak positive relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 2 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(15) = -.280$, $p = .313$. The data show there is a weak negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 3 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(25) = -.514$, $p = .007$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 4 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(30) = .708$, $p < .001$. The data show there is a strong positive relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 5 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(19) = -.794$, $p < .001$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and the PTO for teachers in School 6 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(11) = -.769$, $p = .009$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 7 to determine if there was a significant relationship between

the two variables, $r(18) = -.610$, $p = .007$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 8 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(33) = -.421$, $p = .015$. The data show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 9 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(17) = .021$, $p = .947$. The data show there is a weak positive relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 10 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(15) = -.031$, $p = .917$. The data show there is a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The relationship between teachers' scores on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and their PTO scores was significant for schools 3-8 and not significant for schools 1, 2, 9, and 10.

Ho4₅: There is no relationship between teachers' LPI scores on the Encourage the Heart dimension and their PTO scores.

A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and the PTO for teachers in School 1 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(18) = .017$, $p = .954$. The data show there is a weak positive relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 2 to determine if there was significant relationship between the two variables, $r(15) = -.332$, $p = .227$. The data

show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 3 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(25) = -.538, p = .006$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables.

A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and the PTO for teachers in School 4 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(30) = -.708, p \hat{=} .001$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 5 to determine if there was a significant

relationship between the two variables, $r(19) = -.808, p \hat{=} .001$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and the PTO for teachers in School 6 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(11) = -.690, p = .027$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 7 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(18) = -.618, p = .006$. The data show there is a strong negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 8 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(33) = -.447, p = .008$. The data show there is a moderate negative relationship between the two variables.

A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 9 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(17) = -.094$, $p = .760$. The data show there is a weak negative relationship between the two variables. A Pearson correlation was conducted on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and the PTO scores for teachers in School 10 to determine if there was a significant relationship between the two variables, $r(15) = -.139$, $p = .637$. The data show there is a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The relationship between teachers' scores on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and their PTO scores was significant for schools 3-8 and not significant for schools 1, 2, 9, and 10.

Chapter 5 provides the summary of all the findings and conclusions for this research. Also, recommendations for further research and recommendations for practice are provided in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences on the five dimensions of the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* (LPI) (model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart) between teachers' scores and their principal's score for participants in this study and to determine if a relationship existed between teachers' Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) scores and their LPI scores. Two surveys were used to conduct the research. The PTO (Bentley & Rempel, 1980) was used to measure the teachers' perceptions of their work environment. The Leadership Practices Inventory (Kouzes, & Posner, 2003) was used to measure the leadership practices of principals. This study was conducted in an East Tennessee school system, and it involved 10 principals and 208 teachers. Participating teachers taught in grades 3-5, 6-8, or K-8 schools.

The daily function and routine of a school has many complex parts and it involves people in different jobs. Principals play many roles in the overall daily function of a school setting. Principals are ultimately responsible for all that goes on in their buildings. Not only do principals deal with students and their issues and concerns, they must take on a greater challenge, professional relationship with their teachers (Young, 1998). When teachers have low morale consistently, they begin to detach themselves from their students, colleagues, and job (Young, 1998). Pillay (2010) described morale as the spirit of a person or group as shown by confidence, cheerfulness, discipline, and performance of assigned tasks. When morale is high, productivity generally increases. Collaboration seems to be one of the biggest contributing factors in increasing teacher morale from their principals (Thomas, 1997). Andrews, Parks, and Nelson (1985) found high morale levels were evident in schools where the principal had characteristics of being a good listener and being accessible to hear issues and concerns. Dunaway (2007)

stated that before leaders can lead or inspire others, they must first understand their own knowledge and beliefs about leadership in any organization. According to Dunaway principals should teach leadership skills to those they are trying to lead, and it is critical that the principal conveys the mission, the beliefs, and the values of the school to all stakeholders involved.

Summary of findings

Principals and teachers play a critical role in the educational process of each school. Increasing demands are placed on administrators and teachers to meet the rigorous curriculum that each state is mandating. Principals and teachers are becoming more accountable for their students' test scores. The PTO produced an overall score and the LPI had 5 dimensions (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart). There were six schools in the kindergarten through eighth grade configuration, two schools in the third through fifth grade configuration, and two schools in sixth grade through eighth grade configuration.

For the Model the Way dimension of the LPI survey the null hypothesis was rejected for schools 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 but was retained for school 3. For schools 1 - 2, and 4 - 10 there was a statistically significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI. Table 2 displays all the summary information for the Model the Way dimension.

Table 2

Model the Way Summary

School	N	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Principal's LPI Score	Teachers' LPI Mean	Difference Score
1 (K-8)	18	2.45	.026	50	43.89	6.11
2 (K-8)	15	2.95	.011	39	46.40	-7.40
3 (K-8)	25	.94	.358	50	51.52	-1.52
4 (K-8)	30	12.75	Â001	10	41.70	-31.70
5 (K-8)	19	3.18	.005	57	49.05	7.95
6 (K-8)	11	9.71	Â001	9	45.73	-36.73
7 (3-5)	18	7.54	Â001	47	54.33	-7.33
8 (3-5)	33	6.78	Â001	49	32.94	16.06
9 (6-8)	17	18.52	Â001	45	43.06	-36.06
10 (6-8)	15	3.32	.005	57	46.13	8.87

For the Inspire A Shared Vision dimension of the LPI, the null hypothesis was rejected for schools 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 10, but was retained for schools 2, 6, 7, and 9. For schools 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 10, there was a statistically significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on this dimension on the LPI. Table 3 displays the summary information for the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension.

Table 3

Inspire A Shared Vision Summary

School	N	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Principal's LPI Score	Teachers' LPI Mean	Difference Score
1 (K-8)	18	4.89	Â001	58	43.94	14.06
2 (K-8)	15	2.06	.059	42	47.60	-5.60
3 (K-8)	25	4.20	Â001	58	51.80	6.20
4 (K-8)	30	2.93	.006	50	42.77	7.23
5 (K-8)	19	3.61	.002	60	49	11.00
6 (K-8)	11	1.74	.112	39	46	-7.00
7 (3-5)	18	0.66	.518	55	54.28	0.72
8 (3-5)	33	5.25	Â001	48	35.27	12.73
9 (6-8)	17	-0.77	.448	45	43	2.00
10 (6-8)	15	-3.21	.006	57	47.73	9.27

For the LPI dimension, Challenge the Process the null hypothesis was rejected for schools 1 - 8 and retained for school 9 - 10. For schools 1-8 there was a statistically significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI. Table 4 displays the summary information for the Challenge the Process dimension.

Table 4

Challenge the Process Summary

School	N	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Principal's LPI Score	Teachers' LPI Mean	Difference Score
1 (K-8)	18	4.78	Â001	57	45.72	11.28
2 (K-8)	15	2.20	.045	39	45.93	-6.93
3 (K-8)	25	3.38	.002	57	50.12	6.88
4 (K-8)	30	6.41	Â001	58	42.23	15.77
5 (K-8)	19	3.99	.001	60	48.58	11.42
6 (K-8)	11	2.48	.033	36	45.73	-9.73
7 (3-5)	18	4.30	Â001	59	53.67	5.33
8 (3-5)	33	3.95	Â001	44	34.85	9.15
9 (6-8)	17	1.11	.282	46	44.29	1.71
10 (6-8)	15	0.65	.524	48	45.93	2.07

For the LPI dimension, Enable Others to Act, the null hypothesis was rejected for schools 1 - 6 and 8 - 10, but was retained for school 7. For schools 1 - 6 and 8 - 10 there was a statistically significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI. Table 5 displays the summary information for the Enable Others to Act dimension.

Table 5

Enable Others to Act Summary

School	N	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Principal's LPI Score	Teachers' LPI Mean	Difference Score
1 (K-8)	18	5.15	Â001	58	47.78	10.22
2 (K-8)	15	4.23	.001	34	47.53	-13.53
3 (K-8)	25	3.08	.005	58	51.16	6.84
4 (K-8)	30	5.50	Â001	57	43	14.00
5 (K-8)	19	3.77	.001	58	46.79	11.21
6 (K-8)	11	3.57	.005	32	46.82	-14.82
7 (3-5)	18	0.31	.764	55	54.72	0.28
8 (3-5)	33	3.17	.003	41	33.15	7.85
9 (6-8)	17	0.45	.658	47	46.35	0.65
10 (6-8)	15	3.48	.004	56	45.87	10.13

For the Encourage the Heart of the LPI dimension, the null hypothesis was rejected for schools 1 - 5, 8, and 10, but was retained for schools 6, 7, and 9. For schools 1 - 5, 8, and school 10, there was a statistically significant difference between teachers' scores and their principal's score on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI. Table 6 displays the summary information for the Encourage the Heart dimension.

Table 6

Encourage the Heart Summary

School	N	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Principal's LPI Score	Teachers' LPI Mean	Difference Score
1 (K-8)	18	3.98	.001	57	45.83	11.17
2 (K-8)	15	5.12	Â.001	27	45.47	-18.47
3 (K-8)	25	2.64	.014	57	49.84	7.16
4 (K-8)	30	5.65	Â.001	58	43.30	14.70
5 (K-8)	19	4.65	Â.001	58	42.95	15.05
6 (K-8)	11	0.58	.573	44	46.45	-2.45
7 (3-5)	18	1.30	.211	57	55.28	1.72
8 (3-5)	33	3.17	.001	41	31.26	9.74
9 (6-8)	17	-1.09	.292	46	43.94	2.06
10 (6-8)	15	2.96	.010	55	46.07	8.93

The Pearson correlation coefficients were all positive for the relationship between the PTO scores and the scores on the Model the Way dimension of the LPI and displayed a range of .054 to .826. The null hypothesis was rejected for schools 3 - 7 and retained for school 1 - 2 and 8 - 10. Six of the 10 schools produced a statistically significant relationship. Table 7 displays the summary information for this analysis.

Table 7

Relationship of Teacher's LPI (Model the Way) Scores to Teachers' PTO Scores

School	N	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	Teacher's LPI Mean Score	Teachers' PTO Mean
1 (K-8)	18	-.041	.890	43.89	1.66
2 (K-8)	15	-.412	.127	46.40	2.28
3 (K-8)	25	-.544	.005	51.52	2.16
4 (K-8)	30	-.707	Â001	41.70	2.19
5 (K-8)	19	-.753	Â001	49.05	2.16
6 (K-8)	11	-.826	.003	45.73	1.83
7 (3-5)	18	-.559	.016	54.83	2.08
8 (3-5)	33	-.363	.038	32.94	2.30
9 (6-8)	17	-.081	.792	43.06	1.66
10 (6-8)	15	-.099	.737	46.13	1.99

The Pearson correlation coefficients were all positive for the relationship between the PTO scores and the scores on the Inspire a Shared Vision dimension of the LPI and displayed a range of .084 to .713. The null hypothesis was rejected for schools 3 - 7 and retained for school 1 - 2 and 8 - 10. Five of the 10 schools produced a statistically significant relationship. Table 8 displays the summary information for this analysis.

Table 8

Relationship of Teacher's LPI (Inspire A Shared Vision) Scores to Teachers' PTO Scores

School	N	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	Teacher's LPI Mean Score	Teachers' PTO Mean
1 (K-8)	18	-.084	.775	43.94	1.66
2 (K-8)	15	-.371	.174	47.60	2.28
3 (K-8)	25	-.528	.007	51.80	2.16
4 (K-8)	30	-.709	Â.001	42.77	2.19
5 (K-8)	19	-.604	.006	49.00	2.16
6 (K-8)	11	-.713	.021	46.00	1.83
7 (3-5)	18	-.708	.001	54.28	2.08
8 (3-5)	33	-.313	.076	35.27	2.30
9 (6-8)	17	-.427	.145	43.00	1.66
10 (6-8)	15	-.145	.620	47.73	1.99

The Pearson correlation coefficients were all positive for the relationship between the PTO scores and the scores on the Challenge the Process dimension of the LPI and displayed a range of .060 to .727. The null hypothesis was rejected for schools 3 - 7 and retained for school 1 - 2 and 9 - 10. Five of the 10 schools produced a statistically significant relationship. Table 9 displays the summary information for this analysis.

Table 9

Relationship of Teacher's LPI (Challenge the Process) Scores to Teachers' PTO Scores

School	N	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	Teacher's LPI Mean Score	Teachers' PTO Mean
1 (K-8)	18	-.060	.839	45.72	1.66
2 (K-8)	15	-.369	.176	45.93	2.28
3 (K-8)	25	-.555	.004	50.12	2.16
4 (K-8)	30	-.670	Â001	42.23	2.19
5 (K-8)	19	-.693	.001	48.58	2.16
6 (K-8)	11	-.727	.017	45.73	1.83
7 (3-5)	18	-.537	.022	53.67	2.08
8 (3-5)	33	-.304	.086	34.85	2.30
9 (6-8)	17	-.398	.178	44.29	1.66
10 (6-8)	15	-.108	.713	45.93	1.99

The Pearson correlation coefficients were all positive for the relationship between the PTO scores and the scores on the Enable Others to Act dimension of the LPI and displayed a range of .031 to .794. The null hypothesis was rejected for schools 3 - 8 and retained for school 1 - 2 and 9 - 10. Six of the 10 schools produced a statistically significant relationship. Table 10 displays the summary information for this analysis.

Table 10

Relationship of Teacher's LPI (Enable Others to Act) Scores to Teachers' PTO Scores

School	N	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	Teacher's LPI Mean Score	Teachers' PTO Mean
1 (K-8)	18	.033	.910	47.78	1.66
2 (K-8)	15	-.280	.313	47.53	2.28
3 (K-8)	25	-.514	.007	51.16	2.16
4 (K-8)	30	.708	Â001	43.00	2.19
5 (K-8)	19	-.794	Â001	46.79	2.16
6 (K-8)	11	-.769	.009	46.82	1.83
7 (3-5)	18	-.610	.007	54.72	2.08
8 (3-5)	33	-.421	.015	33.15	2.30
9 (6-8)	17	.021	.947	46.35	1.66
10 (6-8)	15	-.031	.917	45.87	1.99

The Pearson correlation coefficients were all positive for the relationship between the PTO scores and the scores on the Encourage the Heart dimension of the LPI and displayed a range of .017 to .808. The null hypothesis was rejected for schools 3 - 8 and retained for school 1 - 2 and 9 - 10. Six of the 10 schools produced a statistically significant relationship. Table 11 displays the summary information for this analysis.

Table 11

Relationship of Teacher's LPI (Encourage the Heart) Scores to Teachers' PTO Scores

School	N	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i>	Teacher's LPI Mean Score	Teachers' PTO Mean
1 (K-8)	18	.017	.954	45.83	1.66
2 (K-8)	15	-.332	.227	45.47	2.28
3 (K-8)	25	-.538	.006	49.84	2.16
4 (K-8)	30	-.708	Â001	43.30	2.19
5 (K-8)	19	-.808	Â001	42.95	2.16
6 (K-8)	11	-.690	.027	46.45	1.83
7 (3-5)	18	-.618	.006	55.28	2.08
8 (3-5)	33	-.447	.008	31.26	2.30
9 (6-8)	17	-.094	.760	43.94	1.66
10 (6-8)	15	-.139	.637	46.07	1.99

Conclusions

It is important that principals and teachers strive to work together on factors they can control. Some of those factors are teacher workload, teacher support and encouragement, and staff incentives. Teachers also need to strive to be intrinsically motivated themselves. Overall, student learning is the most important factor in the school setting.

The findings in this study seem to support Hewitt's (2008) research and other literature in this field that principals need to be supportive of their teachers. Because of the mixed results in this study, it is unclear what the relationship between teachers' scores and their principal's scores on the LPI really indicate. However the importance of teachers and principals working together to ensure student learning is taking place is clear.

Recommendations for practice

The following recommendations for practice have been developed as a result of this study:

1. Professional development (in-service opportunities) and training should be implemented for principals to build their leadership skills.
2. Districts need to focus on fostering the leadership of each principal and provide encouragement and an opportunity for them to grow and learn with the current research.
3. Recommendations for practicing teachers would be in-service opportunities that would focus on teachers who have a desire to become administrators. If those teachers were identified, they could be given access to the Leadership Practices Inventory, and have help in building their leadership skills.

4. Surveys should be distributed each year in the participating school district to study the relationship of a principal's leadership style and the morale of teachers. This may decrease teacher dropout rates.

Recommendations for further research

The following recommendations for further research have been developed as a result of this study:

1. A qualitative study could be conducted to seek advice and opinions on this same topic from current practicing teachers and administrators.
2. A similar research project could be expanded to include multiple districts in a region.
3. A similar research project could be expanded to include all grade levels in each district because the present study focused on K-8.
4. A research project could also be conducted to determine if student achievement is linked to teacher morale or a principal's leadership skills.

REFERENCES

- Adams, C. F. (1992). Finding psychic rewards in today's schools: A rebuttal. *Clearing House*, 65, 343-347.
- Allen, L. & Glickman, C. D. (1992). School improvement: The elusive faces of shared governance. *NASSP Bulletin*, 76(542), 80-87.
- Andrew, L. D., Parks, D. J., Nelson, L. A., & Phi Delta Kappa Commission on Teacher/Faculty Morale. (1985). *Administrator's Handbook for Improving Faculty Morale*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 4, 231-272.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bauer, S C. (1992). Myth, consensus, and change. *Executive Educator* 14(7), 26-28.
- Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bentley, R., & Rempel, A. (1980). *Manual for the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire*. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue Research Foundation.
- Blanchard, K. H. (1999). *The heart of a leader: Insights on the art of influence*. Colorado Springs, CO: Cook Communication Ministries.
- Blanchard, K. H. (2001). *High five: The magic of working together*. New York, NY: Morrow.
- Blanchard, K. H. (2002). *Whale done: The power of positive relationships*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Blase, J., Dedrick, C., & Strathe, M. (1986). Leadership behavior of school principals in relation to teacher stress, satisfaction, and performance. *Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education & Development*, 24(4), 159-171.
- Blasé, J., & Kirby, P. (1992). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. R. (2001). *Empowering teachers: What successful principals do*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Byham, W. C., Cox, J., & Shomo, K. H. (1992). *Zapp! in education: How empowerment can improve the quality of instruction and student, and teacher satisfaction*. New York, NY: Fawcett Columbine.
- Chemers, M. M. (1997). *An integrative theory of leadership*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Covey, S. R. (2004). *The 7 habits of highly effective people: Restoring the character ethic*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Dunaway, D. (2007). *Eight Leader Behaviors That Increase Motivation, Morale, and Performance...And One That Won't*. National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Retrieved October, 2013. http://cnx.org/contents/2de9115f-0934-4975-af52-35aee74d0270@1/Eight_Leader_Behaviors_That_In
- Dungy, T., & Whitaker, N. (2007). *Quiet strength: The principles, practices, & priorities of a winning life*. Winter Park, FL: Legacy LLC.
- Fisher, M. W. (2003). *Effects of principal leadership style on school climate and student achievement in select Idaho schools*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Idaho.
- French, J. P., & Raven, B. (1960). The bases of social power. *Group Dynamics*, 607-623. New York, NY: Harper and Row.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2008). *What's worth fighting for in the principalship?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Gabriel, J. G. (2005). *How to thrive as a teacher leader*. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gardner, H., & Laskin, E. (1995). *Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Glasser, W. (1993). *The quality school teacher*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2009). Primal leadership. *Leadership Excellence*, 26, 9-10.
- Gonzalez, L., Brown, M., & Slate, J. (2008). Teachers who left the teaching profession: A qualitative understanding. *The Qualitative Report*, 13, p. 1-11.
- Greenleaf, R. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York, NY: Paulist.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 23, 26-34.

- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources* (3rd ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Hersey, P. (1984). *The situational leader*. Escondido, CA: Center for Leadership Studies.
- Hewitt, P (2008). Study pinpoints reasons for principal shortage. College of Education and Health Professions, Arkansas.
- Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (1982). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Ingersoll, R. M. (2001). Teacher turnover and teacher shortages: An organizational analysis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(3), 499-534.
- Jenlink, P. (2001). *Marching into a new millennium: Challenges to educational leadership*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Johnson, M. 1980. Effective teaching as perceived by teachers and principals in selected Indiana school corporations. Ball State University doctoral dissertations. Abstract. Muncie, IN: Ball State University.
- Johnsrud, L., & Rosser, V. (2002). Faculty members morale and their intention to leave. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73, 518-542.
- Jones, T. (2010). What's your vision? *Leadership Excellence*, 27, 6-7.
- Kelehear, Z. (2005). Controlling stress. *Principal Leadership*, 62, 65.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1999). *Encouraging the heart: A leader's guide to rewarding and recognizing others*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003a). *Leadership practices inventory*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003b). *The five practices of exemplary leadership publication*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Laohavichien, T., Fredendall, L., & Cantrell, R. (2009). The effects of transformational and transactional leadership on quality improvement. *The Quality Management Journal*, 16, 7-24.

- Leech, D. & Fulton, C.R. (2008). Shared decision-making and the principal's leadership behaviors in secondary schools in a large urban district. *Education, 128(4)*, p. 630-644).
- Lemberg, P. (2008,). Too much to do: Four keys to effective delegating. *Nonprofit World, 26*, 21-22.
- Lewin, K., Liippit, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*, 271-301.
- Liontos, L. B. (1993). *Shared-decision making*. Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon,
- Lumsden, L. (1998). *Teacher morale*. Eugene, OR: Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC document reproduction service No. EDO-EA-98-4).
- Lundin, S. C., Paul, H., & Christensen, J. (2000). *Fish!: A remarkable way to boost morale & improve results*. New York, NY: Hyperion.
- Maehr, M. L., Midgley, C., & Urdan, T. C. (1991). *School leader as motivator*. Urbana, IL: National Center for School Leadership, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Martin, E. (1983). *The teacher as decision maker*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2002). *Leadership 101*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Maxwell, J. C. (2006). *The 360 degree leader: Developing your influence from anywhere in the organization*. Nashville, TN: Nelson Business.
- McEwan, E. K. (2003). *Ten traits of highly effective principals: From good to great performance*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McNamara, C. (2009). Leaders coaching leaders. *Leadership Excellence, 26*, 18-19.
- Mendel, P. C. (1987). *An investigation of factors that influence teacher morale and satisfaction with work conditions*. Doctoral dissertation. Eugene, OR: Division of Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.
- Meriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary* (11th ed). (2003). Springfield, MA: Meriam-Webster.
- Miller, W. C. (1981). Staff morale, school climate, and education productivity. *Educational leadership, 483-486*.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *Job satisfaction among America's teachers: Effects of workplace conditions, background characteristics, and teacher compensation*. Washington, DC: Author.

- Ngambi, H. C., (2011). The relationship between leadership and employee morale in higher education. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(3), pp. 762-776.
- Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pillay, S. (2010). Boosting morale. *Leadership Excellence*, 27(4), 8-8.
- Pillsbury, P. (2005). *Only the BEST: Hiring outstanding teachers* Association of California School Administrators. Retrieved June, 2013. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/204320787?accountid=41894>
- Polk, J. (2006). *Traits of effective teachers* Taylor & Francis Inc. Retrieved November 2013. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/211016802?accountid=41894>
- Ryan, K., & Cooper, J. M. (2008). *Those who can, teach*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rye, D. E. (2009). *Stop managing and lead: Change your role, change your results*. Avon, MA: Adams Business.
- Sanborn, M. (2004). *The Fred factor: How passion in your work and life can turn the ordinary into the extraordinary*. New York, NY: Currency/Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership*, 4, 13.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. *Educational Leadership*, 47(8), 23-27.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). *Building community in schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2005). *Strengthening the heartbeat*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Shelton, C. (2010). Trust-powered leadership. *Leadership Excellence*, 27, 20.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of the literature*. New York, NY: Free Press 335-371.
- Thomas, V. (1997). *What research says about administrator's management style, effectiveness and teacher morale*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED411569)
- Tye, B. B., & O'Brien, L. (2002). Why are experienced teachers leaving the profession? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84, 24-32.
- Useem, M. (1998). *The leadership moment: Nine stories of triumph and disaster and their lessons for us all*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.
- Weiss, C., Cambone, J., & Wyeth, A. (1992). Trouble in paradise: Teacher conflicts in shared-decision making. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 28, 350-67.

- Weiss, E. M. (1999). Perceived workplace conditions and first-year teachers' morale, career choice commitment, and planned retention: a secondary analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 15*, 861-879.
- Whitaker, T. (2003). *What great principals do differently: Fifteen things that matter most*. Larchmont, N.Y: Eye on Education.
- Whitaker, T. (2004). *What great teachers do differently: Fourteen things that matter most*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Young, D. J. (1998). *Teacher morale and efficacy in rural Western Australia*. Paper presented to the Australian Association for Research in Education, 1998, Annual Conference, Adelaide, Australia.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Letter to Director of Curriculum and Instruction

Kimberly D. Graybeal
Sevierville Middle School
520 High Street
Sevierville, TN 37876

Dr. Debra Cline
Director of Curriculum & Instruction
Central Office
Sevierville, TN 37862
865-453-4671

February 21, 2010

Dear Dr. Cline,

My name is Kimberly D. Graybeal. I am currently a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University. I am working on my dissertation. I would like to request permission to conduct my research in the Sevier County School System and collect data concerning the leadership style of the principal and the morale of the teachers. My study will examine how the principal's leadership style affects the morale of the staff. I would greatly appreciate your approval to conduct my study in pursuit of a doctorate degree from East Tennessee State University.

Sincerely,



Kimberly D. Graybeal

I hereby grant Kimberly D. Graybeal permission to pursue research in the Sevier County School System regarding the leadership style of the principal and how it affects the morale of his/her staff. No direct school, principal, or teacher will be named in the study. *Participation in the study (teacher and principal) will be on a voluntary basis.*



Dr. Debra Cline, Director of Curriculum & Instruction

APPENDIX B
Permission Letter From Kouzes Posner International

KOUZES POSNER INTERNATIONAL
1548 Camino Monde
San Jose, California 95125
FAX: (408) 554-4553

June 25, 2009

Kimberly Graybeal
2869 English Valley Lane
Sevierville, TN 37876

Dear Ms. Graybeal:

Thank you for your request to use the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) in your dissertation. We are willing to allow you to **reproduce** the instrument in written form, as outlined in your request, at no charge. If you prefer to use our electronic distribution of the LPI (vs. making copies of the print materials) you will need to separately contact Lisa Shannon (lshannon@wiley.com) directly for instructions and payment. Permission to use either the written or electronic versions requires the following agreement:

- (1) That the LPI is used only for research purposes and is not sold or used in conjunction with any compensated management development activities;
- (2) That copyright of the LPI, or any derivation of the instrument, is retained by Kouzes Posner International, and that the following copyright statement is included on all copies of the instrument: "Copyright © 2003 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission";
- (3) That one (1) **electronic** copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data be sent **promptly** to our attention; and,
- (4) That you agree to allow us to include an abstract of your study and any other published papers utilizing the LPI on our various websites.

If the terms outlined above are acceptable, would you indicate so by signing one (1) copy of this letter and returning it to us. Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,

Ellen Peterson
Permissions Editor
epeterson@scu.edu

I understand and agree to abide by these conditions:

(Signed) Kimberly Graybeal Date: 7-1-09
Expected Date of Completion is: August, 2010

APPENDIX C
Letter to Principals

Dear Sir or Madam,

My name is Kimberly Graybeal, and I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University in the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Department.

I am conducting a study to determine if there is a difference in the scores of teachers on the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* and the principal's score for K-8 schools. This study will also see if a relationship existed between the Purdue Teacher Opinionaire (PTO) scores and the teachers' LPI score. This study may help determine how teachers perceive the leadership role of principals. I am asking that the teachers in your school complete the same survey.

You are being asked to take part in this research by completing a 30-question survey. This survey should take about 10 minutes to complete. You can complete this survey and return it in the sealed envelope.

This survey is completely anonymous. Please do not put your name on the survey. This research is designed to protect your identity. No school, teacher, or administrator will be named in the research.

Participation in this survey is completely voluntary, and you may opt not to take the survey. You may skip any question you do not want to answer, and you may stop the survey at any time.

If you have any questions or concerns about the survey, you may reach me at 865-429-6474 or email me at kgraybeal@charter.net. You may also contact my research chairman, Dr. Jim Lampley, at 423-439-7619. You may also contact the ETSU Institutional Review Board at 423-439-6054.

Thank you for taking your time to complete this survey. I really appreciate your time.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Graybeal

APPENDIX D
Letter to Teachers

Dear Sir or Madam,

My name is Kimberly Graybeal, and I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University in the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Department.

I am conducting a study to determine if there is a difference in the scores of teachers on the Kouzes-Posner *Leadership Practices Inventory* and the principal's scores for K-8 schools. This study will also see if a relationship existed between the morale of teachers, as measured by the Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire (PTO) and the teacher's LPI score. This study may help determine how teachers perceive the leadership role of principals. I am asking that the principal in your school complete the same survey.

You are being asked to take part in this research by completing a 30-question survey and a 100-question survey about your current principal and morale. This survey should take about 20 minutes to complete. You can complete this survey and return it in the sealed envelope.

This survey is completely anonymous. Please do not put your name on the survey. This research is designed to protect your identity. No school, teacher, or administrator will be named in the research.

Participation in this survey is completely voluntarily, and you may opt not to take the survey. You may skip any question you do not want to answer, and you may stop the survey at any time.

If you have any questions or concerns about the survey, you may reach me at 865-429-6474 or email me at kgraybeal@etsu.edu. You may also contact my research chair, Dr. Jim Lampley, at 423-439-7619. You may also contact the ETSU Institutional Review Board at 423-439-6054.

Thank you for taking your time to complete this survey. I really appreciate your time.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Graybeal

APPENDIX E
Leadership Practices Inventory--Observer Form

This section of the questionnaire deals with the leadership practices of the principal of your school. To what extent does your current principal typically engage in the following behaviors? Choose the response number that best applies to each statement and circle the number.

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

The principal of my school . . .

1.	Sets a personal example of what he/she expect of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2.	Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3.	Seeks out challenging opportunities that test his or her own skills and abilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4.	Develops cooperative relationships among the people he/she work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5.	Praises people for a job well done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6.	Spends time and energy making certain that the people he/she works with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7.	Describes a compelling image of what our future could be like.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8.	Challenges people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

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

9.	Actively listens to diverse points of view.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10.	Makes it a point to let people know about his or her confidence in their abilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11.	Follows through on the promises and commitments that he/she makes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
12.	Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
13.	Searches outside the formal boundaries of his or her organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
14.	Treat others with dignity and respect.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15.	Makes sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
16.	Asks for feedback on how his or her actions affect other people's performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
17.	Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting a common vision.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
18.	Asks "What can we learn?" when things don't go as expected.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
19.	Supports the decisions that people make on their own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

1 = Almost Never	4 = Once in a while	7 = Fairly Often	10 = Almost always
2 = Rarely	5 = Occasionally	8 = Usually	

3 = Seldom		6 = Sometimes				9 = Very Frequently					
20.	Publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
21.	Build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
22.	Paints the “big picture” of what we aspire to accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
23.	Makes certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
24.	Gives people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
25.	Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
26.	Is clear about his or her philosophy of leadership?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
27.	Speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
28.	Experiments and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
29.	Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
30.	Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Thank you for your participation in this study!

APPENDIX F
Leadership Practices Inventory--Self-Form

For each of the following statements, please circle the response which best describes how often you as a principal engage in the practice.

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

1.	I set a personal example of what I expect of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2.	I talk about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3.	I seek out challenging opportunities that test my own skills and abilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4.	I develop cooperative relationships among the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5.	I praise people for a job well done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6.	I spend time and energy making certain that the people I work with adhere to the principles and standards we have agreed on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7.	I describe a compelling image of what our future could be like.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8.	I challenge people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

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

9.	I actively listen to diverse points of view.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10.	I make it a point to let people know about my confidence in their abilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11.	I follow through on the promises and commitments that I make.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
12.	I appeal to others to share an exciting dream of the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
13.	I search outside the formal boundaries of my organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
14.	I treat others with dignity and respect.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15.	I make sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of our projects.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
16.	I ask for feedback on how his or her actions affect other people's performance.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
17.	I show others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting a common vision.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
18.	I ask "What can we learn?" when things don't go as expected.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
19.	I support the decisions that people make on their own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

1 = Almost Never	4 = Once in a while	7 = Fairly Often	10 = Almost always
2 = Rarely	5 = Occasionally	8 = Usually	

3 = Seldom	6 = Sometimes	9 = Very Frequently	
------------	---------------	---------------------	--

20.	I publicly recognize people who exemplify commitment to shared values.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
21.	I build consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
22.	I paints the “big picture” of what we aspire to accomplish.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
23.	I make certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
24.	I give people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
25.	I find ways to celebrate accomplishments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
26.	I am clear about my philosophy of leadership.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
27.	I speak with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
28.	I experiment and take risks, even when there is a chance of failure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
29.	I ensure that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
30.	I give the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Thank you for your participation in this study!

APPENDIX G
Purdue Teacher Opinionaire

Prepared by Ralph R. Bentley and Averno M. Rempel

This instrument is designed to provide you with the chance to communicate your opinions about your work as a teacher and different school problems in your particular school situation. Please do not list your name on this document.

Please read each statement carefully. Select (1) Agree, (2) Probably Agree, (3) Probably Disagree, (4) Disagree. Please Circle your answers.

1. Details, "red tape," and required reports absorb too much of my time.	1	2	3	4
2. The work of individual faculty members is appreciated and commended by our principal.	1	2	3	4
3. Teachers feel free to criticize administrative policy at faculty meetings called by our principal.	1	2	3	4
4. The faculty feels that their suggestions pertaining to salaries are adequately transmitted by the administration to the board of education.	1	2	3	4
5. Our principal shows favoritism in his relations with the teachers in our school.	1	2	3	4
6. Teachers in this school are expected to do an unreasonable amount of record keeping and clerical work.	1	2	3	4
7. My principal makes a real effort to maintain close contact with the faculty.	1	2	3	4
8. Community demands upon the teacher's time are unreasonable.	1	2	3	4
9. I am satisfied with the policies under which pay raises are granted.	1	2	3	4
10. My teaching load is greater than that of most of the other teachers in our school.	1	2	3	4
11. The extra-curricular load of the teachers in our school is unreasonable.	1	2	3	4
12. Our principal's leadership in faculty meetings challenges and stimulates our professional growth.	1	2	3	4
13. My teaching position gives me the social status in the community that I desire.	1	2	3	4
14. The number of hours a teacher must work is unreasonable.	1	2	3	4
15. Teaching enables me to enjoy many of the material and cultural things I like.	1	2	3	4
16. My school provides me with adequate classroom supplies and equipment.	1	2	3	4
17. Our school has a well-balanced curriculum.	1	2	3	4
18. There is a great deal of griping, arguing, taking sides, and feuding among our teachers.	1	2	3	4
19. Teaching gives me a great deal of personal satisfaction.	1	2	3	4
20. The curriculum of our school makes reasonable provision for student individual differences.	1	2	3	4
21. The procedures for obtaining materials and services are well defined and efficient.	1	2	3	4
22. Generally, teachers in our school do not take advantage of one	1	2	3	4

another.				
23. The teachers in our school cooperate with each other to achieve common, personal, and professional objectives.	1	2	3	4
24. Teaching enables me to make my greatest contribution to society.	1	2	3	4
25. The curriculum of our school is in need of major revisions.	1	2	3	4
26. I love to teach.	1	2	3	4
27. If I could plan my career again, I would choose teaching.	1	2	3	4
28. Experienced faculty members accept new and younger members as colleagues.	1	2	3	4
29. I would recommend teaching as an occupation to students of high scholastic ability.	1	2	3	4
30. If I could earn as much money in another occupation, I would stop teaching.	1	2	3	4
31. The school schedule places my classes at a disadvantage.	1	2	3	4
32. Within the limits of financial resources, the school tries to follow a generous policy regarding fringe benefits, professional travel, professional study, etc.	1	2	3	4
33. My principal makes my work easier and more pleasant.	1	2	3	4
34. Keeping up professionally is too much of a burden.	1	2	3	4
35. Our community makes its teachers feel as though they are a real part of the community.	1	2	3	4
36. Salary policies are administered with fairness and justice.	1	2	3	4
37. Teaching affords me the security I want in an occupation.	1	2	3	4
38. My school principal understands and recognizes good teaching procedures.	1	2	3	4
39. Teachers clearly understand the policies governing salary increases.	1	2	3	4
40. My classes are used as "dumping grounds" for problem students.	1	2	3	4
41. The lines and methods of communication between teachers and the principal in our school are well developed and maintained.	1	2	3	4
42. My teaching load at this school is unreasonable.	1	2	3	4
43. My principal shows a real interest in my department.	1	2	3	4
44. Our principal promotes a sense of belonging among the teachers in our school.	1	2	3	4
45. My teaching load unduly restricts my nonprofessional activities.	1	2	3	4
46. I find my contacts with students, for the most part, highly satisfying and rewarding.	1	2	3	4
47. I feel that I am an important part of this school system.	1	2	3	4
48. The competency of the teachers in our school compares favorably with that of teachers in other schools with which I am familiar.	1	2	3	4
49. My school provides the teachers with adequate audio-visual aids and projection equipment.	1	2	3	4
50. I feel successful and competent in my present position.	1	2	3	4
51. I enjoy working with student organizations, clubs, and societies.	1	2	3	4
52. Our teaching staff is congenial to work with.	1	2	3	4
53. My teaching associates are well prepared for their jobs.	1	2	3	4
54. Our school faculty has a tendency to form into cliques.	1	2	3	4
55. The teachers in our school work well together.	1	2	3	4
56. I am at a disadvantage professionally because other teachers are better prepared to teach than I am.	1	2	3	4

57. Our school provides adequate clerical services for the teachers.	1	2	3	4
58. As far as I know, the other teachers think I am a good teacher.	1	2	3	4
59. Library facilities and resources are adequate for the grade or subject area which I teach.	1	2	3	4
60. The "stress and strain" resulting from teaching makes teaching undesirable for me.	1	2	3	4
61. My principal is concerned with the problems of the faculty and handles these problems sympathetically.	1	2	3	4
62. I do not hesitate to discuss any school problem with my principal.	1	2	3	4
63. Teaching gives me the prestige I desire.	1	2	3	4
64. My teaching job enables me to provide a satisfactory standard of living for my family.	1	2	3	4
65. The salary schedule in our school adequately recognizes teacher competency.	1	2	3	4
66. Most of the people in this community understand and appreciate good education.	1	2	3	4
67. In my judgment, this community is a good place to raise a family.	1	2	3	4
68. This community respects its teachers and treats them like professional persons.	1	2	3	4
69. My principal acts interested in me and my problems.	1	2	3	4
70. My school principal supervises rather than "snoopervises" the teachers in our school.	1	2	3	4
71. It is difficult for teachers to gain acceptance by the people in this community.	1	2	3	4
72. Teachers' meetings as now conducted by our principal waste the time and energy of the staff.	1	2	3	4
73. My principal has a reasonable understanding of the problems connected with my teaching assignment.	1	2	3	4
74. I feel that my work is judged fairly by my principal.	1	2	3	4
75. Salaries paid in this school system compare favorably with salaries in other systems with which I am familiar.	1	2	3	4
76. Most of the actions of students irritate me.	1	2	3	4
77. The cooperativeness of teachers in our school helps make our work more enjoyable.	1	2	3	4
78. My students regard me with respect and seem to have confidence in my professional ability.	1	2	3	4
79. The purposes and objectives of the school cannot be achieved by the present curriculum.	1	2	3	4
80. The teachers in our school have a desirable influence on the values and attitudes of their students.	1	2	3	4
81. This community expects its teachers to meet unreasonable personal standards.	1	2	3	4
82. My students appreciate the help I give them with their schoolwork.	1	2	3	4
83. To me there is no more challenging work than teaching.	1	2	3	4
84. Other teachers in our school are appreciative of my work.	1	2	3	4
85. As a teacher in this community, my nonprofessional activities outside of school are unduly restricted.	1	2	3	4
86. As a teacher, I think I am as competent as most other teachers.	1	2	3	4
87. The teachers with whom I work have high professional ethics.	1	2	3	4
88. Our school curriculum does a good job of preparing students to become enlightened and competent citizens.	1	2	3	4

89. I really enjoy working with my students.	1	2	3	4
90. The teachers in our school show a great deal of initiative and creativity in their teaching assignments.	1	2	3	4
91. Teachers in our community feel free to discuss controversial issues in their classes.	1	2	3	4
92. My principal tries to make me feel comfortable when visiting my classes.	1	2	3	4
93. My principal makes effective use of the individual teacher's capacity and talent.	1	2	3	4
94. The people in this community, generally, have a sincere and wholehearted interest in the school system.	1	2	3	4
95. Teachers feel free to go to the principal about problems of personal and group welfare.	1	2	3	4
96. This community supports ethical procedures regarding the appointment and reappointment of members of the teaching staff.	1	2	3	4
97. This community is willing to support a good program of education.	1	2	3	4
98. Our community expects the teachers to participate in too many social activities.	1	2	3	4
99. Community pressures prevent me from doing my best as a teacher.	1	2	3	4
100. I am well satisfied with my present teaching position.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX H
Demographic Information Teacher Form

1. What is your gender?
 1. Male
 2. Female

2. What is the gender of your administrator?
 1. Male
 2. Female

3. What is the highest degree you have earned? (Check one.)
 1. Bachelor's degree
 2. Master's degree
 3. Educational Specialist
 4. Doctorate

4. How many years have you taught? _____

5. Have you taught at a school other than this one?
 1. No
 2. Yes

6. What is your age? _____

APPENDIX I
Demographic Information Principal Form

1. What is your gender?

- 1. Male
- 2. Female

2. What is the highest degree you have earned? (Check one.)

- 1. Bachelor's degree
- 2. Master's degree
- 3. Educational Specialist
- 4. Doctorate

3. How many years have you been an administrator? _____

4. What is your age? _____

APPENDIX J
IRB Approval

East Tennessee State

University

Office for the Protection of Human Research Subjects • Box 70565 • Johnson City, Tennessee 37614-1707 Phone: (423) 439-6053 Fax: (423) 439-6060

IRB APPROVAL – Initial Exempt

June 7, 2011

Ms. Kimberly Graybeal
2869 English Valley Lane
Sevierville, TN 37876

RE: Principal Leadership Style and the Effects on Teacher Morale

IRB#: c0511.16e

On **June 2, 2011**, an exempt approval was granted in accordance with 45 CFR 46. 101(b)(2). It is understood this project will be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Policies. No continuing review is required. The exempt approval will be reported to the convened board on the next agenda.

- Form 103; Narrative; Potential Conflict of Interest (none identified); CV; Informed consent; Survey

Unanticipated Problems Involving Risks to Subjects or Others must be reported to the IRB (and VA R&D if applicable) within 10 working days.

Proposed changes in approved research cannot be initiated without IRB review and approval. The only exception to this rule is that a change can be made prior to IRB approval when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to the research subjects [21 CFR 56.108 (a)(4)]. In such a case, the IRB must be promptly informed of the change following its implementation (within 10 working days) on Form 109 (www.etsu.edu/irb). The IRB will review the change to determine that it is consistent with ensuring the subject's continued welfare.

Sincerely,
Chris Ayres, Chair
ETSU Campus IRB

Appendix K
Leadership Practices Inventory Categories

Category Title	Correlating Questions
Model the Way	1,6,11,16,21,26
Inspire a Shared Vision	2,7,12,17,22,27
Challenge the Process	3,8,13,18,23,28
Enable others to act	4,9,14,19,24,29
Encourage the heart	5,10,15,20,25,30

Appendix L

Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire Categories

Category Title	Correlating Questions
Rapport with Principal	2,3,5,7,12,33,38,41,43,44,61,62,69,70,72,73,74,92,93,95
Satisfaction with Teaching	19,24,26,27,29,30,46,47,50,51,56,58,60,76,78,82,83,86,89,100
Rapport among teachers	18,22,23,28,48,52,53,54,55,77,80,84,87,90
Teacher Salary	4,9,32,36,39,65,75
Teacher Load	1,6,8,10,11,14,31,34,40,42,45
Curricular Issues	17,20,25,79,88
Teacher Status	13,15,35,37,63,64,68,71
Community Support for Education	66,67,94,96,97
School Facilities and Services	16,21,49,57,59
Community Pressures	81,85,91,98,99

VITA

KIMBERLY DAWN PARTON GRAYBEAL

Education: Carson Newman College, Jefferson City, Tennessee;
B.A. Elementary Education
2002

Carson Newman College, Jefferson City, Tennessee;
Curriculum & Instruction, M.Ed;
2004

Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate, Tennessee;
Administration & Supervision, Ed.S.;
2006

East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee;
Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, Ed.D.;
2015

Professional
Experience:

Classroom Teacher,
Sevierville Middle School, Sevierville, Tennessee;
2002-Present

Adjunct Professor,
Tusculum College, Knoxville, Tennessee;
2007-Present

Honors and
Awards:

Teacher of the Year,
Sevierville Middle School,
2007, 2010

Team Leader,
Sevierville Middle School,
2007-Present