Spring 2014

An Exploration of the Relationship between Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Instructional Leadership and Transformational Leadership Behaviors

Michael J. Finley
Georgia Southern University

Recommended Citation

Hallinger, P. (2007). Research on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership: Retrospect and prospect. The Leadership challenge- Improving learning in schools. Retrieved from: Http://research.acer.edu.au/research?conference?2007/7 Hallinger, P. (2008). A review of PIMRS studies of principal instructional leadership: Assessment of progress over 25 years. Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) May 14, 2008, New York. Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 8(1), 9-32. Hallinger, P. (2008). A review of PIMRS studies of principal instructional leadership: Assessment of progress over 25 years. Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) May 14, 2008, New York. Hallinger, P. (2011). A review of three decades of doctoral studies using the principal instructional management rating scale: A lens on methodological progress in educational leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 47(2), 271-306. Avolio, B.J. & B.M. Bass (2004). Multifactor leadership questionnaire manual (Third Edition). Lincoln, Nebraska: Mind Garden, Inc. Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., & Jung, D.I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72, 441-462.

AN EXPLORATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS

by

MICHAEL FINLEY

(Under the Direction of James Green)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership behaviors and transformational leadership behaviors. In addition, the study examined the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and a principals' level of degree and principals' teaching area background. This quantitative study was driven by two teacher questionnaires: the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The subscales examined in the PIRMS include framing the school goals, communicating the school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, promoting professional development, and providing incentives for learning . The subscales utilized for the MLQ include idealized influence (attributes), idealized influence (behaviors), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. In addition to the teacher questionnaires, the principals answered two demographic questions about their level of education and their principal teaching area background. A multiple regression analysis was used to determine if the transformational

leadership subscales, principals' level of degree, or principals' teaching area background are predictors of effective instructional leadership. The findings from this study depicted a strong relationship between instructional and transformational leadership behaviors. In addition, "intellectual stimulation," "idealized influence (behavior)," and "individual consideration" are the three best predictors of instructional leadership behaviors as identified by the regression analyses. The findings from the study did not find that a principals' level of education or a principals' teaching area background are predictors of effective instructional leadership as perceived by teachers.

INDEX WORDS: Core content principal, Multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ), Non-core content background principal, Principal instructional management rating scale (PIMRS), Principals' teaching area background.

AN EXPLORATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS

by

MICHAEL JEROME FINLEY

B.S., Georgia State University, 2005

M.A., Central Michigan University, 2007

Ed.S, Cambridge College, 2008

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

AN EXPLORATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS' INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS

by

MICHAEL J. FINLEY

Major Professor: James Green
Committee: Bryan Griffin
Anthony Smith

Electronic Version Approved:
MAY 2014

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my mother, father, brothers, nephews, and niece. You have always supported me with all of my goals. In addition, I would like to dedicate my dissertation to Dr. Tamika La Salle for always being my number one fan during my process. I love you all! Lastly, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to all of my students that I have taught or supervised while in education. I am a true example that your socioeconomic status or race does not determine your outcome. Through God and hard work your goals can be accomplished.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to give thanks to God for getting me into the program at Georgia Southern University and guiding me through the process. I acknowledge and understand that without you as the leader of my life none of this would be possible. Next, I want to thank my dissertation chair, Dr. James Green and my dissertation committee members Dr. Bryan Griffin and Dr. Anthony Smith for all of their expertise and advice during this journey. Last but not least, I would like to thank all of the teachers and principals who took the time to participate in this study.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements
…….7
List of Tables
……11
List of Figures
……..12
CHAPTER 1 13
Background 14
The Principalship 14
The Principal as Instructional Leader 15
Teacher Perceptions of Instructional Leadership 16
Principal as Transformational Leader 16
Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Instructional Leadership 18
Other Variables: Principals' Level of Degree and Teaching Area Background 19
Summary of Background Literature 20
Statement of the problem 20
Research Questions 21
Significance of the Study 21
Research Methods 22
Research Design 22
Populations and Sample 23
Instrumentation 23
Data Collection 27
Data Analysis 27
Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions 28
Definitions of Terms 28
Core Content Background Principal 28
Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) 29
Non-Core Content Background Principal 29

Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) 29
Principals' Teaching Area Background 29
Summary 30
CHAPTER 2 31
Review of Literature 31
Introduction 31
Leadership 31
Educational Leadership 33
Effective Schools through Instructional Leadership 36
The Effective Schools Movement 36
Instructional Leadership Defined 38
The Principal as Instructional Leader 39
Teacher Perceptions of Instructional Leadership 41
Impediments to Instructional Leadership 42
Assessments of Principal as Instructional Leadership 44
Transformational Leadership 46
Transformational Leadership Defined 46
The Four I's of Transformational Leadership 48
Transactional Leadership 49
Laissez-Faire Leadership 51
Assessment of Transformational Leadership 52
Other Variables Related to Instructional Leadership 53
Principals' Level of Graduate Degree 53
Principals' Teaching Area Background 55
Teachers' Perceptions of Variables Related to Instructional Leadership 56
Research Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Instructional Leadership 59
Summary and Conclusion 64
CHAPTER 3 67
METHOD 67
Research Questions 67
Research design 68
Population 68

Sample…… 69
Instrumentation 70
Data collection 74
Summary 75
CHAPTER 4.....76
REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS 76
Introduction 76
Research Questions 77
Findings 77
PIMRS Subscale Subscales.....73
Response to Research Questions.....81
Chapter Summary.....83
CHAPTER 5.....85
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS 85
Summary of the Study.....85
Discussion of Findings 86
Instructional leadership and Transformational leadership.....87
Instructional leadership and Principals' Level of Degree and Principals' Teaching Area Background 89
Conclusions 90
Implications.....104
Recommendations 105
Implementing the Results of the Study.....92
Further Research.....106
References 108
Appendices……
…….111

List of Tables

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Principal's Instructional Leadership, Transformation Leadership, Principal's Educational Degree, and Principal's Certificatio Area 67

Table 2 Correlations of PIMRS Instructional Leadership Sub-Scales 69

Table 3 Correlations of Transformational Leadership Sub-scales.....72

Table 4 Correlation table of transformational (MLQ) and Instructional Leadership Scales (PIMRS).....74

Table 5 Regression Results for Principal's Instructional Leadership Dimensions 78

List of Appendices

Appendix A Letter of Participation 111
Appendix B Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) 112
Appendix C Multifactor Leadership Questionairre (MLQ).....119
Appendix D Principal Questionnaire 128

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

During the 1980's, research on effective schools resulted in another role being added to the school principalship, the role of instructional leader. As a consequence, policymakers in the USA began to stress that all principals should give priority to this role in order to make their own schools more effective (Barth, 1986; Cuban, 1984, 1988; Hallinger & Wimpelberg, 1992). While instructional leadership has been the most popular theme in educational leadership over the last two decades, the concept is not well defined (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Essentially, this means different researchers have different views in regards to the definition and instructional leadership behaviors that frame instructional leadership. This poses a problem; if instructional leadership is not well defined, then it may be hard to determine what is an instructional leader and, moreover, how to become an effective instructional leader. There have been a multitude of variables studied in relation to instructional leadership, which include, among others, mission, culture and climate, managing the instructional program, resource provider, and providing professional learning. However, a number of other correlates to a principal's instructional leadership remain to be explored. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine if there is a relationship between teacher perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and the extent to which a principal exhibits transformational leadership behaviors, the level of graduate degree of the principal, and the principal's previous teaching area background.

Background

The Principalship

According to Hallinger (1992), American principals from the 1920's through the 1970's were focused on their role as administrative manager. In the 1980s, the effective schools movement headed by Ron Edmonds began to describe the principal as an instructional leader. As instructional leader, the principal was expected to be knowledgeable about curriculum and instruction and able to intervene directly with teachers in making instructional improvements. Hallinger further noted that by the mid-1980's professional norms deemed it inadmissible for principals to focus their efforts exclusively on maintenance of the school or even on program management. The educational standard for principals became instructional leadership.

Later, during the 1990s, reformers began to advocate for change in the organizational structure, professional roles, and goals of public education (Valentine & Prater, 2011). Reformers recommended the decentralization of power over curricular and instructional decisions from the school district to the school site, expanded roles for teachers and parents in the decision-making process, and an increased emphasis on intricate instruction and active learning (Hallinger, 1992). As a result of the many changes facing schools, the view of the principal as the transformational leader emerged (Valentine & Prater). Leithwood (1994) argued that transformational approaches to school leadership are especially appropriate to the challenges facing schools entering the 21st century.

Currently, test-driven accountability is now the model in public schools, a product of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (Jennings & Rentner, 2006). Hallinger has stated,

"Principals again find themselves at the nexus of accountability and school improvement with an increasingly explicit expectation that they will function as instructional leaders" (Hallinger, 2005, p. 2).

The Principal as Instructional Leader

The traditional definition of instructional leadership emphasized the principal's role as a "Master Teacher," that is, the principal as an instruction and curriculum expert (Mitchell & Castle, 2005). Leithwood (1994) had a similar view when he defined instructional leadership to only comprise the behaviors that directly affect the curriculum, teacher instruction, supervision, and staff development. Hallinger and Murphy (1987) expanded this definition when they stated that instructional leadership has to be defined by observable practices and behaviors that principals can put into practice. The difference between Leithwood's (1994) and Hallinger and Murphy's definition was that Leithwood's definition excludes behaviors that are specifically focused on school climate and mission; whereas, Hallinger and Murphy's view includes the focus of a mission and school climate in its view of instructional leadership. Both definitions view the new educational standard for principals as instructional leadership.

Instructional leaders are described variously as strong and directive, focused on developing culture, goal-oriented, expert in curriculum and instruction, and showing ability to work directly with teachers on the improvement of teaching and learning (Hallinger, 2005). Using these attributes as a conceptual framework, Hallinger and Murphy (1985) have identified three dimensions of instructional leadership in the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIRMS) which include the following: 1) defining the schools mission, 2) managing the instructional program, and 3) promoting a positive school climate (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985;

Hallinger, 2011). These three dimensions form Hallinger and Murphy's model, which are broken down into ten instructional job functions, are behaviors of principals' instructional leadership.

Teacher Perceptions of Instructional Leadership

The number of studies that examine teacher perceptions of principals' instructional leadership are scarce. Blasé and Blasé (2000) used the Inventory of Strategies Used by Principals to Influence Classroom Teaching (ISUPICT), to determine the characteristics of school principals that positively influence classroom teaching and the effects to which those characteristics have on classroom instruction. O'Donnell and White (2005) examined principals' instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement to determine if there was a significant relationship between principal instructional leadership behaviors and student performance in eight grade reading and mathematics as measured by the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment. Both of these studies found that improving the school climate was very important from a teachers' perspective.

Principal as Transformational Leader

Transformational leadership involves an exceptional form of influence that moves followers to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them (Northouse, 2010). Moreover, transformational leadership occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they stir their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group (Bass, 1990). Transformational leadership involves the leader moving the follower

beyond immediate self-interests through idealized influence, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration (Bass, 1999).

Idealized influence and inspirational leadership are demonstrated when the leader envisions a desirable future, articulates how it can be reached, sets an example to be followed, sets high standards of performance, and shows determination and confidence (Bass, 1999). Furthermore, according to Bass, intellectual stimulation is demonstrated when the leader helps followers to become more innovative and creative. Finally, Bass stated that individualized consideration is displayed when leaders pay attention to the developmental needs of followers and support and coach the development of their followers. Idealized influence, inspirational leadership, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration are all characteristics of transformational leadership.

In comparison, transactional leadership differs from transformational leadership due to the fact that a transactional leader does not individualize the needs of subordinates or focus on their personal development (Northouse, 2010). Transactional leadership is composed of three components. Contingent reward leadership which refers to leaders giving followers things they want in exchange for things leaders want (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). Active management-by-exception refers to leaders actively monitoring performance and taking corrective action as problems become apparent (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Last, there is passive management-by-exception which refers to leaders that wait to take action until after mistakes or other performance problems have happened and called to their attention (Hoy & Miskel).

Effective transactional leaders must frequently fulfill the expectations of their followers (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). This means that effective transactional leadership is contingent on the

leaders' abilities to meet and respond to the reactions and changing expectations of their followers (Kellerman, 1984). Klmoski and Hayes (1980), amongst others, have found that in the workplace contingent reward transactional leadership can positively influence performance and employee satisfaction. On the other hand, management-by-exception transactional leadership has demonstrated negative impacts on satisfaction and performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993). Despite the clear distinction between transformational and transactional leadership styles, Bass (1985, 1999) has suggested that transformational leadership actually is an extension of transactional leadership, therefore, a leader can simultaneously be both or neither.

Effective transformational leadership does require boundaries and guidance and as such it is important that organizations promoting transformational leadership ensure a culture that supports such leaders (Brymer & Gray, 2006). Also, being an effective transformational leader requires a deep understanding of oneself (Brymer & Gray). Therefore, transformational skills' should be supported by a leader's personal, authentic or spiritual growth (Luthans & Avolio 2003; Elliot, 2002).

Relationship between Transformational Leadership and Instructional Leadership

Transformational leadership and instructional leadership have been the more popular models of leadership over the past 25 years (Hallinger, 2003). The models were adapted from the research of Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and Liethwood, Leonard, and Sharratt (1998). It is evident from their research that there are some similarities and differences between the two models (Hallinger, 2007).

Some of the differences emphasize that transformational leaders operate from a ground up model in comparison to instructional leaders operating from the top down model (Hallinger,

2007). Creating a shared sense of purpose and being visible in the school are some examples of how transformational and instructional leadership have similarities (Hallinger).

Other Variables: Principals' Level of Degree and Teaching Area Background

Besides the relationship between transformational leadership behavior and teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership, several additional variables merit investigation. The level of graduate degree of the principal is a variable of interest because of the perceptions of the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of graduate programs. The educational literature of the early 21st century has placed principal preparation programs and associated graduate degree programs under indictment (Petzko, 2008). Also, a highly acclaimed study from the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute recently stated that "study after study has shown that the training principals typically receive in university programs and from their own districts does not do nearly enough to prepare them for their roles as leaders of learning" (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007).

In addition to the level of graduate degree held by the principal, a principal's previous teaching area background (subject principal taught as a teacher) and is another variable with respect to instructional leadership that merits investigation. Stein and Nelson (2003) stated that, their knowledge, research has not examined the subject-matter-knowledge requirements of effective instructional leadership. Leadership content knowledge is a new construct (Stein & Nelson). In addition, the field of educational administration offers few, if any, images of what it might look like or the advantages it might confer to those who possess it (Stein & Nelson). This variable, the principal's own content area background, could be important because of the importance that followers give to the leader's credibility (Collins, 2001).

Summary of Background Literature

Principals again find themselves at the nexus of accountability and school improvement with an increasingly explicit expectation that they will function as "instructional leaders" (Hallinger, 2005, p. 2). A review of the literature reveals that what has not been explored is the possible relationship between a teacher's perception of their principal as an instructional leader and select variables which include the level to which the principal is a transformational leader, the level of graduate degree of the principal, and the principals' teaching content background area. The current study will focus on examining the possibility of a relationship between how teachers perceive their principal as an instructional leader and certain selected variables.

Statement of the problem

It is a given that principals need to be instructional leaders. Also, researchers separately have found transformational leadership to be effective for developing high functional organizations where the members all have roles that require self-direction, problem solving, and full participation. While instructional leadership has been the most popular theme in educational leadership over the last two decades, the concept is not well defined (Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005). Therefore, if instructional leadership is not well defined than it may be hard to predict what variables may have a positive effective on teachers' perception of the principals' instructional leadership. I will examine whether the extent to which a principal is a "transformational leader" may be a predictor of how teachers perceive their principal as an instructional leader. In addition, I will examine whether the level of degree of a principal and the principals' previous teaching area background may be a predictor of how teachers perceive their principal as an instructional leader.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following overarching research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership (instructional leadership sub-scales; PIMRS) and transformational leadership (transformational leadership sub-scales; MLQ) behaviors?
2. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and the following variables:

a. Principals' level of advanced degree;

b. Principals' subject area preparation?

Significance of the Study

The research regarding instructional leadership and transformational leadership illustrate an abundance of characteristics, traits, and dispositions that each leadership style embodies. Moreover, each leadership style has been deemed effective from the research. Studies about instructional leadership and transformational leadership are plentiful when studied separately; however, the connection between the two is not conclusive. What the research has not explored with more detail is whether the transformational leadership behavior of principals may be a predictor of how teachers perceive their principals' instructional leadership.

From examining the literature of my other two variables which include the level of graduate degree of the principal and the principals' previous teaching area background I have found that there is a lack of research in relation to these two variables and teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership. In result of there being a lack of research about these

variables, I will explore these variables to see if the principals' previous teaching background and teaching area background have a relationship with a teachers perception of their principals' instructional leadership.

The purpose of this study was to examine if there is a possible relationship between a teacher's perception of their principal as an instructional leader and select variables which include the level to which the principal is a transformational leader, the level of graduate degree of the principal, and the principals' teaching content background area.

Research Methods

Research Design

In this quantitative study, I used a correlation research design. Correlational research refers to studies in which the purpose is to discover relationships between variables through the use of correlational statistics (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Further, it involves nothing more than collecting data on two or more variables for each individual in a sample and computing a correlation coefficient (Gall, Gall, & Borg). The independent variables in this study consisted of the extent to which a principal is perceived by teachers to be a transformational leader, a principal's level of graduate degree, and a principal's teaching subject area background. The dependent variable consisted of teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership. I chose to employ a quantitative design to be able to generalize the findings of how transformational leadership behavior by principals, as well as other selected variables, might relate to teacher perceptions about their principal as an instructional leader.

Populations and Sample

The target population for this investigation included teachers from a school district in a large urban area in the Southeastern region of the USA. I gathered my sample size from a population of 750 school teachers and 30 school principals. The sample size from the population was 358 school teachers and 30 school principals, which was sufficient for data analysis (Cohen, 1992).

I used cluster sampling to select my participants. Cluster sampling is used when it is more feasible to select groups of individuals (called clusters) rather than individuals from a defined population (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). All of the teachers in this study were certified teachers under the supervision of a public school principal. In addition, all of the principals were full-time administrators and hold appropriate state certification in educational administration.

Instrumentation

I used two questionnaires during the study. One questionnaire included two questionnaires compiled into one for the teachers and a separate questionnaire was used for principals. One of the questionnaires that the teachers took measured their principals' instructional leadership (PIMRS) and the measured the extent to which their principal is a transformational leader (MLQ Form 5X). The principals answered a questionnaire with two questions that revealed information about the principals' level of degree and his or her teaching area background. From the results of the questionnaire taken by the teachers and the questionnaire taken by the principals, I was able to answer the proposed research questions.

Hallinger's Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (1982) was one of the two questionnaires administered to the teachers. The PIMRS assesses three dimensions of the instructional leadership construct: defining the schools' mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning climate (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). These dimensions are further delineated into 10 instructional leadership functions, each of which is measured by behaviorally anchored items (Hallinger, 2008). These 10 instructional functions consists of: framing the schools goals, communicating the schools goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, promoting professional development, and providing incentives for learning. The survey was guided by these characteristics of instructional leadership identified from the PIMRS. The survey consists of 50 Likert type questions ranging from one to five. Five meaning a teacher perceives that the principal "almost always" behaves in the manner indicated by the survey item and one meaning a teacher perceives that the principal "almost never" behaves in the manner indicated by the survey item. The PIMRS instrument has been validated by meeting a high standard of reliability (Hallinger, 1983). The PIRMS survey consists of 10 subscales. The 10 subscales exceeded .80 using Cronbach's test of internal consistency (Hallinger, 2011). The subscales of the PIRMS instrument is scored by calculating the mean for the items that compose each subscale (Hallinger, 2011). Later studies have generally substituted Ebels' (1951) test for calculating interrater reliability for Cronbach's formula. Dunn's, Fulton's, Leitrner's, Mercer's, Moore's, and O'day's (as cited in Hallinger, 2011) studies have supported the original validation study in its conclusion that the scale provides reliable data on instructional leadership. The data from the PIRMS questionnaire provided teacher perceptions about the principal's instructional leadership.

I used the PIMRS instrument over other instruments because it is the single most widely used measure of principal leadership over the past 30 years (Hallinger, 1995). Furthermore, the PIMRS instrument has been validated as an instrument providing reliable results in studies of school leadership (Hallinger). Therefore, I felt that Hallinger and Murphy's (1985) PIMRS instrument is a good instrument to use to measure principals' instructional leadership behaviors.

Bass and Avolio's (1990) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is the second questionnaire that the teachers completed. The principal's transformational leadership level was measured by using the MLQ (Bass, 1999). The researcher only used the transformational sub scales in this instrument. Transformational leadership refers to the leader moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration (Bass). The full range of leadership, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), implies that every leader displays a frequency of both the transactional and transformational factors, but each leader's profile involves more of one and less of the other (Bass). The MLQ (Form 5X) contains 45 items; there are 36 items that represent the nine leadership factors. These factors include five transformational leadership factors which are idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration; transactional leadership which include contingent reward leadership, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception passive; and nontransactional leadership which includes laissez-faire leadership (Hebert, 2011). The survey of 45 items uses a five response Likert scale ranging from frequently, if not always to not at all and is recommended for organizational survey purposes and research by its authors (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Reports from the MLQ manual (Avolio & Bass, 2004), based on the most recent United States normative sample, indicate that MLQ scores for transformational characteristics were found to have reliabilities ranging from .70 to .83. Moreover, other studies by different authors have substantiated the claims with similar results (Lowe & Kroeck, 1996; Tejeda, 2001). To test the construct validity of the MLQ the authors completed studies testing the present nine factor model against other models (Hebert, 2011). Further, the nine factor model has been demonstrated as being superior with a goodness-of-fit of .91 for follower rating (Avolio & Bass). Also, external predictive validity of the MLQ has been established over the years as multiple studies have indicated that high MLQ transformational scores have been consistent (Hebert, 2011). Overall, the MLQ has been widely studied and has been found to exhibit internal consistency, rest-retest reliability, external predictive validity, and construct validity (Eid, Johnson, Brun, Laberg, Nyhus, & Larsson 2004; Garman, Davis-Lenane, & Corrigan, 2003; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Lowe & Kroeck, 1996).

I used the MLQ instrument over other instruments that measure transformational leadership because the MLQ has been extensively researched and validated and its reliability scores ranged from good to moderate. Therefore, I felt that Avolio and Bass' (1990) MLQ instrument was a good instrument to use to measure the extent to which a principal is a transformational leader.

The principal questionnaire was used to gather information about my other two variables. I utilized a questionnaire with two questions so that I could gather information about the principals' level of graduate degree and the principals' previous teaching background. Thru this information I was able to answer my research questions.

Data Collection

Data were collected using the PIMRS and MLQ questionnaires for the teachers and a separate questionnaire for the principals. I was granted approval from the Institutional Review Board of Georgia Southern University and the urban school district I that I conducted my research in for the study. After permission was granted, I gained permission from the area superintendent of the school district to enlist participants. Next, I contacted 31 school principals in the district to ask for their participation in my study by completing a brief questionnaire that asked them to indicate their level of advanced degree and their teaching subject area background. Also, I asked teachers to participate with the study by completing two surveys compiled into one in relation to their principals' transformational and instructional leadership behaviors. The principals and teachers were given two weeks to complete the survey with two email reminders before I stopped collecting data.

Data Analysis

SPSS software was used to analyze the data. Multiple regression was used to see if there is a relationship between teacher perceptions of their principal as an instructional leader and selected variables. Multiple regression was used to determine the correlation between a criterion variable and a combination of two or more predictor variables (Gall, Gall, & Borg 2007). The teachers completed the PIMRS and the MLQ questionnaires to provide information about a teachers' perception of their principal as an instructional leader (PIRMS) and, to provide information to measure the extent to which a principal is a transformational leader (MLQ). Further, the principals' completed a questionnaire to provide information about their level of graduate degree and previous teaching area background. The researcher discussed implications

for further research and connected the findings with the literature currently available. The objective of this research was to see if there was a relationship between a teachers' perception of their principals' instructional leadership and the extent to which a principal is a transformational leader, the level of graduate degree of the principal, and the principals' previous teaching area background.

Limitations, Delimitations, and Assumptions

There are couple limitations to the current study. The first limitation is the number of participants that took the questionnaire. I could not have every teacher and principal in every school district take the questionnaire because it was not feasible. I only had teachers and principals take the questionnaire in one school district. Drawing a sample from only one school district is a limitation because it may not generalize to others. In addition, I assume that participants gave honest responses to all the survey items.

Definitions of Terms

Several terms that are used throughout this and subsequent chapters are defined in order to add clarity. In cases where standard definitions are not available, the researcher has provided operational definitions for this investigation.

Core Content Background Principal

For the purpose of this investigation a core content background principal is one whose academic preparation as a teacher and whose teaching experience has been in mathematics, science, literacy, or social studies, which are the CRCT or high school graduation test subjects.

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) implies that every leader displays a frequency of both the transactional and transformational factors, but each leader's profile involves more of one and less of the other (Bass, 1999). The MLQ was used to measure the extent to which a principal is a transformational leader.

Non-Core Content Background Principal

For the purpose of this investigation a non-core background principal is one whose academic preparation as a teacher is other than mathematics, science, literacy, or social studies. Examples of a non-core principal's background would include physical education, vocal or instrumental music, vocational technical education, or information technology.

Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS)

The PIMRS assesses three dimensions of the instructional leadership construct: defining the schools' mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning climate (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985).

Principals' Teaching Area Background

A principals' teaching subject area is the subject area that the principal taught when he or she was a classroom teacher.

Summary

A principals' Instructional leadership was viewed thru the eyes of the teachers by examining the relationship it may have with three variables (transformational leadership, level of graduate degree, and previous teaching area background). This study used two surveys for the teachers and one questionnaire for the principals. Hallinger's PIRMS instructional leadership survey and Bass and Avolio's (1990) MLQ survey were the instruments used to collect data on instructional leadership and transformational leadership. Further, the principals' took a questionnaire to provide information about their level of graduate degree and previous teaching area background. The population was taken from one urban school district. The sample size to meet a 95% confidence interval consisted of 29 school principals and 358 teachers (Cohen, 1992). The response rate from the questionnaires consisted of 30 school principals and 234 teachers. The teachers' years of experience, age, and gender will vary depending on the make-up of the school. I used cluster sampling to select my participants. Further, multiple regression was conducted to interpret and analyze the data. Multiple regressions was performed by using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). This study is important because adds to the body of research in the area; create awareness about predictors of instructional leadership, and serves as a foundation for further research. The goal of this study was to see if there may be a relationship between a teachers' perception of their principals' instructional leadership and the extent to which a principal is a transformational leader, the level of graduate degree of principal, and the previous teaching area background of the principal.

CHAPTER 2

Review of Literature

Introduction

This section will be a detailed review of the literature about teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and select variables. The focus of the review is to display the previous and current information about instructional leadership and variables that may have a relationship to instructional leadership. The researcher will review the research on instructional leadership, with special attention given to the relationship between transformational leadership qualities and teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership. In addition, this review will consider the relationship between principals' academic teaching background, level of academic degree, and teachers' perceptions of their instructional leadership. The review of literature will move progressively in the following order: educational leadership, instructional leadership, transformational leadership, and other variables related to instructional leadership. Each topic has sub-headings that will examine the area of focus at a more detailed level.

Leadership

Leaders and leadership are important because they serve as anchors, provide guidance in times of change, and are responsible for the effectiveness of organizations (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Bass (1990) observed that there are apparently as many definitions of leadership as there are scholars attempting to study this concept. Bass (1990) articulated common unifying themes across a wide range of definitions noting that leadership involves influencing a group or individual into compliance through the leader's charisma, power persuasion, or other behaviors. Bennis (1989) opined that leadership is like beauty--it is hard to define, but you know it when

you see it. This means that an environment with good leadership will show even if we cannot identify its characteristics.

Bass (1990) and Jago (1982) conceptualized leadership from a personality perspective, which suggests that leadership is a combination of special traits or characteristics that some individuals possess. These traits and characteristics influence others to complete tasks. Katz (1955) and Connelly, Gilbert, Zaccaro, Threlfall, Marks, and Mumford (2000) address leadership from a skills perspective. The skills viewpoint is based on the capabilities in reference to knowledge and skill that make effective leadership possible (Northhouse, 2010). For example, one cannot be a principal if he or she cannot read or write at a level expected for professional educators. Moreover, they must be proficient at evaluating whether teachers can effectively teach, read, and write.

Burns (1978) and Downton (1973) viewed leadership threw a transformational perspective. Burns (1978) and Downton (1973) both explained that transformational leadership influences followers to want to accomplish more than is usually expected of them. Traits, skills, and transformational leadership are a few ways that leadership has been conceptualized by different theorists. For the purpose of this review of literature, leadership is defined as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal (Burns, 1978, Howell & Avolio, 1993).

Pont, Nusche, and Moorman (2008) looked at the differences between the concepts of leadership and principalship. They would later agree that the concept of the principalship originated from the industrial model of schooling where one individual bears all of the responsibility for the entire organization (Pont, Nusche, Moorman). The concept of leadership is

a broader concept where authority to lead does not reside in only in one person, but it can be disseminated among different people within and beyond the school (Pont, Nusche, Moorman). School leadership can include people occupying a range of roles such as principals, assistant principals, leadership teams, school governing boards, and school-level staff involved in leadership tasks (Pont, Nusche, Moorman).

Educational Leadership

The role of a school leader is intricate and leadership differs from school to school (Naidoo, Muthukrishna, & Hobden, 2012). A number of scholars have argued that there is not one best way to lead as leadership styles are linked to context, and there are often webs of contextual influences operating (Raihani, 2008). Educational leadership is unique since there are many leadership styles that a principal may use to effectively lead a school. According to Koontz and O'Donnell (cited in Saitis, 2000), principal leadership involves the art and the process of influencing individuals so that they collaborate willingly to achieve common objectives. Some of the qualities and skills that are looked upon as important via the research include culture, intellectual stimulation, relationships, optimizer, knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment to name a few from Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) 21 research based responsibilities of the school leader.

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) noted that an effective principal is a necessary requirement for an effective school. As the key intermediary between the classrooms, the individual school and the educational system as a whole, effective school leadership is paramount to improving the efficiency and equity of schooling (Pont, Nusche, Moorman, 2008).

There are seven strong claims about successful school leadership identified by Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008).

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

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

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

4. School leaders improve teaching and learning indirectly and most powerfully through their influence on staff motivation, commitment and working conditions.

5. School leadership has a greater influence on schools and students when it is widely distributed.

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

7. A small handful of personal traits explain a high proportion of the variation in leadership effectiveness. (p. 27)

Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) gave strong emphasis to the first claim that leadership is the second most influential force in the building, meaning school officials should be extremely careful about who they place in leadership roles. Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) gave five sources of evidence to support the first claim. For example, they mentioned Hallinger and Heck (1996a;1996b;1998) and the quantitative large-scale studies they reviewed in

the 80's and 90's. They concluded that the combined direct and indirect effects of school leadership on pupil outcomes are small but educationally significant (Leithwood, Harris, Hopkins).

Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) explained that central idea behind the second claim (all successful leaders draw upon the same repertoire of basic leadership practices) is that the basic task of leadership is to improve employee performance. By improving employee performance, it is likely that the teacher can improve pupil learning since they are the number one influence on pupil learning. Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins further explained that there are four leadership practices that help increase the chances of improving employee performance: 1) building vision and setting directions, 2) understanding and developing people, 3) redesigning the organization, and 3) managing the teaching and learning programs.

The third claim elaborates on the four leadership practices mentioned in claim two. Claim three focuses on the way in which leaders apply these leadership practices. Claim four focuses on the leaders enhancing the teaching and learning in the school setting. Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) explained that the most powerful method for a leader to improve the teaching and learning is his or her influence on staff motivation, commitment and working conditions. Thus, this fourth claim emphasizes that school leaders improve teaching and learning indirectly via the teachers and creating positive working conditions. Claim five and claim six gives a synopsis on how school leadership has a greater influence on students when it is widely distributed. Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins posited that when the power of others in the school setting increases there is no loss of power and influence in relation to the headteachers or principals (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins).

Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins' (2008) seventh claim concerns the personal traits in relation to leader effectiveness. They listed flexibility, open-mindedness, resilience, and optimism as traits that could make the difference between successful leaders and unsuccessful leaders in school settings.

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) developed a list with 21 responsibilities that are required for effective school leadership. Marzano further created a plan that a school leader can follow to enhance the achievement of students in schools. Marzano's plan for effective school leadership included five steps that had the 21 responsibilities for effective school leadership integrated throughout the steps. These steps included developing a strong school leadership team, distributing some responsibilities throughout the leadership team, selecting the right work, identifying the order of magnitude implied by the selected work, and matching the management style to the order of magnitude of the change initiative. Exercising these five steps were the five steps that Marzano believed that would lead to effective school leadership.

Effective Schools through Instructional Leadership

The Effective Schools Movement

The Equal Educational Opportunity Survey (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, and Weinfield, 1966) ushered in the effective schools movement. This report analyzed the degree of segregation of minority group students and teachers in the schools and the relationship between student achievement as measured by achievement tests and the kinds of schools they attend (Coleman et al., 1966). One of the findings from the survey shows that student achievement is strongly related to the educational backgrounds and aspirations of the

other students in the school (Coleman et al.). An analysis of the findings from the survey showed that children from a given family background, when put in schools of different social composition, will achieve at quite different levels (Coleman et al.). For example, if a white student from a home that is strongly and effectively supportive of education is put in a school where most students do not come from such homes, his achievement will be little different than if he were in a school made up of others like himself (Coleman et al.). Conversely, if a minority student from a home with little educational support is placed with schoolmates with strong educational backgrounds, his or her achievement is likely to increase (Coleman et al.). The Coleman report concluded that family background, not the school, was the major determinant of student achievement (Lezotte, 2001). The Coleman research placed the spotlight on home and school relations.

Coleman's (1966) report was supported by Mosteller and Moynihan (1972). These researchers' viewpoint supported the notion that the family background is a crucial determinant for improving student achievement (Coleman, 1966). Ron Edmonds (1973) and Brookover and Lezotte (1977) disagreed with Coleman and his colleagues' ideas and studied "school effects" in response. Edmonds (1973) did two things. First, he identified that there were schools with a significant low-income student population in which those students were clearly demonstrating academic mastery. Edmonds' reason for doing this was to show that all students are educable. This goes against Coleman (1966) and his colleagues who stressed the primary importance of family background.

Next, Edmonds (1973) distinguished the difference between an effective and ineffective school. He established the difference between the two by doing a study where he examined 55 schools that were deemed effective schools and he identified the institutional characteristics that

were consistent in those schools. Edmonds' research led him to the correlates of effective schools. The five correlates of effective schools include strong instructional leadership, a strong sense of mission, positive school climate, classroom observation, and standardized achievement (Edmonds, 1973).

Edmonds (1973) and, Brookover and Lezotte (1977) are responsible for the research of the effective schools movement in elementary schools and researchers from the United Kingdom are responsible for research in secondary schools (Lezotte, 2001). Their findings were almost synonymous.

Today Edmonds' (1973) correlates of effective schools have evolved into a more refined version. These correlates consists of a clear and focused mission, safe and orderly environment, climate of high expectations, frequent monitoring of student progress, positive home-school relations, and the opportunity to learn and student time on task (Lezotte, 2001).

Instructional Leadership Defined

The instructional leadership role of the school principal has interested educational administrators and scholars since at least the start of school improvement programs in the 1970s (Mitchell & Castle, 2005). Hallinger (1992) stated that the term instructional leadership has consistently suffered from conceptual and practical limitations, first because the term means different things to different people and second because transforming practice takes a longer time for which scholars and administrators have patience. Also, Bridges (1977) agreed with other theorists that instructional leadership is not a well-defined concept. Bridges' (1977) commented on instructional leadership and its definition as follows:

> Of the seven major task areas for which principals have responsibility, curriculum and instruction has generated the most sound and fury. On the one hand, the principal has been exhorted to exert instructional leadership; while on the other hand, he has been told flatly that such a role is beyond his or any other human being's capacity. The problem with these disputations is that the exponents of a given position have neither defined sharply what is signified by the concept of instructional leadership nor made their assumptions explicit (Bridges, 1967, p. 136).

Since Bridges (1967) made his statements about instructional leadership, different theorists have continued to explore different conceptualizations and definitions of instructional leadership.

Blasé and Blasé (1999) defined instructional leadership as a blend of several tasks, such as supervision of classroom instruction, staff development, and curriculum development. De Bovoise (1984) suggested that instructional leadership focuses on establishing school wide goals, defining the purpose of schooling, providing resources for learning, supervision and evaluating teachers, coordinating staff development activities, and creating collegial relationships with and among teachers. Hallinger and Murphy (1987a), Blasé and Blasé (1999), Bridges (1967), Mitchell and Castle (2005), amongst others, are theorists who have explored and conceptualized a definition of instructional leadership.

The Principal as Instructional Leader

Since the 1980's the primary focus has been on the principal as instructional leader (Hallinger, 2005). Instructional leadership is a particular form of leadership that emphasizes the improvement of teaching and learning in the schools' technical core (Hoy&Miskel, 2008).

Instructional leadership has changed school administrators' conventional understanding of the role of the principal. Gulcan (2012) stated that the role of the principal as the instructional leader includes five items. These five items include 1) identifying the vision and mission of the school, 2) programming and administering education, 3) staff development, 4) monitoring and assessing the teaching process, and 5) creating and developing a positive school climate. Hoy and Miskel stated that instructional leaders attempt to change such school factors as curricular content, teaching methods, assessment strategies, and cultural norms for academic achievement. Hallinger (2005) has further explained that instructional leaders are commonly seen as strong and directive, culture builders, goal-oriented, both leaders and mangers, and people who combine expertise with charisma.

Hallinger and Murphy (1985) created a model of instructional leadership called the Principal Instructional Measurement Rating Scale (PIMRS) (Hallinger, 1982, 1990, 2011). The PIMRS (Hallinger, 1982, 2011) is grounded in a conceptual framework that proposes three dimensions in this role: 1) defining the schools mission, 2) managing the instructional program, and 3) promoting a positive school climate. These three dimensions are later broken down into ten instructional functions. The ten instructional functions consists of 1) framing the schools goals, 2) communicating the schools goals, 3) supervising and evaluating instruction, 4) coordinating the curriculum, 5) monitoring student progress, 6) protecting instructional time, 7) maintaining high visibility, 8) providing incentives for teachers, 9) promoting professional development, and 10) providing incentives for learning (Hallinger, 2011). Gulcan (2012) and Hallinger (2011) had similar views about the roles of the principal as instructional leader. They included in their model defining the mission, having a positive school climate, and managing the instructional plan.

It is the principals' passionate commitment to the student's academic achievement that will make the difference between a highly successful school and one that is content with the status quo (Cross & Rice, 2000). The heart of the instructional leadership is the ability of leaders to change schools from cultures of internal accountability to institutions that can meet the demands of external accountability (Halverson, Prichett, & Watson, 2007).

Teacher Perceptions of Instructional Leadership

Few studies have directly examined teachers' perspectives on principals' everyday instructional leadership characteristics and the impacts of those characteristics on teachers. In a qualitative study, Blasé and Blasé (2000) used the Inventory of Strategies Used by Principals to Influence Classroom Teaching (ISUPICT), to determine the characteristics of school principals that positively influence classroom teaching and the effects to which those characteristics have on classroom instruction. Two major themes emerged: talking with teachers to promote reflection (e.g., making suggestions, giving feedback) and promoting professional growth (e.g., emphasizing the study of teaching and learning, supporting collaboration efforts among educators). In essence, talking with teachers to promote reflection and promoting professional growth are the major dimensions of effective instructional leadership, as reported by teachers.

In a different study, O'Donnell and White (2005) examined principals' instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement to determine if there was a significant relationship between principal instructional leadership behaviors and student performance in eight grade reading and mathematics as measured by the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment. In this quantitative study they used Phillip Hallinger's (1987) PIRMS instrument to get the teacher's perceptions of principals' instructional leadership. The findings indicate that teacher

perceptions of principal behaviors focused on improving the school learning climate. Moreover, these findings were identified as predictors of student achievement in eight grade reading and mathematics as measured by the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment. Items that fall under the dimension of Hallinger's promoting the school culture include protecting the instructional time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives to teachers, promoting professional development, and providing incentives for learning. These are the areas that the teachers perceived to be more important in regards to their principals' instructional leadership.

A similarity from the findings from the two studies indicates that improving the school learning climate is important to teachers. Teachers want more professional development and a positive school culture that includes principals communicating with teachers to promote reflection.

Impediments to Instructional Leadership

In the 1980's era is when findings from research on school effectiveness and school improvement emerged to reinforce a strongly held belief among policy makers and practitioners that principal leadership "make a difference" in school performance" (Edmonds, 1979). The research from this era identified principal instructional leadership as an important factor in instructionally effective schools (Bossert et al., 1982; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Hallinger, 2011). Researchers challenged the literature and identified some limitations from empirical investigations of the principal's role as an instructional leader (Bossert et al., 1982; Cuban, 1984; Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Rowan et al., 1983; Hallinger, 2011). These limitations included,

1.) Lack of clearly explicated conceptual frameworks for studying relevant constructs;

2.) Lack of valid and reliable instrumentation for studying the role;

3.) Lack of theoretical models that articulated how this role influenced student learning;

4.) Reliance on weak research designs, ill-equipped to test for causal effects.

These limitations were cause for concern in an array of attempts to insert emerging research findings into government policies and principal training curricula (Barth, 1986; Cuban, 1984; Hallinger, 2011). The drive to turn principals into instructional leaders ran counter to findings from empirical studies and theoretical analysis that sought to account for why most principals did not assume an active role as instructional leaders (Barth, 1986, 1990; Cuban, 1984, 1988; March, 1978; Weick, 1976). Impediments to instructional leadership were reasons most principals of the past did not give enough emphasis to their role as instructional leader. The impediments for instructional leadership are manifold. Key reasons include the following:

1. At a practical level, principals are required to fulfill a variety of roles (e.g., political, managerial, instructional); to focus too much on only one of them would have dysfunctional consequences (Cuban, 1988);

2. Expectations that principals act as instructional leaders assume a level of expertise, personal values and ambition that run counter to the population characteristics and career trends of American principals (March, 1978);

3. The daily routine of managing schools pushes towards a set of work activities characterized by brevity, interruption, and fragmentation that is at odds with many of the key activists proposed for instructional leaders (Barth, 1980; Bridges, 1977; Deal & Celoti, 1980; March, 1978; Marshall, 1996; Peterson, 1977-78; Weick, 1976);

4. The "one size fits all" framework of instructional leadership disseminated through the leadership academies is at odds with multiple constraints that act on the exercise of leadership across schools that differ in resources, size staffing, and student needs (Barth, 1986; Bridges, 1977; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Hallinger & Wimpelberg, 1992).

These impediments make it hard for principals of the past to commit totally to being instructional leaders. Cuban (1988) and March (1977) viewed instructional leadership as too much for one person to accomplish effectively. After a period of relative decline in popularity during the 1990s, there has been a new and unprecedented global commitment among government agencies toward training principals to be instructional leaders (Hallinger 2003; Huber, 2003; Stricherz, 2001a, 2001b).

Assessments of Principal as Instructional Leadership

Duke and Stiggins (1985) stated that one of the conditions necessary for principals to exercise strong instructional leadership is the availability of reliable, valid, usable methods for assessing their leadership behaviors. The methods of assessing instructional leadership for principals include direct observation, interviews, document analysis, and questionnaires. Hallinger and Murphy (1985) advanced a model of instructional leadership involving three dimensions. The dimensions include a principal defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning climate (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Hallinger and Murphy (1985) measured the instructional leadership model by creating the PIRMS assessment tool. The PIRMS questionnaire asks the respondents to indicate the frequency with which the principal engages in behaviors associated with the three dimensions of instructional leadership (Hoy & Miskel).

Other assessments for instructional leadership include Alig-Mielcarek and Hoy's (2005) Instructional Leadership Inventory (ILI) and the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED) (Porter, Goldring, Elliot, Murphy, Polikoff, & Cravens, 2008). The Instructional Leadership Inventory (ILI) (Alig-Mielcarek and Hoy, 2005) is an instrument that provides reliable and valid scales which measure the three elements of instructional leadership. The ILI (2005) is made up of 30 items instrument that measure the three components of instructional leadership. The elements include defining and communicating school goals, monitoring and assessing the curriculum and instructional program, and promoting school wide professional development. Hallinger (2007b) and Alig-Mielcarek and Hoy (2005) had similar findings which suggest that principal instructional leadership behaviors influence the situational factor of academic press, the school's emphasis on academic and intellectual activity which in turn directly relates to student achievement (Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

The VAL-ED (Porter, 2008) is a set of evidence-based rating scales which focus "100 percent" on school principals' learning-centered leadership behaviors (Peabody, 2008; Porter, Goldring, Murphy, Elliot, & May, 2008). The Val-ED instrument uses a multirater, evidence-based approach to measure the effectiveness of school leadership behaviors known to influence teacher performance and student learning. The Val-ED instrument is a 360-degree assessment which includes the response of the teachers, the principal, and the principals' supervisor. Core components and key processes are measured with the Val-ED instrument. Core components are the characteristics of schools that support the learning of students and improve the ability of teachers to teach. Key processes refer to how leaders construct and manage those core components. Results of the assessment are displayed graphically and in tabular form and include

principals', supervisors', and teachers' aggregated mean effectiveness rating on each scale and total score.

The literature gives information about the history, perceptions, roles, and assessments of instructional leadership. Although instructional leadership may be deemed as one of the more popular leadership styles today it is not the only leadership style of preference or effectiveness. Transformational leadership is a leadership style that goes above and beyond the simple exchanges and agreements of transactional leadership (Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

Transformational Leadership

The emergence of transformational leadership as a new perspective on leadership started with a classic work by James MacGregor Burns (1978) titled *Leadership*. Burns' intentions were to attempt to link the roles of leadership and followership. Burns described and defined two types of leadership, which are transformational and transactional (Northhouse, 2010).

Transformational Leadership Defined

Transformational leadership is the process whereby a person engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and follower (Northhouse, 2010). Bass extended Burns's work by giving more attention to followers' rather than leaders' needs.

Transformational leadership involves an exceptional form of influence that moves followers to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them (Northouse, 2010). Transformational leadership occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their

employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group, and when they stir their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group (Bass, 1990). It includes assessing followers' motives, satisfying their needs, and treating them as full human beings (Northhouse). Transformational leadership has been researched with multiple variables including student achievement, transactional leadership, and instructional leadership.

A quantitative study examined the relationships between principal managerial, instructional, and transformational leadership and student achievement in public high schools. The results from the study showed that within transformational leadership, the principal's ability to identify a vision and provide an appropriate model had the greatest relationship to achievement (Valintine & Prater, 2011). Transformational leadership involves the leader moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests through idealized influence, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration (Bass, 1999).

Transformational leadership requires boundaries and guidance and, as such, it is imperative that organizations supporting transformational leadership ensure a culture that supports such leaders (Brymer & Gray, 2006). An effective transformational leader requires a deep understanding of oneself (Brymer & Gray). This means that transformational skills' should be supported by a leader's personal, authentic or spiritual growth (Luthans & Avolio 2003; Elliot, 2002). According to Bass (as cited in Krishnan, 2002), transformational leadership is considered effective in any situation or culture and does not specify any conditions under which authentic transformational leadership is irrelevant or ineffective.

The Four I's of Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership describes a process by which leaders bring about significant positive changes in individuals, groups, teams, and organizations (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991) by using inspiration, vision, and the ability to motivate followers to transcend their self-interests for a collective purpose. Idealized influence, inspirational leadership, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration are characteristics of transformational leadership (Bass, 1990). Bass identified these dimensions of transformational leadership below (Bass, 1985):

1. Idealized Influence (Bass originally called this charisma but later renamed it idealized influence to describe providing a clear vision and mission, instilling pride in what needs to be accomplished, and gaining respect and trust from leading with high moral and ethical standards)

2. Inspiration (communicating high expectations, adding meaning to goals and undertakings, using symbols to focus efforts, expressing important purposes in simple ways, doing things to keep people motivated)

3. Intellectual Stimulation (encouraging new and better ways of doing things, fostering creativity, re-examining assumptions, promoting intelligence, rationality, and problem solving)

4. Individual Consideration (showing a personal interest in employees and their development)

Idealized influence and inspirational leadership are demonstrated when the leader envisions a desirable future, articulates how it can be reached, sets an example to be followed, sets high standards of performance, and shows determination and confidence (Bass, 1999). Intellectual stimulation is demonstrated when the leader helps followers to become more innovative and creative (Bass, 1999). Individualized consideration is displayed when leaders pay attention to the developmental needs of followers and support and coach the development of their followers (Bass, 1999). Bass and Riggio (2006) and Baldoni (2005) and agree that transformational leadership has four elements that include idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration that constitutes its framework.

Transactional Leadership

The concept of transactional leadership was first introduced by Burns (1978); he defined transactional leadership as an exchange the between leader and subordinates. Transactional leadership differs from transformational leadership due to the fact that a transactional leader does not individualize the needs of subordinates or focus on their personal development (Northouse, 2010). Transactional leadership is composed of three components: 1) contingent reward leadership, which refers to leaders giving followers things they want in exchange for things leaders want (Kuhnert and Lewis, 1987); 2) active management-by-exception, which refers to leaders actively monitoring performance and taking corrective action as problems become apparent (Hoy & Miskel, 2008); and 3) passive management-by-exception which refers to leaders that wait to take action until after mistakes or other performance problems have happened and are called to their attention (Hoy & Miskel).

Contingent reward and active management-by-exception leadership provides information such as goals and positive and negative feedback to followers (Bass, 1985). Contingent reward behavior, in relation to defining what needs to be done, how to get things done, and what performances need to be accomplished, may allow followers to be psychologically empowered by being able to better understand the significance, meaning, and value of their job (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005). Active management-by-exception followers are capable of realizing what behaviors and performances are viewed as deviances, mistakes, or errors in their performances and having the ability take corrective action and respond accordingly (Sosik & Jung, 2010). Passive management by exception is viewed as a let things happen before the leader reacts to the problem model. Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1999) and Bono and Judge (2004) suggested that passive management-by-exception model be included as a passive leadership component with the laissez-faire model of leadership.

Effective transactional leaders must frequently fulfill the expectations of their followers (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987). This means that effective transactional leadership is contingent on the leaders' abilities to meet and respond to the reactions and changing expectations of their followers (Kellerman, 1984). Kilmoski and Hayes (1980), among others, have found that in the workplace contingent reward transactional leadership can positively influence performance and employee satisfaction. Management-by-exception transactional leadership has demonstrated negative impacts on satisfaction and performance (Howell & Avolio, 1993). Despite the clear distinction between transformational and transactional leadership styles, Bass (1985; 1999) suggested transformational leadership actually is an extension of transactional leadership; therefore, a leader can simultaneously be both or neither. Bass and his colleagues have argued

that transactional leadership is a necessary precondition if transformational leadership is to be effective (Avolio, Bass, and Jung (1999)).

Theoretically, transactional leadership is viewed as a less effective form of leadership than transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). Transactional leaders are viewed as leaders who concentrate on compromise, intrigue, and control; therefore, they are more likely to be seen as more inflexible, detached, and manipulative than transformational leaders (Bass& Riggio, 2006). Empirically, previous research has specified that transformational leadership has a more positive effect on many leadership outcomes when compared to transactional leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

Laissez-Faire Leadership

Bass (1998) characterized Laissez-Faire leadership as the absence of transactions with followers. Laissez-faire leadership is a style where a leader believes that the group can make its own decisions without the leader or, at least, with very little input from the leader (Ricketts & Ricketts, 2011). Bass and Avolio (1990) had the same view as Bass (1998) and Northhouse (2010) about Laissez-Faire leadership. Bass and Avolio (1990, p. 20) defined the laissez-faire approach as, "the absence of leadership, the avoidance of intervention, or both." Laissez-Faire leaders relinquish responsibilities, delays decisions, give no feedback, and make little effort to help followers satisfy their needs (Northhouse). The laissez-faire leadership style is appropriate only when the groups' level of maturity and intelligence is close to that of the leader (Ricketts & Ricketts). There are three modified versions of laissez-faire leadership, which includes participative leadership, delegation leadership, and superleadership.

Participative leadership is a form of laissez-faire that includes leading by gathering and considering input from group members. Delegation leadership is when groups or organizations are allowed to attempt new tasks and learn new skills, thereby possibly enriching their jobs and increasing their satisfaction and motivation. Superleadership involves leading people to lead themselves. Laissez-Faire leadership style has been viewed by a number of researchers as a style with an absence of leadership.

Assessment of Transformational Leadership

Avolio & Bass's 2004 Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire is the survey that is utilized to measure the extent to which a principal is a transformational leader. Transformational leadership refers to the leader moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1990). The full range of leadership, as measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), implies that every leader displays a frequency of both the transactional and transformational factors, but each leader's profile involves more of one and less of the other (Bass, 1998).

Kouzes' and Posners' Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Kouzes & Posner, 1993) is another tool used for measuring transformational leadership. The LPI's purpose is to provide someone with information about his or her leadership behavior. This survey is built upon five leadership practices which include challenging the process, inspiring a shared vision, enabling others to act, and modeling the way (Kouzes & Posner). By implementation of the LPI, the leader and the persons observing the leader can give feedback on the five leadership practices. The LPI (Kouzes & Posner) uses a scale that ranges from "1" (almost never) to "10" (almost

always). The more the behaviors are included in the LPI, the more likely the leader will be viewed as transformational (Kouzes & Posner). Extensive testing by Kouzes and Posner revealed that the instrument exhibits sound psychometric properties. The MLQ (2004) and the LPI (1993) both measure the extent to which a person is a transformational leader.

Other Variables Related to Instructional Leadership

This section will examine additional variables that might be related to instructional leadership. Two that will receive attention include the principal's level of academic degree and the principal's teaching area. In other words, what does research report regarding these variables and the perceptions that their teachers have in relation to their principals' instructional leadership.

Principals' Level of Graduate Degree

The educational literature of the early 21st century has placed principal preparation programs and associated graduate degree programs under indictment (Petzko, 2008). To become an administrator in America's public schools, one must complete baccalaureate requirements and a graduate program that meets criteria found in a state's certification or licensure standards (Ervay, 2006). Advanced degrees and training in education administration are generally associated with lower performance ratings (Ballou & Podgursky, 1995). Several studies have reported the need to reform principal preparation programs in order to address responsibilities associated with being a school's instructional leader (Acker-Hocevar & Cruz-Janzen, 2008; Brown, 2006). A highly acclaimed study from the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute recently stated: "study after study has shown that the training principals typically receive in

university programs and from their own districts does not do nearly enough to prepare them for their roles as leaders of learning" (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007).

A qualitative study was conducted in a north Texas School District where they surveyed all of the administrators in the district about their perceptions regarding university and proprietary principal preparation programs (Borgemenke, 2011). A focus group comprised of administrators from the school district was selected to explore commonalities, provide depth, and comment on the survey results that were gathered. The themes that emerged from the focus groups examination include the following:

1. The group felt that the work they do in professional development should be credited toward program completion requirements;
2. Principal preparation programs need to incorporate a strong component of instruction, leadership, motivation, and budgeting into their curriculum;
3. The responses from the group were in general negative toward having totally online principal preparation programs. (p.4)

While the focus group did find value in the core concepts the principal preparation programs adopted, they also felt that the programs where lacking in the themes listed above (Borgemenke, 2011). The focus group felt that while core knowledge of leadership is important, practical knowledge is imperative for successful preparation programs. Ervay's (2006) research found that what is missing in most of preparation programs is an intensive focus on research, the interpretation of literary thought, the advocacy of justifiable and well-supported points of view, the consideration of historical and current applications of mathematics and science, an interest and conversance with the fine arts, and the ability to comprehensively articulate ideas and

processes both orally and in writing. Borgemenke (2011) and Ervay's (2006) research found variables that could possibly improve preparation programs in the university setting.

Although Ervay's (2006) and Borgemenke's (2011) research found variables that could possibly improve principal preparation programs, their research did not speak specifically to the level of degree being one of those variables for principal improvement. Although most states continue to require potential school leaders to complete university coursework before they assume leadership positions, there is little evidence that the university programs as now conducted make any difference in preparing principals who create high performance schools (Brent 1998).

Principals' Teaching Area Background

A principal's legitimacy often comes from classroom experience and knowledge of instructional practices, not simply from their position, professional status, or the process through which they were allocated to their professional positions (Spillane, Hallett,&Diamond, 2003). Hallinger and Heck (1998) and Smylie and Bennett (2006) commented that while extensive research has focused on the practices of effective principals, little work exists that examines the strategic and practical knowledge that these school leaders use in facing different problems and issues in their work – in short, few have tried to answer how knowledge affects practice.

In a qualitative study using data from observations and interviews with 84 teachers at eight Chicago public elementary schools, researchers found that the construction of leadership for instruction is often found in various types of interactions (e.g., subject area) and varies by the leaders' position (Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond, 2003). The construction of leadership around "expertise" involved practical experience and/or the knowledge associated with formal

certification or training in specific content areas (Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond). The study showed that when teachers constructed principals as leaders on the premise of expertise, they often did so in relation to knowledge about classroom teaching. (Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond). Expertise was summoned more often when the teachers constructed other teachers as leaders than when they constructed administrators as leaders. (Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond).

Stein and Nelson (2003) stated that the subject-matter-knowledge requirements of effective instructional leadership is an area that deserves in-depth investigation. They found that the study of administrators' understanding of subject matter and how it must be transformed for the purposes of leadership has been neglected in research on educational administration, and they recommended research in this area. Leadership content knowledge is a new construct that has little research in the field of educational leadership (Stein & Nelson).

The research from Stein and Nelson (2003) and Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond, (2003) does not speak to the principals' teaching area background directly, but instead to the principals' knowledge of the content and to how teachers constructed principals as leaders on the premise of expertise. There was a lack of evidence that examined whether a teachers' perception of a principals' teaching area background has a relationship with instructional leadership.

Teachers' Perceptions of Variables Related to Instructional Leadership

This section will explore teacher perception of various variables. These variables include transformational leadership, principals' level of degree, and a principals' teaching area background.

Teachers′ Perceptions of Principals′ Level of Transformational Leadership.

According to Sergiovanni (2007), transformational leaders seek to inspire and empower members of the organization to focus on a common vision and to take ownership of the change process through a collaborative approach. Results of several studies support the conclusion that transformational leadership has a positive impact on teachers' perceptions of school conditions, their commitment to change, and the organizational learning that takes place (Pepper, 2010). Sahin (2004) indicated that principals and teachers noted there was a positive relationship between transformational leadership and the dimensions of a positive school culture.

Teachers′ Perceptions of Principals′ Level of Graduate Degree.

To become an administrator in America's public schools, one must complete baccalaureate requirements and a graduate program that meets criteria found in a state's certification or licensure standards (Ervay, 2006). Many states require a master's degree in education, typically in education administration, and it is now common for persons who pursue careers in administration to acquire a Ph.D. or an Ed.D. Eberts and Stone (1988) analyzed the effects of various principal characteristics on mathematics test scores of fourth graders. Findings demonstrate that a measure of academic leadership on the part of the principal is associated with higher student test scores. Eberts and Stone (1988) also found a negative relationship between principals' advanced degrees and student test scores. This means that Eberts and Stone's (1988) study in relation to advanced degrees are not viewed as a major determinate for improving student achievement on test scores. Eberts and Stone (1988) did warn that their findings could be due to the sorting process in which principals with better credentials receive more difficult assignments.

Ballou and Podgursky (1995) examined the performance of public school principals as rated by teachers they supervise. Ballou and Podgursky (1995) found that principals with post master graduate degrees receive significantly lower performance ratings from teachers. The study concluded by emphasizing that they found little support for recent proposals to enhance "professionalism" by requiring post masters' graduate degrees and additional administrative training for principals (Ballou & Podursky). The results from Ballou and Podgursky are consistent with Eberts and Stone (1988) who found a negative relationship between principals' post masters' graduate degrees and student test scores.

Valentine and Prater (2011) found that although there may be other principal variables that influence effectiveness, such as personal motivation, prior experiences, intelligence, or dedication, the findings from their study reinforced the notion that the principal's education level is associated with teachers' perception of the principal's effectiveness. Principals with greater levels of formal preparation focusing on the principalship were perceived as more capable leaders (Valentine & Prater, 2011). As a principals' educational level increased, so did the teachers' perceptions of their principals' competence (Valentine & Prater, 2011). The overwhelming evidence indicates that principals in this study who had more education were considered more effective leaders by their teachers. Valentine and Prater's (2011) study yielded different results than Eberts and Stone's (1988) and Ballou and Podgursky's (1995) studies in relation to advanced degrees and their relationship to student achievement.

Eberts and Stone's (1988) and Ballou and Podursky's (1995) research supports the idea that advanced degrees have a negative relationship with student test scores or a teachers' evaluation of their principal whereas Valentine and Prater's (2011) research supports findings a positive relationship from a teachers' perception. There is a limited amount of research

supporting the notion that advanced degrees prepare and improve principals as instructional leaders from a teachers' perspective. This creates a need for further research in this area.

Teacher Perceptions of Principals Teaching Area Background.

In a study about the teacher evaluation process Atkins (1996) supported the notion that the problem with the process includes principals' lack of instructional competence or educational leadership experience. Protheroe (2002) has proposed that a principal's knowledge of teaching standards and what constitutes pedagogical skill is critical to the teacher evaluation process. When principals are perceived to have little teaching or pedagogical experience, or reduced content knowledge, teachers' belief in their principals' abilities to be competent judges of teaching abilities is greatly reduced (Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003).

Research Teachers' Perceptions of Principals' Instructional Leadership

This section will examine teacher perceptions of principals' instructional leadership to see if there is a relationship between selected variables and instructional leadership. The variables are transformational leadership, level of graduate degree, and a principals' teaching area background.

The Relationship between Instructional Leadership and Transformational Leadership.

Two leadership models have dominated the literature in educational administration over the past 25 years: transformational leadership and instructional leadership (Hallinger, 2003). Comparisons of the transformational and instructional leadership models were adapted from the research of Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and Liethwood, Leonard, and Sharratt (1998). It is

evident from the research that the similarities between the models are more significant than the differences (Hallinger, 2007a).

Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and Liethwood, et al. (1998) have described the similarities of instructional and transformational leadership to consist of the following behaviors (as cited in Hallinger, 2007a, p. 4):

1) Producing a shared sense of purpose in the school;
2) Creating a climate of high expectations and school cultures focused on innovation and improvement of teaching and learning;
3) Molding the reward structure of the school to mirror the school's mission as well as goals set for all stakeholders;
4) Organizing and providing a wide range of professional learning activities aimed at intellectual stimulation and the continuous development of staff;
5) Maintaining safe and orderly presence school by being visible and modeling the desired values of the school's culture.

Similarly, Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and Liethwood et al. (1998) have described the differences of instructional and transformational leadership to consist of the following (as cited in Hallinger, 2007a, p. 4):

1) Target of change (i.e., first-order or second-order effects)
2) Extent to which the principal emphasizes an organization and control strategy vs. an empowerment' plan for reform in the school.

The differences are noteworthy: transformational leaders operate from a ground up model compared to instructional leaders operating from the top down model (Hallinger, 2007a).

However, the similarities demonstrate the areas that transformational and instructional leadership can be deemed as similar or related in terms of creating a shared sense of purpose and being visible in the school (Hallinger). Valentine and Prater (2011) found in their study about leadership styles and student achievement that transformational and instructional leadership both had a positive relationship with student achievement. Instructional leadership was linked to achievement via instructional and curriculum improvement and transformational leadership via the identification of a vision and a leader being able provide an appropriate model to follow (Valentine & Prater, 2011). Although instructional leadership and transformational leadership are both linked to student achievement and differences and similarities have been identified about the two styles of leadership there is still a need to see if there is a relationship between transformational leadership and a teachers' perception of his/her principals' instructional leadership. If information can be gathered to see if transformational leadership be a predicator of effective instructional leadership it could fill a gap in the literature.

The Relationship between Principals' Level of Graduate Degree and Instructional Leadership.

Ballou and Podgursky's (1995) research supports the notion that advanced degrees and training in education administration are generally associated with lower performance ratings. As it pertains to teachers, the researchers believe that education makes no difference to teacher performance or student learning and that students would be better off without state efforts to regulate entry into teaching or to provide supports or teachers' learning. Ballou and Podgursky (1995) have a negative view about training and preparation programs for teachers and future leaders.

Borgemenk (2011) and Ervay (2006) addressed principal preparation programs, alternative programs, and district programs to better prepare principals' to become instructional leaders. Their research did not speak to teacher perceptions of a principals' level of degree. Instead the research spoke about a variety of principal preparation programs to improve the principal as an instructional leader. Borgemenk (2011) and Ervay (2006) research supports the idea that principal preparation programs are important to the development of our future leaders.

Ballou and Podgursky's (1995) and Borgemenk (2011) and Ervay (2006) had different views about the training of principals and teachers. Ballou and Podgursky's (1995) did not believe in training teachers or administrators and Borgemenk (2011) and Ervay (2006) believed that training is important to the development of principals as instructional leaders.

The literature does not specifically address the different levels of graduate academic degree in relation to instructional leadership from a teachers' perspective. There is a lack of evidence that supports that a principal that has a doctorate degree will be more or less effective as an instructional leader than one who has a master's degree from a teachers' perspective. This presents a gap in the literature and an opportunity for further investigation.

The relationship between principals′ teaching area background and instructional leadership. Stein and Nelson (2003) stated that, to their knowledge, research has not examined the subject-matter-knowledge requirements of effective instructional leadership. As such, the field of educational administration offers few, if any, images of what it might look like or the advantages it might confer to those who possess it (Stein & Nelson). Leadership content knowledge is a new construct (Stein & Nelson). Stein and Nelson (2003) developed their

concept of leadership content knowledge, focusing on what school leaders should know and understand about teaching and learning in schools: (Goldring, Huff, May, & Camburn, 2007)

Knowledge about subject matter content is related in complex ways to knowledge about how to lead (Stein & Nelson, 2003). Stein and Nelsons' (2003) research examined the content knowledge of certain subject-matters in their conceptualization as a variable that needs more investigation. Stein and Neson (2003) argued that administrators who profess to be instructional leaders—superintendents; deputy, assistant, or area superintendents; and principals—must have some degree of understanding of the various subject areas under their purview.

The challenge that principals face with respect to classroom instruction can differ from one subject area to the next, even in primary schools. Hence, efforts to study and improve school leadership might be well advised to pay attention to subject matter as an explanatory variable (Spillan, 2005). The literature does not speak to the principals' teaching area background directly. This means that the literature does not examine the subject that a principal taught as a teacher and if a there is a relationship between a teachers' perception of their principals' teaching subject background and instructional leadership. Instead the literature examines the principals' knowledge of content in the core subjects and if there is a relationship to instructional leadership from a teachers' perception. There is a lack of research on whether a principals' teaching area background has a relationship with instructional leadership directly. This study could be significant to the field of educational leadership due to the lack of research in relation to a principals' teaching area background as a variable which may help identify effective instructional leaders.

Summary and Conclusion

Instructional leadership is not a well-defined concept (Bridges, 1967). Hallinger (1992) supports the belief that the term instructional leadership has suffered from conceptual and practical limitations. There are many different definitions from many different theorists about instructional leadership. As a consequence, researchers have not found a uniform way of predicting which variables are related to effective instructional leadership. However, research suggests that transformational leadership behaviors, principals' level of graduate degree, and a principals' teaching area background might be related. Although, these relationships have either not been explored or findings have not been consistent.

Transformational leadership involves an exceptional form of influence that motivates followers to want to accomplish more than what is usually expected of them (Northouse, 2010). There is previous research that shows that transformational leadership has a positive relationship with instructional leadership in relation to student achievement but limited research from a teachers' perception. The lack of research in this field from a teachers' perception makes this variable worthy of further research. If transformational leadership has a positive relationship from a teachers' perception with instructional leadership than it may be possible to improve training programs for principals and help improve the hiring practices of effective instructional leaders for school improvement.

The level of degree of a principal is a variable that has results that conflict with each other from the literature. Some of the literature speaks to the higher level of the principals' academic degrees having a lower impact on performance ratings (Ballou & Podgursky, 1995)

where other researchers (Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003) have found that if a principal does not have knowledge of the content and prior teaching experience than they are less likely to respect or value his or her opinion as their evaluator. This is a contradiction in the literature about the level of graduate degree of a principal from a teachers' perception. The findings about a principals' level of degree and its possible relation to instructional leadership from a teachers' perspective is minimal. The examined literature addresses the preparation programs of the principal, where few, if any, address the increase or decrease of success with the principals' instructional leadership in relation to the principals' level of academic degree from a teachers' perspective. The research question in this study that addresses if there is a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and a principals' level of degree is significant because of the lack of research in the literature. It is important to know if the level of degree has a positive or negative effect on teacher perceptions of principals' instructional leadership. School leadership is second only to classroom instruction (by teachers) as an influence on student achievement (Leithwood, Sammons, Harris, & Hopkins, 2006). Teachers directly influence student achievement meaning their perception whether positive or negative towards their principals' level of degree could possibly influence their respect for the principal and/or motivation to take instructional advice from their principal. This variable needs further research to fill the gap in the current literature in relation to teachers' perception about the relationship between instructional leadership and principals' level of degree.

Stein and Nelson (2003) expressed to their knowledge research has not examined the subject-matter-knowledge requirements of effective instructional leadership. The literature addresses the content knowledge that a principal should have to be an instructional leader; however, it does not address whether or not a teacher's perception of his/her principals'

academic teaching background (the subject the principal taught as a teacher) has a relationship with instructional leadership. Instead of focusing on the academic teaching background of the principal and if any relationship exist, the literature focuses on the amount of knowledge that a principal has about subject matter. This focus on subject knowledge is known as leadership content knowledge which is a new construct that has minimal research in the field of educational leadership (Stein & Nelson). This research question will examine whether there is a relationship between a principals' academic teaching/subject area background and a teacher perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership due to the lack of research in the field.

It is a given that principals need to be instructional leaders. Researchers separately have found transformational leadership to be effective for developing high functional organizations where the members all have roles that require self-direction, problem solving, and full participation. Instructional leadership has been the most popular theme in educational leadership over the last two decades. Although instructional leadership is a popular leadership style the concept is not well defined (Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005). If instructional leadership is not well defined than it may be hard to predict which variables may have a positive effect on teachers' perception of a principals' instructional leadership. This creates a gap in the literature and gives purpose to further research in this area. Specifically, more research is needed to determine whether a measure of transformational leadership behaviors of principals can predict how teachers perceive their principals' instructional leadership behaviors. As well, researchers have yet to explore whether principals' level of graduate degree or the academic teaching background are related to how teachers perceive their principals' instructional leadership.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to examine if there is a relationship between a teachers' perception of their principals' instructional leadership and transformational leadership behaviors. Further, the researcher examined other variables which included the level of graduate degree of a principal and a principals' teaching area background to see if a relationship exists with a teachers' perception of their principals' instructional leadership. A multitude of variables have been studied in relation to instructional leadership; however, the extent to which a principal is a transformational leader, the level of graduate degree of the principal, and the teaching background area of the principal are three variables that have minimal research. This study is noteworthy because if there is a relationship between one or multiple variables that the researcher is examining it could move us closer to a more universal concept of instructional leadership and possibly serve as a resource for developing current and aspiring instructional leaders.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following overarching research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership (instructional leadership sub-scales; PIMRS) and transformational leadership (transformational leadership sub-scales; MLQ) behaviors?

2. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and the following variables?

    a. Principals' level of advanced degree;

    b. Principals' subject area preparation.

Research design

In this quantitative study, I used a correlation research design. I chose a quantitative study instead of a qualitative study because it allowed for the generalization of findings. Correlational research refers to studies in which the purpose is to discover relationships between variables through the use of correlational statistics (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). It involves collecting data on two or more variables for each individual in a sample and computing a correlation coefficient (Gall et al., 2007). I chose this method because I sought to determine if there is a relationship between teachers' perception of instructional leadership and the extent to which a principal is a transformational leader, the level of graduate degree, and the teaching background area of the principal. The independent variables in this study consisted of the extent to which a principal is perceived by teachers to be a transformational leader, a principal's level of graduate degree, and a principal's teaching subject area background. The dependent variable consisted of teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership.

Population

The target population for this investigation included teachers from one school district in a large urban area in the Southeastern region of the United States. The teachers were certified and under the supervision of a public school principal. In addition, the principals were full-time administrators who held appropriate state certification in educational administration.

Sample

The participants for this study were teachers and principals who volunteered after receiving an invitation from the researcher. They are full-time, certified teachers and principals from the target population, a large urban school district in the Southeastern region of the USA. They may have been motivated to participate in this study because it could add to the existing research in the field. Further, the results from this study in addition to others give more insight on multiple variables that may have a relationship with instructional leadership. The reward that teachers could receive from this study is improvement in the hiring practices of instructional leaders which may produce better schools. Also, the reward for principals could be the improvement of professional development in relation to instructional leadership. The sample was collected from a population of 750 school teachers and 30 school principals. The response rate and sample size used for the study consisted of 30 school principals and 234 teachers. The sample size by school ranged from two to 19. A response rate of 30.4% of teachers responded to the survey. A confidence level of 78.2% was met for this sample (Nulty, 2008).

I used cluster sampling to select the participants. Cluster sampling is used when it is more feasible to select groups of individuals (called clusters) rather than individuals from a defined population (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007).

The ethnic composition of the school district where the study was conducted consists of the following: 4.8% Asian, 72.0% Black, 16.1% Hispanic, 2.2% Multiracial, 4.0% White, and 0.9% Other. The school district has a population that is 51% male and 49% female. This school district is also a Title I district with 76.8% of the students receiving free or reduced lunches.

Instrumentation

I used two questionnaires during the study. One questionnaire (two questionnaires combined into one) was for the teachers and the other for the principal. The teacher questionnaire was made up of two questionnaires combined into one to measure the principals' instructional leadership (PIMRS, 1982) and the extent to which a principal is a transformational leader (MLQ, 2004). I only used the transformational leadership scales in the MLQ questionnaire. The principal questionnaire is a two question form that asks for the principal's prior teaching background and his or her highest degree level. From the results given from the teacher and principal questionnaire the researcher was able to answer the proposed research questions.

Hallinger's (1982) Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) was one of the two questionnaires administered to the sample. The PIMRS assesses three dimensions of the instructional leadership construct: defining the schools' mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school learning climate (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). The three dimensions include 10 instructional leadership functions divided amongst the three dimensions. The first dimension, defining the school's mission includes framing the school's goals and communicating the school's goals. The second dimension, managing the instructional program, includes supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, and

monitoring student progress. The third dimension, promoting a positive school learning climate, includes protecting instructional time, promoting professional development, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, and providing incentives for learning.

The survey consists of 50 Likert type questions ranging from one to five. Five meaning a teacher perceives that the principal "almost always" behaves in the manner indicated by the survey item and one meaning a teacher perceives that the principal "almost never" behaves in the manner indicated by the survey item. The PIMRS instrument has been validated by meeting a high standard of reliability (Hallinger, 1983). The PIRMS survey consists of 10 subscales. The 10 subscales exceeded .80 using Cronbach's test of internal consistency (Hallinger, 2011). Individually the internal consistency for the PIMRS subscales are as follows: framing the goals (.89), communicating goals (.89), supervision/evaluation (90), curricular coordination (.90), monitors student progress (.90), protects instructional time (.84), visibility (.81), incentives for teachers (.78), professional development (.86), and incentives for learning (.87) (Hallinger).

The subscales of the PIRMS instrument is scored by calculating the mean for the items that compose each subscale (Hallinger, 2011). Later studies have generally substituted Ebels' (1951) test for calculating interrater reliability with Cronbach's formula. With Cronbach's formula a researcher is able to treat each teacher's response independently. Later studies have substituted Ebels' (1951) test because of the limitations of using Ebles' formula (Hallinger, Wang, and Chen, 2013). The first limitation of Ebles' formula assumes that teachers are randomly selected from the same population (Hallinger, Wang, & Chen). The second limitation is that item-level scores are ignored in Ebles' formula, which only employs the total score from a teacher on the relevant subscale (Hallinger, Wang, & Chen). Various researchers' (Dunn, Fulton, Leitner, Mercer, Moore, O'Day, as cited in Hallinger, 2011) studies have supported the

original validation study in its conclusion that the scale provides reliable data on instructional leadership. The data from the survey provided teacher perceptions about the principal's instructional leadership.

The PIMRS instrument is scored by calculating the mean for the items that comprise each subscale (Hallinger, Wang, and Chen, 2013). This score represents the principals' performance within a given instructional leadership function. The subscale average is calculated by averaging the item scores within each instructional leadership subscale. When there is more than one respondent, the score is obtained by averaging the averages.

Avolio and Bass's (2004) Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) is the second scale the researcher utilized. The principal's transformational leadership level was measured by using the MLQ (Bass, 1999). Transformational leadership refers to the leader moving the follower beyond immediate self-interests through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration (Bass, 1999). The full range of leadership as measured by the MLQ implies that every leader displays a frequency of both the transactional and transformational factors, but each leader's profile involves more of one and less of the other (Bass, 1999). The MLQ (Form 5X) contains 45 items, with 36 items representing the nine leadership factors. These factors include five transformational leadership factors, which include the following: 1.) idealized influence (attributed), 2.) idealized influence (behavior), 3.) inspirational motivation, 4.) intellectual stimulation, and 5.) individualized consideration. Transactional leadership includes the following: 1.) contingent reward leadership, 2.) management-by-exception (active), and 3.) management-by-exception (passive). Nontransactional leadership includes laissez-faire leadership (Hebert, 2011). The survey of 45

items uses a five response Likert scale ranging from frequently to not at all (Avolio & Bass, 2004).

There have been criticisms concerning the high correlations among the transformational scales, as well as between the transformational leadership scales and contingent reward; the mixing of behaviors; impact and outcomes within a single leadership scale, and distinguishing between idealized influence (behavioral) and idealized influence (attributed) (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; 1998; House, Spangler, & Woyke, 1991).

Reports from the MLQ manual (Avolio & Bass, 2004), based on the most recent United States normative sample, indicate that MLQ scores for transformational characteristics were found to have reliabilities ranging from .70 to .83. Moreover, other studies by different authors have substantiated the claims with similar results (Lowe & Kroeck, 1996; Tejeda, 2001). To test the construct validity of the MLQ the authors completed studies testing the present nine factor model against other models (Hebert, 2011). Further, the nine factor model has been demonstrated as being superior with a goodness-of-fit of .91 for follower rating (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Also, external predictive validity of the MLQ has been established over the years as multiple studies have indicated that high MLQ transformational scores have been consistent (Hebert, 2011). Overall, the MLQ has been widely studied and has been found to exhibit internal consistency, rest-retest reliability, external predictive validity, and construct validity (Eid et al., 2004; Garman et al., 2003; Howell & Avolio, 1993; Lowe & Kroeck, 1996).

The principal questionnaire is a two question form that asks about the principal's prior teaching background and his or her highest degree level. The principal questionnaire was field tested by three principals. Responses were categorical data.

Data collection

There were two questionnaires administered during this study. There was one questionnaire for the principals and a separate one for the teachers. The teacher's questionnaire consisted of two questionnaires collapsed into one to get their perceptions about their principals' instructional leadership (PIMRS) and transformational leadership (MLQ) behaviors. The principals took a separate questionnaire about their level of degree and teaching area background. The principal questionnaire and teacher questionnaire (PIRMS and MLQ) were administered via SurveyMonkey®. I sent an email explaining what the study was about with directions on how to complete the questionnaire. One untraceable link was attached to the email which directed them to the questionnaire for the study. I used the skip logic option in SurveyMonkey® to link the principal questionnaire to the teacher questionnaire. The skip option tool asked the teacher and principal to click on their current position (principal or teacher). After the participants' selection they were redirected to the principal questionnaire if they were the principal and to the teacher questionnaire if they were a teacher. The participants had two weeks to complete the questionnaire. I sent a reminder email after the first week and before the last day of the administration.

SurveyMonkey® is an online tool used to administer anonymous web-based surveys. There was not a way to link the data back to individual schools or principals. I coded the schools by number in Surveymonkey® so that I knew which schools had participated and which school had not for data analysis purposes. In survey monkey, I used codes instead of school names to ensure that there was not a way that the data could be linked back to individual schools or principals. The results were reported in composite form, and no school or any individual

participant was identifiable. The survey was field tested in three schools, with three teachers per school, which ensured that the data collection procedure permitted correct data analysis.

Summary

The purpose of this research was to observe whether there was a relationship between teachers' perception of their principal's instructional leadership and the extent to which a principal is a transformational leader, level of graduate degree of the principal, and the principals' teaching background area. A correlational research design was used and the data were analyzed using multiple regression. Participants were teachers and principals of an urban school district in the Southeastern region of the USA.

CHAPTER 4

REPORT OF DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine if there was a relationship between teacher perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and the extent to which a principal exhibits transformational leadership behaviors, the level of graduate degree of the principal, and

the principal's previous teaching area background. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) and Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) were used to observe teacher perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and transformational leadership behaviors. Further, a two question questionnaire was used to collect information on principals regarding their level of education and principal teaching area background. This chapter provides an overview of the research questions and research design. Also, this chapter goes into detail about the description of the participants and research results via tables with narration attached. The research questions will be stated and addressed to conclude this section.

Research Questions

This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership (instructional leadership sub-scales; PIMRS) and transformational leadership (transformational leadership sub-scales; MLQ) behaviors?

2. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and the following variables:

    a. Principals' level of advanced degree;

    b. Principals' subject area preparation?

Findings

There were 234 teachers and 30 principals who completed the questionnaire. Of the 30 responding principals, 10 hold master's degrees (33%), 10 specialist degrees (33%), and 10 doctoral degrees (33%). Out of the 30 principals, 23 of them had a teaching certificate/degree in one of the CRCT core subject areas (math, language arts, science, social studies). On the other hand, seven out of the 30 school principals did not have a teaching certificate/degree that was in one of the CRCT core subject areas.

Table 1 displays the mean scores, standard deviations, and correlations from teacher responses on the questionnaires for instructional (PIMRS) and transformational leadership (MLQ). In addition, it includes the mean scores and standard deviations for a principals' level of degree (Ed.S, Ed.D), and principals' teaching area certification. Instructional leadership behaviors of principals' were measured by the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) which consists of the following subscales: Framing the School's Goals, Communicating the School Goals, Supervision and Evaluation of Instruction, Curricular Coordination, Monitoring Student Progress, Protecting Instructional Time, Visibility, Incentives for Teachers, Promoting Instructional Improvement and Professional Development, and Providing Incentives for Learning. The PIMRS values ranged from 1-5. Almost never (1), seldom (2), sometimes (3), frequently (4), and almost always (5) were the values for the PIMRS. The transformational leadership behaviors were measured on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The MLQ subscales consist of the following: idealized influence (behavior), Idealized influence (attributed), intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration. The MLQ values ranged from 0-4. Not at all (0), once in a while (1), Sometimes (2), fairly often (3), frequently, if not always (4) were the values for the MLQ. Reverse scoring was not required for any items of these items. The principals' level of degree

(Ed.S and Ed.D) and academic background certification were dummy variables. They were coded 0 or 1. One means that the principal has the variable being investigated. For example, a principal who has an Ed.S was coded 1 whereas a principal who does not was coded 0.

The teachers rated principals the highest in the category Framing the School Goals (4.25) (Table 1) and the lowest in the category of "Maintaining high visibility" (3.15) (Table 1) as it related to their perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership behaviors as measured by the PIMRS. In addition, the teachers rated principals the highest in the category "Inspirational Motivation" (3.36) (Table 1) and the lowest in the category of "Individualized Consideration" (2.69) (Table 1) as it related to their perceptions of their principals transformational leadership behaviors as measured by the MLQ.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations Among Principal's Instructional Leadership, Transformation Leadership, Principal's Educational Degree, and Principal's Certification Area

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
FG	---																		
CG	**.796**	**---**																	
S/E	**.739**	**.749**	**---**																
CC	**.793**	**.759**	**.845**	**---**															
MP	**.735**	**.736**	**.811**	**.833**	**---**														
PT	**.625**	**.619**	**.671**	**.686**	**.687**	**---**													
MV	**.570**	**.585**	**.655**	**.645**	**.693**	**.629**	**---**												
PIT	**.604**	**.659**	**.682**	**.684**	**.722**	**.661**	**.823**	**---**											
PD	**.720**	**.713**	**.772**	**.805**	**.742**	**.693**	**.683**	**.755**	**---**										
PIL	**.535**	**.586**	**.611**	**.639**	**.634**	**.614**	**.757**	**.838**	**.680**	**---**									
IS	**.664**	**.664**	**.715**	**.729**	**.724**	**.693**	**.792**	**.802**	**.749**	**.737**	**---**								
IIB	**.629**	**.652**	**.672**	**.687**	**.664**	**.611**	**.708**	**.713**	**.712**	**.644**	**.857**	**---**							
IM	**.601**	**.640**	**.596**	**.617**	**.599**	**.537**	**.618**	**.631**	**.639**	**.567**	**.779**	**.890**	**---**						
IIA	**.645**	**.654**	**.653**	**.661**	**.636**	**.640**	**.751**	**.709**	**.715**	**.690**	**.892**	**.865**	**.826**	**---**					
IC	**.601**	**.609**	**.670**	**.658**	**.665**	**.639**	**.815**	**.817**	**.725**	**.777**	**.907**	**.795**	**.716**	**.861**	---				
MA	.013	-.40	.039	.044	-.18	-.094	-.025	.013	-.026	.019	-.020	.044	-.020	-.037	-.030	---			
EdS	-.038	-.007	-.077	-.009	.010	.034	.039	-.019	-.008	-.051	.006	-.076	-.023	.020	.023	-.495	---		
PHD	.026	.046	.039	-.034	.008	.059	-.015	.006	.034	.033	.013	.033	.043	.016	.006	-.486	-.519	---	
PC	.074	.049	.028	-.023	,040	.032	.032	.062	-.038	.057	.004	.010	.026	.010	.008	.291	-.222	-.062	---
M	4.25	4.17	3.98	4.06	3.91	3.87	3.15	3.50	3.98	3.47	2.75	3.19	3.36	3.04	2.69	.316	.346	.337	.773
SD	.638	.717	.777	.761	.799	.779	.841	.978	.774	1.03	1.01	.833	.754	1.03	1.11	.466	.476	.473	.419

Note. Variables include: **1** = Principal's Instructional Management (PIM) ***Framing***; **2** = PIM ***Communicate***; **3** = PIM ***Supervise***; **4** = PIM ***Coordinate***; **5** = PIM ***Monitor*** **; 6** = PIM ***Protect***; **7** = PIM ***Maintain***; **8** = PIM ***Provide;*** **9** = PIM ***Promote***; **10** = PIM ***Incentives***; **11** = Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) ***Intellectual*** ; **12** = MLQ ***Behavior***; **13** = MLQ ***Inspiration*** ; **14** = MLQ ***Attributed***; **15** = MLQ ***Individualized***; **16** = Principal ***Master's Degree*** Dummy (1= Highest Degree is Masters, 0 otherwise); **17** = Principal ***EdS Degree*** Dummy (1 = Highest Degree is EdS, 0 otherwise); **18** = Principal ***EdD Degree*** Dummy (1 = Highest Degree is EdD, 0 = otherwise); **19** = Principal CORE ***Certification*** Dummy (1 = Principal holds certification in CORE area, 0 = otherwise). Significant correlations are in bold ($p < .05$).

Table 2 presents the Calculated *r* values for the instructional leadership subscales. They range from .535 to .845 and indicate statistically significant ($p < 05$) positive relationships between each set of two variables. Thus, the sub-scales appear to be uni-dimensional. Hallinger (1982) argued that the high levels of inter-correlation among subscales were deemed acceptable since the instrument is being used for diagnostic purposes as well as for research (Hallinger, 1982). Further, due to the relatively narrow domain represented by the instructional leadership construct, it would be expected that subscales would overlap (Hallinger). The results from this study are consistent with the statements by Hallinger (1982) as it relates to high inter-correlations of the instructional leadership scales.

Table 2

Correlations of PIMRS Instructional Leadership Sub-Scales

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
PIM FRAME	Pearson Correlation										
	Sig. (2-tailed)										
	N										
PIM	Pearson Correlation	**.796****									
COMMUNICATE	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000									
	N	234									
PIM	Pearson Correlation	**.739****	**.749****								
SUPERVISE	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000								
	N	234	234								
PIM	Pearson Correlation	**.793****	**.759****	**.845****							
COORDINATE	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000							
	N	234	234	234							
PIM MONITOR	Pearson Correlation	**.735****	**.736****	**.811****	**.833****						
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000						
	N	234	234	234	234						
PIM PROTECT	Pearson Correlation	**.625****	**.619****	**.671****	**.686****	**.687****					
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000					
	N	234	234	234	234	234					
PIM	Pearson Correlation	**.570****	**.585****	**.655****	**.645****	**.693****	**.629****				
MAINTAIN	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000				
	N	234	234	234	234	234	234				
PIM PROVIDE	Pearson Correlation	**.604****	**.659****	**.682****	**.684****	**.722****	**.661****	**.823****			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000			

	N	234	234	234	234	234	234	234			
PIM PROMOTE	Pearson Correlation	**.720****	**.713****	**.772****	**.805****	**.742****	**.693****	**.683****	**.755****		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		
	N	234	234	234	234	234	234	234	234		
PIM	Pearson Correlation	**.525****	**.586****	**.611****	**.639****	**.634****	**.614****	**.757****	**.838****	**.680****	
INCENTIVES	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	234	234	234	234	234	234	234	234	234	
MEAN PIM	Pearson Correlation	**.814****	**.832****	**.874****	**.891****	**.884****	**.804****	**.836****	**.885****	**.883****	**.827****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234	234	234	234	234	234

Note. Variables include: **1** = Principal's Instructional Management (PIM) ***Framing***; **2** = PIM ***Communicate***; **3** = PIM ***Supervise***; **4** = PIM ***Coordinate***; **5** = PIM ***Monitor*** **; 6** = PIM ***Protect***; **7** = PIM ***Maintain***; **8** = PIM ***Provide;*** **9** = PIM ***Promote***; **10** = PIM ***Incentives***
Significant correlations are in bold ($p < .05$).

Table 3 presents the Calculated *r* values for the transformational leadership subscales. They range from .716 to .907 and indicate statistically significant ($p < .05$) positive relationships between each set of two variables. Thus, the sub-scales appear to be uni-dimensional. The results from this study are consistent with the criticisms of the MLQ as it relates to high correlations of the transformational leadership scales (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; 1998; House, Spangler, & Woyke, 1991).

Table 3

Correlations of Transformational Leadership Sub-scales

		1	2	3	4	5
MLQ INTELLECTUAL	Pearson Correlation					
	Sig. (2-tailed)					
	N					
MLQ BEHAVIOR	Pearson Correlation	**.857****				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000				
	N	234				
MLQ INSPIRATIONAL	Pearson Correlation	**.779****	**.890****			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000			
	N	234	234			
MLQ ATTRIBUTED	Pearson Correlation	**.892****	**.865****	**.826****		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		
	N	234	234	234		
MLQ INDIVIDUALIZED	Pearson Correlation	**.907****	**.795****	**.716****	**.881****	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	234	234	234	234	
MEAN MLQ	Pearson Correlation	**.956****	**.934****	**.886****	**.959****	**.933****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234

Note. Variables include: 1 = Intellectual Stimulation (MLQ); 2 = Behavior (MLQ); 3 = Inspirational (MLQ); 4 = Attributed (MLQ); 5 = Individualized (MLQ); Significant correlations are in bold ($p < .05$).

Table 4 depicts the correlation between teacher perceptions of their principals' instructional and transformational leadership behaviors. All of the subscales are highly correlated and significant. The data in this chart address research question number one.

PIMRS Subscales

As depicted in Table 4, there was a strong and positive relationship between the instructional leadership (PIMRS) and the transformational leadership (MLQ) subscales. Further, all of the correlations were significant at a .05 or lower level. The two transformational (MLQ) leadership subscales with the strongest correlations with instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales are "intellectual stimulation" and "individualized consideration." "Intellectual stimulation" describes a leader encouraging new and better ways of doing things, fostering creativity, re-examining assumptions, promoting intelligence, rationality, and problem solving (Bass, 1985). Principals who promote "intellectual stimulation" as defined by the MLQ tend to be rated higher on PIMRS (instructional leadership) by teachers. "Individualized consideration" describes a leader who shows a personal interest in employees and their development (Bass). Principals who demonstrate "individualized consideration" as defined by the MLQ tend to be rated higher on PIMRS (instructional leadership) by teachers.

Table 4

Correlation table of transformational (MLQ) and Instructional Leadership Scales (PIMRS)

Instructional Leadership sub-scales; PIMRS		Transformational Leadership sub-scales; MLQ MLQ INTELLECTUAL	MLQ BEHAVIOR	MLQ INSPIRATIONAL	MLQ ATTRIBUTED	MLQ INDIVIDUALIZED
PIMRS FRAME	Pearson's *r*	**.664****	**.629****	**.601****	**.645****	**.601****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234
PIMRS COMMUNICATE	Pearson's *r*	**.664****	**.652****	**.640****	**.654****	**.609****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234
PIMRS SUPERVISE	Pearson's *r*	**.715****	**.672****	**.596****	**.653****	**.670****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234
PIMRS COORDINATE	Pearson's *r*	**.729****	**.687****	**.617****	**.661****	**.658****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234
PIMRS MONITOR	Pearson's *r*	**.724****	**.664****	**.599****	**.636****	**.665****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234
PIMRS PROTECT	Pearson's *r*	**.693****	**.611****	**.537****	**.640****	**.639****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234
PIMRS MAINTAIN	Pearson's *r*	**.792****	**.708****	**.618****	**.751****	**.815****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234
PIMRS PROVIDE	Pearson's *r*	**.802****	**.713****	**.631****	**.709****	**.817****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234
PIMRS PROMOTE	Pearson's *r*	**.749****	**.712****	**.639****	**.715****	**.725****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234
PIMRS INCENTIVES	Pearson's *r*	**.737****	**.644****	**.567****	**.690****	**.777****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234
MEAN PIMRS	Pearson's *r*	**.856****	**.785****	**.707****	**.794****	**.827****
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	234	234	234	234	234

Regression Analysis of MLQ and PIMRS Subscales

Regression analysis of mean teacher perceptions of principals' instructional leadership (PIMRS) with the transformational leadership subscales, principals' higher level of education, and the principals' subject area preparation were conducted to see if any of these variables could predict effective principal instructional leadership from the perspective of teachers. The transformational leadership subscales and instructional leadership subscales are all correlated and significant as noted in correlation Table 4. The instructional leadership scales and the principals' level of degree and principals' academic background (certification) is not related at all as noted in the correlations depicted in Table 1.

The regression analysis did indicate some predictors of effective instructional leadership (PIMRS) as it relates to the transformational leadership (MLQ) subscales. "Intellectual stimulation," "idealized influence (behavior)," and "individualized consideration" are the three best predictors of instructional leadership behaviors identified by the regression analyses. The "intellectual stimulation" transformational leadership subscale was the only predictor of effective instructional leadership across all of the instructional leadership subscales. There was a .10 *p*-value used with the transformational variables due to multicollinearity. Multicollinearity occurs

when predictor variables are highly correlated with one another, making it difficult to interpret the results of the statistical analysis because of the variables possibly measuring the same things (Allison, 1999).

When the *p*-values were less than .10, the item was deemed as statistically significant with the transformational leadership variables. The "intellectual stimulation" (MLQ) subscale ranged from .00 to .09 (see Table 5) as it relates to the *p*-value, which makes this subscale significant. Other transformational leadership subscales were significant with some instructional leadership subscales, but not all. "Intellectual stimulation," "idealized influence (behavior)," and "individualized consideration" are the three best predictors of instructional leadership behaviors identified by the regression analyses.

The "idealized influence" (behavioral) (MLQ) subscale is a predictor for the "supervising/evaluation instruction" (.07), "coordinating the curriculum" (.06), "monitoring student progress" (.08), "maintaining visibility" (.09), and "promoting professional development" (.04) (see Table 5) instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales (see Table 5). The "inspirational motivation" (MLQ) subscale is a predictor for the "communicating school goals" (.06) instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscale. The "idealized influence" (attributed) (MLQ) subscale is a predictor for the "monitoring student progress" (.08) and "providing incentives for teachers" (.00) instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales (see Table 5). Lastly, the "individualized consideration" (MLQ) subscale is a predictor for the "maintaining visibility" (.00), "providing incentives for teachers" (.00), "promoting professional development" (.05), and "providing incentives for learning" (.00) instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales (see Table 5).

The regression analysis of a principals' level of degree (Ed.S., Ed.D.) as it relates to the instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales revealed that this variable is not a predictor of effective instructional leadership (see Table 5). The results are consistent with each subscale of instructional leadership (PIMRS) as the *p*-values are greater than .05 (see Table 5). In addition, the regression analysis of principals' academic background (certification) as it relates to the instructional leadership subscales revealed that this variable is not a predictor of effective instructional leadership. These results are consistent with each subscale of instructional leadership (PIMRS) as the *p*-values are greater than .05 (see Table 5).

Table 5

Regression Results for Principal's Instructional Leadership Dimensions

	PIMRS Frame School Goals				PIMRS Communicate School Goals				PIMRS Supervise/Evaluate Instruction				PIMRS Coordinate the Curriculum			
	b	se	t	p	b	se	t	p	b	se	t	p	b	se	t	p
Model Intercept	**2.89**	**.16**	**17.58**	**.000**	**2.40**	**.18**	**13.20**	**.000**	**2.31**	**.19**	**12.32**	**.000**	**2.28**	**.18**	**12.65**	**.000**
MLQ Intellectual	**.28**	**.09**	**3.15**	**.002**	**.24**	**.098**	**2.5**	**.01**	**.36**	**.10**	**3.53**	**.00**	**.435**	**.097**	**4.487**	**.00**
MLQ Behavior	.04	.10	.43	.67	.086	.115	.749	.46	**.22**	**.119**	**1.855**	**.07**	**.219**	**.114**	**1.921**	**.06**
MLQ Inspirational	.10	.10	1.01	.31	**.199**	**.105**	**1.893**	**.06**	-.02	.109	-.174	.86	.016	.105	.151	.88
MLQ Attributed	.12	.08	1.43	.16	.086	.093	.931	.35	-.05	.096	-.549	.58	-.044	.092	-.477	.63
MLQ Individual	-.06	.07	-.76	.45	-.026	.081	-.321	.75	.10	.083	1.138	.26	-.010	.080	-.130	.90
Principal EdS Degree	-.03	.08	-.31	.76	.06	.09	.67	.51	-.11	.09	-1.14	.26	-.06	.09	-.71	.48
Principal EdD Degree	.01	.08	.08	.94	.08	.087	.89	.38	-.01	.09	-.14	.89	-.12	.09	-1.35	.18
Principal CORE Cert.	-.10	.08	-1.23	.22	-.089	.086	-1.036	.30	-.02	.089	-.174	.86	.075	.086	.873	.38
Model F	24.90				26.63				31.91				34.5			
Model p-value	.00				.00				.00				.00			
R^2	.47				.49				.53				.55			
Adjusted R^2	.45				.47				.52				.54			

Table 5 Continued

	PIMRS Monitor Stud Progress				PIMRS Protect Instructional Time				PIMRS Maintain High Visibility				PIMRS Provide Incentives for Teachers			
	b	se	t	p	b	se	t	p	b	se	t	p	b	se	t	p
Model Intercept	**2.14**	**.19**	**11.18**	**.000**	**2.40**	**.20**	**12.27**	**.000**	**1.38**	**.17**	**8.31**	**.000**	**1.39**	**.19**	**7.48**	**.000**
MLQ Intellectual	**.477**	**.103**	**4.625**	**.00**	**.437**	**.105**	**4.161**	**.00**	**.197**	**.090**	**2.196**	**.03**	**.368**	**.100**	**3.675**	**.00**
MLQ Behavior (Ideal)	**.211**	**.121**	**1.739**	**.08**	.151	.124	1.218	.22	**.179**	**.105**	**1.697**	**.09**	.191	.118	1.617	.11
MLQ Inspirational	.038	.111	.344	.73	-.142	.113	-1.250	.21	-.127	.097	-1.317	.19	.031	.108	.289	.77
MLQ Attributed (Ideal)	**-.171**	**.098**	**-1.752**	**.08**	.080	.099	.804	.42	.017	.085	.204	.84	**-.333**	**.095**	**-3.508**	**.00**
MLQ Individual	.078	.085	.920	.36	-.003	.087	-.031	.97	**.394**	**.074**	**5.330**	**.00**	**.558**	**.083**	**6.755**	**.00**
Principal EdS Degree	.08	.10	.82	.42	.18	.10	1.80	.07	.08	.08	.99	.33	-.01	.09	-.12	.90
Principal EdD Degree	.04	.09	.38	.70	.18	.09	1.92	.06	.01	.08	.08	.94	-.01	.09	-.06	.96
Principal CORE Cert.	-.091	.091	-.997	.32	-.113	.093	-1.223	.22	-.076	.079	-.959	.34	-.129	.088	-1.458	.20
Model F	33.0				27.7				61.3				69.0			
Model p-value	.00				.00				.00				.00			
R^2	.54				.50				.69				.71			
Adjusted R^2	.52				.49				.67				.70			

Table 5 Continued.

	PIMRS Promote Professional Development				PIMRS Provide Incentives for Learning			
	b	se	t	p	b	se	t	p
Model Intercept	**2.07**	**.18**	**11.83**	**.000**	**1.63**	**.23**	**7.21**	**.000**
MLQ Intellectual	**.240**	**.094**	**2.555**	**.011**	**.205**	**.121**	**1.692**	**.092**
MLQ Behavior	**.230**	**.111**	**2.079**	**.039**	.051	.143	.355	.723
MLQ Inspirational	-.016	.101	-.154	.877	-.059	.131	-.454	.650
MLQ Attributed	.030	.089	.337	.736	-.052	.115	-.450	.653
MLQ Individual	**.153**	**.078**	**1.969**	**.050**	**.593**	**.100**	**5.926**	**.000**
Principal EdS Degree	.01	.09	.06	.95	-.12	.11	-1.03	.30
Principal EdD Degree	.03	.08	.37	.71	.01	.11	.04	.97
Principal CORE Cert.	.077	.083	.927	.355	-.098	.107	-.917	.360
Model F	40.7				45.1			
Model p-value	.00				.00			
R^2	.59				.62			
Adjusted R^2	.58				.60			

Note. Principal EdS Degree coded 1 if the principal's highest degree is an EdS, 0 otherwise; Principal EdD Degree is coded 1 if the principal's highest degree is an EdD, 0 otherwise; Principal CORE Cert. is coded 1 if the principal holds certification in a CORE area, 0 otherwise. n = 234. All p-values less than .05 are statistically significant; those for MLQ items are significant if p-values are less than .10 due to multicollinearity issues for MLQ; significant regression estimates results are in bold.

Response to Research Questions

The overarching question in this study asked whether there is a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership (instructional leadership sub-scales; PIMRS) and transformational leadership sub-scale (MLQ) behaviors. Analysis of data suggests that there is a strong relationship with all of the instructional leadership sub-scales and the transformational leadership sub-scales. The calculated *r* values range from .537 ("protecting instructional time") to .817 ("promoting professional development") (see Table 4) and indicate strong positive (direct) relationships between each set of two variables, signifying that as one value increases so too does the other variable. In addition, each of the strong correlations is statistically significant at the .05 level.

In addition, this investigation asked the question of whether there is a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and the following variables: a.) principals' level of advanced degree; and b.) principals' subject area preparation. Regression analysis of mean teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership (PIMRS) with the principals' higher level of education and the principals' subject area preparation indicated that there was not a statistically significant relationship at the .05 level. Neither of these variables are predictors of effective instructional leadership.

A regression analysis was conducted with instructional leadership (PIRMS) subscales and transformational leadership (MLQ) subscales to see if the transformational leadership subscales were predictors of effective instructional leadership. The results showed that "intellectual stimulation," "idealized influence (behavior)," and "individual stimulation" are the three best predictors of instructional leadership behaviors identified by the regression analyses. The results

showed that the only predictor for all of the instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales was the transformational leadership (MLQ) subscale "intellectual stimulation". This means that "intellectual stimulation" is a predictor of effective instructional leadership. The *p*-values ranged from .00 to .09 (see table 5). With the transformational leadership variables there was a .10 significance level used due to multicollinearity.

Other transformational leadership subscales were significant with some instructional leadership subscales but not all. The "idealized influence" (behavioral) (MLQ) subscale is a predictor for the "supervising/evaluation instruction" (.07), "coordinating the curriculum" (.06), "monitoring student progress" (.08), "maintaining visibility" (.09), and "promoting professional development" (.04) (see Table 5) instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales (see Table 5). The "inspirational motivation" (MLQ) subscale is a predictor for the "communicating school goals" (.06) instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscale (see Table 5). The "idealized influence" (attributed) (MLQ) subscale is a predictor for the "monitoring student progress" (.08) and "providing incentives for teachers" (.00) instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales (see table 5). Lastly, the "individualized consideration" (MLQ) subscale is a predictor for the "maintaining visibility" (.00), "providing incentives for teachers" (.00), "promoting professional development" (.05), and "providing incentives for learning" (.00) instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales (see Table 5).

With the correlation and multiple regression analysis, the investigation was able to answer both research questions. The results showed that teacher perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership attributes and behaviors as measured by the MLQ and their principal's instructional leadership behaviors as measured by the PIMRS are positively correlated with statistical significance. Further, multiple regression analysis revealed which

variables were more likely to predict effective instructional leadership. The level of degree and principals' academic background (certification) was not a predictor of effective instructional leadership. "Intellectual stimulation" was a predictor of effective instructional leadership across all of the subscales. In addition, "idealized influences" (behavioral), "inspirational motivation," "idealized influence" (attributed), and "individualized consideration" were predictors of certain instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales, but not all (see Table 5).

Chapter Summary

This study included 264 participants. There were 234 certified teachers and 30 school principals from a Southeastern school district who completed the questionnaire and 419 who attempted. The teachers completed a questionnaire to observe their principals' instructional leadership and transformational leadership behaviors. The questionnaire consisted of the MLQ and the PIMRS combined into a single format. For teachers, the overall mean score for instructional (PIMRS) leadership questionnaire was 3.84 and the overall mean score for transformational (MLQ) leadership questionnaire was 3.01. The principals completed a two question questionnaire to provide information about their level of degree and principal teaching area background. The principals' level of degree and principal teaching area background (certification) were used as dummy variables in the data analysis.

The study addressed two research questions. The overarching research question in this study was the following: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership (PIMRS) and transformational leadership (MLQ) subscales? The researcher found that there is a direct relationship between all of the instructional leadership sub-scales and transformational leadership sub-scales. The calculated *r* values ranged from .537

("protecting instructional time") to .817 ("promoting professional development") (see Table 4) and indicate strong positive relationships between each set of two variables, signifying that as one value increases so too does the other variable. In addition, each of the strong correlations is statistically significant at the .05 level. In addition to the correlation analysis multiple regression analysis was completed to see if certain transformational leadership subscales could predict effective instructional leadership. Intellectual stimulation was the only transformational leadership variable to predict instructional leadership across all subscales. "Idealized influence" (behavior), "idealized influence" (attributed), "inspirational motivation," and "individualized consideration" were the other transformational leadership (MLQ) variables that were predictors of at least one instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscale (see Table 5).

The second research question addressed the relationship between teachers' perception of their principals' instructional leadership and two additional independent variables: a.) their principal's level of advanced degree and b.) their principal's subject area background (certification). A multiple regression analysis of mean teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership (PIMRS) with the principals' higher level of education and the principals' subject area preparation indicated that there was not a correlational relationship. Moreover, the variables investigated (level of degree and principal's teaching area background (certification) had a p-value that was higher than .05 as it relates to the instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales, which means that they are not statistically significant.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary of the Study

While instructional leadership has been a popular theme in educational leadership over the last two decades, the concept is not well defined (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). The purpose of this correlational study was to examine if there was a relationship between teacher perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership behaviors and transformational leadership behaviors. In addition, the researcher examined a principals' level of degree and principals' teaching subject area background to see if a relationship exists in relation to teacher perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership. The PIMRS instrument was used to observe teacher perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and the MLQ to observe teacher perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership behaviors. Multiple regression was used to analyze the results. The results indicated a strong positive relationship between instructional leadership behaviors and transformational leadership behaviors. Further, the multiple regression analysis indicated that a principals' level of degree and academic teaching background (certification) were not predictors of effective instructional leadership. The multiple regression analysis did show that "intellectual stimulation" (MLQ subscale) is a predictor of effective instructional leadership as it relates to all subscales of instructional leadership (PIMRS). Idealized influence (behavior), idealized influence (attributed), inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration were the other transformational

leadership (MLQ) variables that were a predictor of at least one instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscale (see Table 5).

Discussion of Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine teacher perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership behaviors to see if a relationship exists with teacher perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership behaviors. In addition, the researcher examined whether a relationship existed between a teachers' perception of their principals instructional leadership behaviors and their principals' level of educational degree and principals' teaching area background. The finding will be compared to the existing literature that exists about the dependent and independent variables.

Instructional Leadership

There is a strong relationship between all of the instructional leadership subscales. They range from .535 to .845 and indicate statistically significant ($p < .05$) positive relationships. The results from this study are consistent with the statements by Hallinger (1982) as it relates to high inter-correlations of the instructional leadership scales. Hallinger (1982) argued that the high levels of inter-correlation among subscales were deemed acceptable since the instrument (PIMRS) is being used for diagnostic purposes as well as for research (Hallinger, 1982). Further, due to the relatively narrow domain represented by the instructional leadership construct, it would be expected that subscales would overlap (Hallinger, 1982). This study is consistent with Hallinger's findings of high correlations among the PIMRS sub-scales.

Transformational Leadership

The results from this study are consistent with the criticisms of the MLQ as it relates to high correlations of the transformational leadership scales. The transformational leadership correlations range from .716 to .907 and indicate statistically significant ($p < .05$) positive relationships between each set of two variables. Previous studies have been critical of the MLQ because of the high correlations among the transformational scales (Conger & Kanungo, 1987; 1998; House, Spangler, & Woyke, 1991). The high correlations found in this study are consistent with these previous studies.

Instructional leadership and Transformational leadership

There was a strong and positive relationship between the instructional leadership (PIMRS) and the transformational leadership (MLQ) subscales. Further all of the correlations were significant at a .05 or lower level. The two transformational (MLQ) leadership subscales with the strongest correlations with instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales are "intellectual stimulation" and "individualized consideration." "Intellectual stimulation" is when a leader encouraging new and better ways of doing things, fostering creativity, re-examining assumptions, promoting intelligence, rationality, and problem solving (Bass, 1985). A principal who promotes "intellectual stimulation" as defined by the MLQ tend to be rated higher on PIMRS (instructional leadership) by teachers. "Individualized consideration" is when a leader shows a personal interest in employees and their development (Bass). A principal who demonstrates "individualized consideration" as defined by the MLQ tend to be rated higher on PIMRS (instructional leadership) by teachers. The researcher expected some overlap with the transformational leadership and instructional leadership subscales due to being in a leadership role and experiencing a principal demonstrate both types of leadership behaviors to run a school. The researcher was not surprised with the correlations of the two leadership behaviors.

The regression analysis indicated some predictors of effective instructional leadership (PIMRS) as it relates to the transformational leadership (MLQ) subscales. “Intellectual stimulation,” “idealized influence (behavior),” and “individual stimulation” are the three best predictors of instructional leadership behaviors identified by the regression analyses. The “intellectual stimulation” transformational leadership subscale was the only predictor of effective instructional leadership across all of the instructional leadership subscales.

Findings from this study were consistent with the results of a study by Hallinger’s and Murphy (1985) and Liethwood et al. (1998) when they described the similarities and differences of instructional and transformational leadership (as cited in Hallinger, 2007) with the exception of the fourth similarity listed below. In this study all of the instructional leadership behavior subscales and transformational leadership subscales had a direct and strong relationship. The similarities of transformational and instructional leadership they described were as follows:

1. Producing a shared sense of purpose in the school,
2. Creating a climate of high expectations and school cultures focused on innovation and improvement of teaching and learning,
3. Molding the reward structure of the school to mirror the school’s mission as well as goals set for all stakeholders,
4. Organizing and providing a wide range of professional learning activities aimed at intellectual stimulation and the continuous development of staff,
5. Maintaining safe and orderly presence school by being visible and modeling the desired values of the school’s culture.

The regression analysis showed that each transformational leadership (MLQ) subscale was a predictor of at least one instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales. “Intellectual stimulation”

was a predictor of all instructional leadership subscales. This was consistent with the 21 research based responsiblilites of a school leader reported by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005). "Intellectual stimulation" was one of the 21 that they listed. Researchers should consider examining the transformational leadership subscales and instructional leadership subscales more closely.

Instructional leadership and Principals' Level of Degree and Principals' Teaching Area Background

Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and the following variables: Principals' level of advanced degree and Principals' subject area preparation? Instructional leadership was measured by the PIMRS which is composed of 10 subscales. The subscales include the following: a.) "framing the school goals," b.) "communicating the school goals," c.) "supervising & evaluating instruction," d.) "coordinating the curriculum," e.) "monitoring student progress," f.) "protecting instructional time," g.) "maintaining high visibility," h.) "providing incentives for teachers," i.) "promoting professional development," and j.) "providing incentives for learning." The principals answered two questions on a questionnaire to collect their information about their level of degree and principal area background. A regression analysis of mean teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership (PIMRS) with the principals' higher level of education and the principals' subject area preparation indicated that there was not a correlation among these variables.

The absence of a correlation between the level of degree and instructional leadership was not consistent with the study by Valentine and Prater (2011). Valentine and Prater (2011) found that principals with greater levels of formal preparation focusing on the principalship were

perceived as more capable leaders by teachers. Further, Valentine and Prater found that as a principals' educational level increased, so did the teachers' perceptions of their principals' competence. Conversely, Ballou and Podgursky's (1995) research supports the notion that advanced degrees and training in education administration are generally associated with lower performance ratings. The findings from this study did not show a negative association with performance ratings as it relates to a principals' level of degree; however, it did show that there was not a relationship between principals' level of degree and instructional leadership behaviors from a teachers' perception. From the results of this study, a principals' level of degree does not have a relationship with or predict effective instructional leadership.

A regression analysis of mean teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership (PIMRS) with the principals' subject area background (certification) also was conducted. The results showed that there was not a relationship between a principals' subject area background (certification) and instructional leadership (PIMRS) subscales (see table 5). As it relates to the literature, Stein and Nelson (Stein & Nelson, 2003) stated that, to their knowledge, research has not examined the subject-matter-knowledge requirements of effective instructional leadership. Spillane, Hallett, and Diamond's, (2003) study found that when teachers constructed principals as leaders on their premise of expertise, they often did so in relation to knowledge about classroom teaching. However, there was not any literature that addressed the principals' teaching area background from a teachers' perception to see if there was a relationship to instructional leadership. From the results of this study, a principals' subject area background (certification) does not have a relationship with or predict effective instructional leadership.

Conclusions

Evidence from this study showed a strong and direct relationship between instructional leadership behaviors and transformational leadership behaviors. In addition, "Intellectual stimulation," "idealized influence (behavior)," and "individual stimulation" are the three best predictors of instruction leadership behaviors identified by the regression analyses. The instructional leadership subscales include framing the school goals, communicating the school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, protecting instructional time, maintain visibility, providing incentives for teachers, promoting professional development, and providing incentives for learning. Further, the results did not show a relationship between teachers' perceptions of their principals' instructional leadership and a principals' level of degree or principals' subject area background (certification).

Implications

School accountability is increasing and the demands on principals and teachers are growing daily. School principals have to be able to motivate, inspire, guide the instructional program, frame and communicate the school mission/goals, and promote a positive school climate to name a few from a growing list of responsibilities. The research by Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) showed that the number one influence on student achievement is the teacher with the principal being number two. Principals are faced with the challenge of improving schools with small budgets and under paid teachers. This study examined three independent variables to see if they had a relationship with instructional leadership which included transformational leadership subscales, the principals' level of degree, and the principals' teaching area background. Among these variables there was a strong and direct relationship between all of the instructional leadership subscales and transformational leadership subscales.

The implication from this study adds to the growing research about the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and effective instructional leadership behaviors. Based on these findings, school leadership preparation programs and in-service professional development for principals should stress the development of transformational leadership behaviors as they apply to the best practices of instructional leadership. Further, researchers should conduct more research on the transformational subscales (MLQ) "intellectual stimulation," "idealized influence (behavior)," and "individualized consideration" They are the three best predictors of instructional leadership behaviors identified by the regression analyses. Understanding transformational and instructional leadership and their relation to each other could help educators with hiring practices for principals. The research from this study tells one that instructional and transformational leadership combined together could start the beginning of a new leadership style.

Recommendations

Implementing the Results of the Study

Given the importance of the principal's role as the instructional leader, the results of this study suggest the following recommendations.

1. Procedures for selecting school principals should include assessment of candidates' transformational leadership behaviors. Interviewers should focus more on the "intellectual stimulation" (MLQ) subscale as it is a predictor of effective instructional leadership.

2. School districts should implement professional development to assistant principals and principals about transformational leadership (MLQ subscales) and instructional leadership (PIMRS subscales) behaviors. Districts should inform leaders and future leaders how these leadership models are related and the dimensions of transformational leadership that predicts effective instructional leadership.

Further Research

Based upon the findings of this study, the following recommendations for further research are offered.

1. Replicate this study with a larger sample that includes a variety of school district sizes and more diverse communities.
2. Conduct mixed methods study examining teachers' perception of instructional leadership and transformational leadership behaviors. A mixed method design that employs qualitative methods would reveal insights into why teachers perceive their principals to be effective instructional leaders
3. Conduct an investigation that focuses on principals' and teachers' perceptions of how a principal's content knowledge of core subject areas is related to instructional leadership and student achievement. Such a study, for example, would examine whether there is a relationship between a principal's knowledge in math and student achievement in math. If a school leader's subject area knowledge has a relationship to student achievement, perhaps school districts should restructure teacher evaluation procedures so that teachers are evaluated by principals who are subject area specialists.

The two leadership models instructional leadership and transformational leadership have been around since the 1980's and 1990's. From the data and analysis conducted in this dissertation, it is clear that they are highly correlated. Moreover, every transformational leadership subscale is a predictor of at least one instructional leadership behavior (see Table 5). "Intellectual stimulation" is a predictor of all of the instructional leadership subscales. There needs to be more research conducted on the relationship of these two leadership behaviors to see if a universal definition and concept of instructional leadership can be developed.

References

Acker-Hocevar, M., & Cruz-Janzen, M. (2008). Teacher and principal preparation programs: Reforms that sustain high performance and learning in high poverty and diverse schools. *International Learning Journal*, *14*(10), 87-95.

Alig-Mielcarek, J.M. & Hoy, W.K. (2005). Instructional leadership. Its nature, meaning, and influence. In W.K. Hoy and C.G. Miskel (Eds.). *Educational Leadership and reform* (pp. 29-51). Charlotte, NC Information Age Publishing.

Allison, P.D. (1999). *Multiple regression: A primer*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Atkin, J. M., & Black, P. (Eds.). (1996). *Changing the subject: Innovations in science, mathematics and technology education*. London and USA:Routledge.

Avolio, B.J. & B.M. Bass (2004). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire manual (Third Edition*). Lincoln, Nebraska: *Mind Garden*, Inc.

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

Avolio, B.J., Waldman, D. W., & Yammarino, F.L. (1991). Leading in the 1990's: Towards understanding the four I's of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *15*(4), 9-16

Baldoni, J. (2005). *Great Motivation Secret of Great Leaders*, McGraw Hill Professional.

Ballou, D., & Podgursky, M. (1995). Recruiting smarter teachers. *Journal of Human Resources 30*, 326-38.

Barth, R. (1980). *Run school run*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Barth, R. (1986). On sheep and goats and school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, *68*(4), 293-296.

Barth, R. (1990). *Improving schools from within*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

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

Bass, B.M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational dynamics*, *18* (3), 19-31.

Bass, B.M. (1998). *Transformational leadership: Industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bass, B. M. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *8*(1), 9-32.

Bass, B., & Avolio, B. (1990). The multifactor leadership questionnaire. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychological Press

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

Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader.* New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Blase, J., Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly 35* (3), (1999).

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *38*(2), 130-141.

Bono, J.E., & Judge, T.A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 901-910.

Borgemenke, A. J., (2011). Developing capital improvements in principal preparation programs. *School Leadership Review*, *7*(2), 5-22.

Bossert, S., Dwyer. D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *18*, 34-64.

Brent, B.O. (1998). Should graduate training in educational administration be required for principal certification? Existing evidence suggests the answer is no. *Teaching in Educational Administration Newsletter, 5*(2), 1, 3-8.

Bridges, I. (1967). Instructional leadership: A concept re-examined. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 5*(2)*, 136-147.

Bridges, I. (1977). The nature of leadership. In L Cunningham, W Hack, & R. Nystrand (Eds), *Educational administration: The developing decades* (202-230). Berkely, CA: McCutchan.

Brookover, W.B., & Lezotte, L.W. (1977). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in school achievement.* East Lansing: Michigan State University College of Urban Development.

Brown, K. M. (2006). Leadership for social justice and equity: Evaluating a transformative framework and andragogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42* (5), 700-745

Brymer, E., & Gray, T. (2006). Effective leadership: transformational or transactional? *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, *10*(2), 13-19.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

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

Coleman, J. et al., 1966. *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. A. (1987). Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*, 637–647.

Conger, J.A. & Kanungo, R.A. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Connelly,M. S., Gilbert, J. A., Zaccaro, S. J., Threlfall, K. V., Marks, M. A., & Mumford, M. D. (2000). Exploring the relationship of leadership skills and knowledge to leader performance. *Leadership Quarterly*, *11*, 65–68.

Cross, C. T., & Rice, R. C. (2000). The role of the principal as instructional leader in a

standards-driven system. *NASSP Bulletin*, *84*(20),61-65.

Cuban, L. (1984). Transforming the frog into a prince: Effective schools research, policy, and practice at the district level. *Harvard Educational Review*, *54*(2), 128-151.

Cuban, L. (1988). *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Orr, M.T. (2007). *Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute. Available from http://seli.stanford.edu/research /documents/sls_tech_report.pdf.

Deal, T., & Celotti, L. (1980). How much influence do (and can) educational administrators have in classrooms? *Phi Delta Kappan*, *61*(7), 471-473.

De Bevoise, W. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. *Educational Leadership, 41*, 14-20.

Downton, J. V. (1973). *Rebel leadership: Commitment and charisma in a revolutionary process*. New York: Free Press.

Duke, D., & Stiggins, R. (1985). Evaluating performance of principals a descriptive study. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 4*(21), 71-78.

Ebel, R. (1951). Estimation of the reliability of ratings. *Psychometrika*, *16*, 407-424.

Eberts, R., and Stone, J. (1988). Student achievement in public schools: Do principals make a difference? *Economics of Education Review*, *7*(3), 291-299.

Edmonds, R. (1973). A black response to Christopher Jencks' inequality and certain other issues. *Harvard Educational Review*, *43*, 76-92.

Edmonds, R. 1979. Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, *37,* 20-24.

Eid, J., Johnson, B.H., Brun, W., Laberg, J.C., Nyhus, J.K., & Larsson, G. (2004). Situation awareness and transformational leadership in senior military leaders. An exploratory Study: *Military Psychology*, *16*(3), 203-209.

Elliot, R. H. (2002b, November). *Organizational leadership in challenging times: Australian perspectives and new benchmarks.* Paper presented to the Australian Human Resources Institute Leadership Conference.

Epitropaki, O. & Martin, R. (2005). From ideal to real: A longitudinal study of the role of implicit leadership theories on leader-member exchanges and employee outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *90*, 659-676.

Ervay, S. (2006). Academic Leadership in America's Public Schools. *National Association of Secondary School Principals.* NASSP Bulletin, *90*(2) 77.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., Borg, W. R., (2007). *Educational research*: An introduction (8th ed). Boston MA: Pearson Education.

Garman, A.N., Davis-Lenane, D., & Corrigan, P. (2003). Factor structure of the transformational leadership model in human service teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 24, 803-812.

Goldring, E., Huff, J., May, H., & Camburn, E. (2007). School context and individual characteristics: what influences principal practice? *Journal of Educational Administration*, *46*(3), 332-352.

Gulcan, M.G. (2012). Research on instructional leadership competencies of school principals. *Education, 132*(3), 625-635.

Hallinger, P. (1982). *Principal instructional management rating scale*. Version 2.3. Sarasota, FL: Leading Development Associates.

Hallinger, P. (1983). *Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, CA. ERIC Document No. 8320806.

Hallinger, P. (1987). *Principal instructional leadership management rating scale*. Nashville, TN: Author.

Hallinger, P. (1992). The evolving role of American principals: From managerial to instructional to transformative leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *30*(3), 35.

Hallinger, P. (1995). *Leadership resources and Consultancy*. Retrieved from http://philiphallinger.com

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

Hallinger P. (2005). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A fassing Fancy that refuses to fade Away. *Leadership and Policy in schools*, *4*(3), 221-239.

Hallinger, P. (2007). Research on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership: Retrospect and prospect. *The Leadership challenge- Improving learning in schools*. Retrieved from: Http://research.acer.edu.au/research?conference?2007/7

Hallinger, P. (2007). *The principal instructional management rating scale*. Principal form 2.0. Sarasota, FL:Leadingware.com. Retrieved January 5, 2008 from: http://www.coarsegoldschool.com/survey2007/principalForm11_13_07.pdf

Hallinger, P. (2008). *A review of PIMRS studies of principal instructional leadership: Assessment of progress over 25 years*. Paper prepared for presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) May 14, 2008, New York.

Hallinger, P. (2011). A review of three decades of doctoral studies using the principal instructional management rating scale: A lens on methodological progress in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *47*(2), 271-306.

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

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (1996b). The principal's role in school effectiveness: An assessment of methodological progress, 1980-1995, in K. Leithwood, J.Chapman, P.Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart. (Eds.), *International handbook of research in educational leadership and administration,* New York, NY*:* Kluwer Academic Publishers*,* Dordrecht, pp.723-783.

Hallinger, P. & Heck, R.H. 1998. Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, *9*, 157-191.

Hallinger P. & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals *Elementary School Journal*, *86*(2), 217-248.

Hallinger P, & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, *94*(3), 328-355.

Hallinger, P. & Murphy, J. (1987a). Assessing and developing principal instructional leadership. *Educational Leadership*, *45*(1), 54-61.

Hallinger, P., Wang, W.C., Chen, C.W. (2013). Assessing the measurement properties of the principal instructional management rating scale: A meta-analysis of reliability studies. *Educational Administration Quarterly,* 49(2), 272-303.

Hallinger, P., & Wimpelberg, R. (1992). New settings and changing norms for principal development. *The Urban Review*, *67*(4), 1–22.

Halverson, R., Prichett, R. P., Watson, J. G. (2007) Formative feedback and the new instructional leadership. *Wisconsin Center for Educational Research* Working Paper 2007-3. Accessed January 17, 2009 at http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/ publications/ workingPapers/Working_Paper_No_2007_03.pdf

Herbert, E.B. (2011). The relationship between emotional intelligence, transformational leadership, and effectiveness in school principals, *Educational Policy Studies* Dissertations. Paper 66. Retrieved from http://digitalarchive.gsu.edu/eps_diss/66

Howell, J. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). The ethics of charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Academy of Management Executive*, *6*(2), 43-54.

House, R.J., Spangler, W.D., & Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the U.S. presidency: A psychological theory of leadership effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *36*, 364-396.

Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Huber, S. (2003). School leader development: current trends from a global perspective, in P. Hallinger (ed.), *Reshaping the Landscape of School Leadership Development: A Global Perspective*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. *Management Science*, *28(*3), 315-336.

Jennings, J, & Rentner, D.S, (2006). Ten big effects of the no child left behind act on public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 88*(2), 110-113.

Judge, T.A. & Piccolo, R.F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. *89*(5), 755-68.

Katz, R. L. (1955). Skills of an effective administrator. *Harvard Business Review*, *33*(1), 33-42.

Kellerman, B. (1984). *Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NI: Prentice-Hall.

Kilmoski, R.J., & Hayes, N.J. (1980). Leader behavior and subordinate motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, *33*, 543-555.

Krishnan, V.R. (2002). Transformational leadership and value system congruence. *International Journal of Value Based Management*, *15*(1), 19-33.

Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1993). *Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI): A self-assessment and analysis.* San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.

Kuhnert, K.W., & Lewis, P. (1987). Transactional and transformational leadership: A Constructive/Developmental Analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*(4), 648-657.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *30*(4), 498-518.

Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership & Management*, *28*(1), 27-42. doi:10.1080/13632430701800060.

Leithwood, K., Leonard, L, & Sharratt, L. (1998). Conditions fostering organizational learning in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *34*(2), 243-276.

Leithwood, K., Montgomery, D. (1982). The role of the elementary principal in program improvement. *Review of Educational Research*, *52*, 309-339.

Leithwood, K., Day, C, Sammons, P., Harris, A., and Hopkins, D. (2006). *Successful school leadership: What it is and how it influences pupil learning.* DfES, London, available at www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR800.pdf.

Lezotte, L. (2001). *Revolutionary and evolutionary: The effective schools movement*: Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products, Ltd.

Lowe, K.B., Kroeck, K.G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly*. *7*(3), 385-425.

Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic leadership: A positive development approach. In K. S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship*, 241-258. San Francisco: Beret-Koehler.

March, J.G. (1978). Bounded rationality, ambiguity, and the engineering of choice. *Bell Journal of Economics 9*, 587-608.

Marshall, K. (1996). How I confronted HSPS (Hyperactive Superficial Principal Syndronme) and began to deal with the heart of the matter. *Phi Delta Kappan 77* (5), 336-345.

Marzano, R.J., Waters, T., & McNulty B.A. (2005). *School Leadership that Works: From Research to Results*. Alexandria, VA: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.

Mitchell, C., & Castle, J.B. (2005). The instructional role of elementary school principals. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *28*(3), 499-433.

Mosteller, F., & Moynihan, D.P. (1972). *On equality of educational opportunity*. New York: Random House.

Naidoo, L., Muthukrishna, N., & Hobden, S., (2012). The leadership behavior of the school principal: An exploratory study in five special schools in Kwazalu-Natal. *Gender and Behaviour*, *10*(2), December 2012.

Northhouse, P. G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. California: SAGE

Nulty, D. D., (2008). The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(3)*,* June 2008.

O'donnell R.J., & White, G.P. (2005). Within the accountability era: Principals' instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89. doi:10.1177/019263650508964505

Peabody College of Education. (2008). *Development of the Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education* (VAL-ED). Retrieved January 5, 2009 from: http://peabody.vanderbilt.edu/x8451.xmll

Pepper, K. (2010). Effective principals skillfully balance leadership styles to facilitate student success: a focus for the reauthorization of ESEA. *Planning and Changing*, *41*(1-2), 42-56.

Peterson, K.D. (1977-1978). The principals'tasks. *Administrator's Notebook*, *26* (8), 1-4.

Petzko, V. (2008). The perceptions of new principals regarding the knowledge and skill important to their Initial Success. *National Association of Secondary School Principals*, *92*, 224. DOI: 10.1177/192636508322834

Pont, B., D. Nusche and H. Moorman (2008), *Improving school leadership*, volume 1: Policy and practice, OECD, Paris. (August 2008).

Porter, A.D., Goldring, E., Elliott, S.N., Murphy, J., Polikoff, M., & Cravens, X. (2008). *Setting performance standards for the VAL-ED assessment of principal leadership*. (ERIC Document No. ED505799).

Porter, A.D., Polikoff, M.S., Goldring, E., Murphy, J., Elliott, S.N., & May, H. (2008). *Building a psychometrically sound assessment of educational leadership. The VAL-ED as a case study.* Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, New York: New York.

Protheroe, N. (2002). *Improving instruction through teacher observation*. Principal. *82*(1), 48-51.

Raihani, G. D. (2008). An Indonesian model of successful school leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *46*(4), 481-496.

Ricketts, C., & Ricketts, J. C. (2011). *Leadership: Personal development and career success*. Clifton Park, NY: Delmar, Cengage Learning.

Rowan, B., Bossert, S.T., and Dwyer, D.C. (1983). Research on effective Schools: A cautionary note. *Educational Researcher*, *12*, 24-31.

Sahin, S. (2004). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership style of school principals and school culture (the case of Izmir, Turkey). *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 4*(2), 387-395.

Saitis, C. (2000) *Management in education* (in Greek) (Athens, Greece, Saitis Publications).

Sergiovanni, T. (2007). *Rethinking leadership*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Smylie, M., & Bennett, A. (2006). What do we know about developing school leaders? In W. Firestone and C. Riehl (eds.), *A new agenda for research in educational leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sosik, J.J. & Jung D. I. (2010). Full range leadership development: *Pathways for people, profit, and planet.* NY: Psychology Press.

Spillane, J.P. (2005). Primary school leadership practice: How the subject matters. *School Leadership and Management 25*(4), 383-397.

Spillane, J.P., Hallett, T., & Diamond J.B., (2003) Forms of capital and the construction of leadership: Instructional leadership in urban elementary schools. *Sociology of Education*, *76*(1) 1-17.

Stein, M.K., Nelson, B.S. (2003). Leadership content knowledge. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 25*(4), 423-448.

Stricherz, M. (2001a, Sept. 12). D.C. Principal's training designed to boost instructional leadership. *Education Week*, *21*(2), 13.

Stricherz, M. (2001b, Sept. 19). Leadership grant aimed at schools in South. *Education Week*, *21*(3), p. 21.

Tejeda, M.J. (2001). The MLQ revisited: Psychometric properties and recommendations. [Electronic Version]. *Leadership Quarterly*, *12* (1), 31.

Valentine, J.W., & Prater, M. (2011). Instructional, transformational, and managerial Leadership and student achievement: High schools principals make a difference. *National Association of Secondary Schools Principals*, *95*, 5-30.

Weick, K. (1976). Education organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Services Qaurtarly*. *21*, 1-19.

Zimmerman, S., & Deckert-Pelton, M. (2003). Evaluating the evaluators: Teachers' perceptions of the principal's role in professional evaluation. *NASSP Bulletin*, *87*(636), 28-37.

Appendix A

Letter of Participation

Greetings!

My name is Michael Finley and I am a doctoral candidate in the educational leadership program at Georgia Southern University. I am conducting a research study under the supervision of Dr. James Green, as part of my dissertation requirements.

The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership and transformational leadership behaviors. If you are a teacher you will be directed to take a questionnaire and if you are a principal you will be directed to take a separate questionnaire. The questionnaire for teachers will consist of 70 short questions and will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. The questionnaire for principals will consist of two questions and will take approximately 2-3 minutes to complete. The questionnaire will ask a couple of demographic questions before you begin the questionnaire. This study is for certified teachers and school principals only.

The benefits to participants may include better professional development in the field of instructional leadership for the principals and better hiring practices for instructional leaders for teachers if there is a relationship between the variables of this study and instructional leadership.

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may discontinue your participation in the study at any time without penalty. The information that you provide will be confidential. Your name will not appear anywhere on the questionnaire. All demographic information will be combined with other participants' information, so no individual responses will be reported.

In the event that you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact Michael Finley at finleyboy81@gmail.com or 404-641-3071 or contact Dr. James Green at jegreen@georgiasouthern.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigators, or if you wish to report any concerns about the study, you may contact Georgia Southern Institutional Review Board at IRB@georgiasouthern.edu

Please indicate your choice below. Clicking on the "NEXT" button below indicates that you have read and understand the terms of this study and thus voluntarily agree to participate. If you do NOT wish to participate in the study, please decline participation by closing the window.

Appendix B

Principal Instructional Management Rating Form

PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

RATING SCALE

TEACHER FORM

Published by:

Dr. Philip Hallinger

199/43 Sukhumvit Soi 8

Bangkok, 10110
Thailand
www.philiphallinger.com
Hallinger@gmail.com

Teacher Form 2.1

THE PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT RATING SCALE

PART I: Please provide the following information about

yourself: (A) School Name: _____

(B) Years, at the end of this school year, that you have worked with the current principal:

___ 1 ___ 5-9 ___ more than 15

___ 2-4 ___ 10-15

(C) Years experience as a teacher at the end of this school year:

___ 1 ___ 5-9 ___ more than 15

___ 2-4 ___ 10-15

(D) Gender of your principal: ___ Male ___ Female

PART II: This questionnaire is designed to provide a profile of principal leadership. It consists of 50 behavioral statements that describe principal job practices and behaviors. You are asked to consider each question in terms of your observations of the principal's leadership over the past school year.

Read each statement carefully. Then circle the number that best fits the specific job behavior or practice of this principal during the past school year. For the response to each statement:

5 represents *Almost Always*
4 represents *Frequently*
3 represents *Sometimes*
2 represents *Seldom*
1 represents *Almost Never*

In some cases, these responses may seem awkward; use your judgment in selecting the most appropriate response to such questions. Please circle only one number per question. Try to answer every question. Thank you.

To what extent does your principal . . . ?

	ALMOST NEVER				ALMOST ALWAYS
I. FRAME THE SCHOOL GOALS					
1. Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals	1	2	3	4	5
2. Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them	1	2	3	4	5
3. Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development	1	2	3	4	5
4. Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals	1	2	3	4	5
5. Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school	1	2	3	4	5
II. COMMUNICATE THE SCHOOL GOALS					
6. Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community	1	2	3	4	5
7. Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings	1	2	3	4	5
8. Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers	1	2	3	4	5
9. Ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school (e.g., posters or bulletin boards emphasizing academic progress)	1	2	3	4	5
10. Refer to the school's goals or mission in forums with students (e.g., in assemblies or discussions)	1	2	3	4	5
III. SUPERVISE & EVALUATE INSTRUCTION					
11. Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	1	2	3	4	5
12. Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction	1	2	3	4	5

13. Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis (informal observations are unscheduled, last at least 5 minutes, and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference)	1	2	3	4	5
14. Point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	1	2	3	4	5
15. Point out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	1	2	3	4	5

IV. COORDINATE THE CURRICULUM

16. Make clear who is responsible for coordinating the curriculum across grade levels (e.g., the principal, vice principal, or teacher-leaders)	1	2	3	4	5
17. Draw upon the results of school-wide testing when making curricular decisions	1	2	3	4	5
18. Monitor the classroom curriculum to see that it covers the school's curricular objectives	1	2	3	4	5
19. Assess the overlap between the school's curricular objectives and the school's achievement tests	1	2	3	4	5
20. Participate actively in the review of curricular materials	1	2	3	4	5

V. MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS

21. Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress	1	2	3	4	5
22. Discuss academic performance results with the faculty to identify curricular strengths and weaknesses	1	2	3	4	5
23. Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals	1	2	3	4	5

24. Inform teachers of the school's performance results in written form (e.g., in a memo or newsletter)	1	2	3	4	5
25. Inform students of school's academic progress	1	2	3	4	5

VI. PROTECT INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

26. Limit interruptions of instructional time by public address announcements	1	2	3	4	5
27. Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time	1	2	3	4	5
28. Ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time	1	2	3	4	5
29. Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts	1	2	3	4	5
30. Limit the intrusion of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time	1	2	3	4	5

VII. MAINTAIN HIGH VISIBILITY

31. Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks	1	2	3	4	5
32. Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students	1	2	3	4	5
33. Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities	1	2	3	4	5
34. Cover classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives	1	2	3	4	5
35. Tutor students or provide direct instruction to classes	1	2	3	4	5

VIII. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR TEACHERS

36. Reinforce superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos	1	2	3	4	5
37. Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance	1	2	3	4	5

38. Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files	1	2	3	4	5
39. Reward special efforts by teachers with opportunities for professional recognition	1	2	3	4	5
40. Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school	1	2	3	4	5

IX. PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

41. Ensure that inservice activities attended by staff are consistent with the school's goals	1	2	3	4	5
42. Actively support the use in the classroom of skills acquired during inservice training	1	2	3	4	5
43. Obtain the participation of the whole staff in important inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5
44. Lead or attend teacher inservice activities concerned with instruction	1	2	3	4	5
45. Set aside time at faculty meetings for teachers to share ideas or information from inservice activities	1	2	3	4	5

X. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR LEARNING

46. Recognize students who do superior work with formal rewards such as an honor roll or mention in the principal's newsletter	1	2	3	4	5
47. Use assemblies to honor students for academic accomplishments or for behavior or citizenship	1	2	3	4	5
48. Recognize superior student achievement or improvement by seeing in the office the students with their work	1	2	3	4	5
49. Contact parents to communicate improved or exemplary student performance or contributions	1	2	3	4	5
50. Support teachers actively in their recognition and/or reward of student contributions to and accomplishments in class	1	2	3	4	5

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Professor Dr. Philip Hallinger, author of the *Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale* (PIMRS), received his doctorate in Administration and Policy Analysis from Stanford University. He has worked as a teacher, administrator, and professor and as the director of several leadership development centers. He has been a consultant to education and healthcare organizations throughout the United States, Canada, Asia, and Australia.

The *PIMRS* was developed with the cooperation of the Milpitas (California) Unified School District, Richard P. Mesa, Superintendent. As a research instrument, it meets professional standards of reliability and validity and has been used in over 200 studies of principal leadership in the United States, Canada, Australia, Europe, and Asia.

The scale is also used by school districts for evaluation and professional development purposes. It surpasses legal standards for use as a personnel evaluation instrument and has been recommended by researchers interested in professional development and district improvement (see, for example, Edwin Bridges, *Managing the Incompetent Teacher,* ERIC, 1984). Articles on the development and use of the *PIMRS* have appeared in *The Elementary School Journal, Administrators Notebook, NASSP Bulletin,* and *Educational Leadership.*

Appendix C

Survey Permission

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Instrument (Leader and Rater Form)

and Scoring Guide
(Form 5X-Short)

by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass

Published by Mind Garden, Inc.

info@mindgarden.com
www.mindgarden.com

MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Leader Form (5x-Short)

My Name: _____ Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____ Leader ID #: _____

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

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

Use the following rating scale:

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

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

Continued =>

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

MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Rater Form (5x-Short)

Name of Leader: _____ Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____ Leader ID #: _____

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

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

___ I am at a higher organizational level than the person I am rating.
___ The person I am rating is at my organizational level.
___ I am at a lower organizational level than the person I am rating.
___ I do not wish my organizational level to be known.

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

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

THE PERSON I AM RATING. . .

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

Continued –>

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

MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Scoring Key (5x) Short

My Name: _____ Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____ Leader ID #: _____

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

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

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

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

Continued =>

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

For Dissertation and Thesis Appendices:

You cannot include an entire instrument in your thesis or dissertation, however you can use up to five sample items. Academic committees understand the requirements of copyright and are satisfied with sample items for appendices and tables. For customers needing permission to reproduce five sample items in a proposal, thesis, or dissertation the following page includes the permission form and reference information needed to satisfy the requirements of an academic committee.

Putting Mind Garden Instruments on the Web:

If your research uses a Web form, you will need to meet Mind Garden's requirements by following the procedure described at http://www.mindgarden.com/how.htm#instrumentweb.

All Other Special Reproductions:

For any other special purposes requiring permissions for reproduction of this instrument, please contact info@mindgarden.com.

Published by Mind Garden, Inc., www.mindgarden.com

www.mindgarden.com

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to grant permission for the above named person to use the following copyright material:

Instrument: ***Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire***

Authors: ***Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass***

Copyright: ***1995 by Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass***

for his/her thesis research.

Five sample items from this instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis, or dissertation.

The entire instrument may not be included or reproduced at any time in any other published material.

Sincerely,

Robert Most
Mind Garden, Inc.
www.mindgarden.com

Appendix D

Principal Questionnaire

Directions: Please answer the following two items below.

1.) Indicate your highest level of degree in professional education:

__Master's Degree
__Specialist Degree
__Doctoral Degree
__None (graduate degree is in a discipline other than "education")

2.) Indicate whether your teaching certification and teaching experience was in one of the core subject areas tested on the Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT)

__ My teaching certification and/or my teaching experience is in one of the core subject areas tested on CRCT (for example, math, science, reading, language arts, social studies)

__ My teaching certification nor my teaching experience is not in one of the core subject areas tested on the CRCT