

Spring 2010

The Development and Validation of the Theory Y Leadership Dispositions Instrument

Patricia Krumnow
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Krumnow, Patricia, "The Development and Validation of the Theory Y Leadership Dispositions Instrument" (2010). *Electronic Theses & Dissertations*. 350.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/350>

This dissertation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE
THEORY Y LEADERSHIP DISPOSITIONS INSTRUMENT

by

PATRICIA KRUMNOW

(Under the Direction of Charles A. Reavis)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to develop a reliable and valid instrument that measures a school principal's Theory Y leadership dispositions. These dispositions include a tendency to take risks and confront conflict for what is ethical, a tendency to have relentless expectations for student growth and instructional leadership, a tendency to be open, honest, and transparent, a tendency to utilize democracy-centered practice, a tendency to reward and recognize growth, not just performance, a tendency to value individual dignity and worth, a tendency to enjoy work, and a tendency to believe that workers are resourceful and receptive to responsibility. Instrument development began with a review of the literature related to the identified dispositions and creation of an initial item pool. A panel of experts reviewed the questions and changes were made based on their recommendations. A pilot study including 43 teachers allowed further instrument adjustments. The revised instrument was distributed using *SurveyMonkey*®, after which statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS. The results showed that scores from the instrument, after some items were dropped, demonstrated evidence of reliability and validity, and could then be used to assess dispositions of school leaders.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE
THEORY Y LEADERSHIP DISPOSITIONS INSTRUMENT

by

PATRICIA KRUMNOW

B.S., Charleston Southern University, 1999

M. Ed., Georgia Southern University, 2003

Ed. S., Georgia Southern University, 2005

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University in

Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

STATESBORO, GEORGIA

2010

© 2010

PATRICIA KRUMNOW

All Rights Reserved

THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE
THEORY Y LEADERSHIP DISPOSITIONS INSTRUMENT

by

PATRICIA KRUMNOW

Major Professor:	Charles A. Reavis
Committee:	Bryan Griffin
	Barbara Mallory
	Teri A. Melton

Electronic Version Approved:
May 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I INTRODUCTION	
Leadership Dispositions	8
Problem Statement	11
Purpose Statement	12
Research Questions	12
Significance of the Study	12
Procedures	13
Definition of Terms	15
Limitations	15
Delimitations	16
Chapter Summary.....	16
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
Introduction	18
Leadership	18
Educational Leadership	19
Theory X Leadership	22
Theory Y Leadership	26
Dispositions	28
Theory Y Leader Dispositions	29
Transformational Leadership	31

Chapter Summary	34
III. METHOD	
Introduction	36
Research Questions	36
Research Design	36
Chapter Summary	45
IV. RESULTS	
Introduction	46
Data Analysis	46
Findings	47
Response to Research Questions	59
Chapter Summary	61
V. SUMMARY	
Summary	63
Analysis of Research Findings	64
Discussion of Research Findings	64
Conclusions	68
Implications	68
Recommendations	69
Dissemination	69
REFERENCES	70
APPENDIX A: IRB APPROVAL	77

APPENDIX B: INSTRUMENT USED FOR THE STUDY.....	79
APPENDIX C: FINAL INSTRUMENT	86

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Leadership Dispositions

For over 200 years, behavioral scientists have attempted to discover what traits, abilities, behaviors, sources of power, or situations determine how well a leader influences subordinates (Yukl, 2005). In schools, leaders are especially important, playing a central role in the achievement of school effectiveness and school improvement (Harris, Day, & Hadfield, 2003). Although behaviors for effective transformational leadership have been identified, the identification of dispositions underlying the behaviors remains elusive.

In order to effectively lead a school, a principal must balance several different leadership approaches, each guided by a set of dispositions. Disposition, simply defined, is a proclivity to act in a particular way in a given situation (Reavis, 2008). A person's dispositions are his or her beliefs and values, which can be influenced by personality, organizational commitment, self-perception, and self-efficacy (Reavis, 2008).

A particular set of dispositions is present in leaders who lead based on Theory Y assumptions. The major premises of Theory Y leadership are set forth in a seminal work by McGregor (1960). When first presented, these premises were contrary to the leading managerial ideas of the time. According to Theory Y leadership, the average human does not dislike work (McGregor, 1960). Rather, work can be a source of satisfaction for employees and people will exercise self-direction and self-control if they are committed to the objectives of the organization (McGregor, 1960). Theory Y leadership also holds that people have the capacity to apply a high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and

creativity in solving problems (McGregor, 1960). Therefore, a Theory Y leader creates conditions that allow members of the organization to achieve their own goals, which are aligned with the goals of the organization (McGregor, 1960).

There are eight specific Theory Y leadership dispositions which will be addressed in this study. These dispositions were synthesized from the literature by Drs. Green, Mallory, Melton, and Reavis at Georgia Southern University in Statesboro, Georgia. (2009). These dispositions relate specifically to education.

1. Theory Y leaders are disposed to taking risks and confronting conflict for what is ethical, both for the common good and the individual. This disposition correlates with Theory Y beliefs, as Theory Y leaders are willing to accept the views of others, as they believe that subordinates have valuable knowledge and skills (McGregor, 1960). Allowing subordinates to be involved in decision making will necessarily involve taking risks and confronting conflict.
2. Theory Y leaders are disposed to relentless expectations for student growth and instructional leadership from those internal and external to the organization. This disposition correlates to Theory Y beliefs because Theory Y leaders believe that, given effective leadership, subordinates can and will work toward organizational goals (McGregor, 1960). In a school, the top priority, or goal, is student achievement, which requires exemplary instructional leadership.
3. Theory Y leaders are disposed to openness and honesty, which is also referred to as transparency. This openness and honesty is an outward expression compatible with the fact that a Theory Y leader focuses upon building mutual trust and respect (Sergiovanni, 1975).

4. Theory Y leaders are disposed to active engagement of all members of the school community through democracy-centered practice. This democracy-centeredness follows from the Theory Y belief that the average person will not only accept, but will seek responsibility (McGregor, 1960). Theory Y also holds that people have the capacity to exercise a high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in solving problems (McGregor, 1960).
5. Theory Y leaders are disposed to reward and recognize growth, not just performance. Therefore, these leaders agree with the Theory Y assumption that one major purpose of leadership is to assist subordinates in reaching their full potential (Kopelman, Protas, & Davis, 2008).
6. Theory Y leaders are disposed to value individual dignity and worth. Theory Y leaders believe that people are inherently good, and are therefore worthy of trust and respect (McGregor, 1960).
7. Theory Y leaders are disposed to enjoy work. Theory Y leaders believe that subordinates derive satisfaction and fulfill their higher order needs through work (McGregor, 1960). Therefore, these same leaders must also believe that they derive satisfaction and satisfy higher order needs through work. It does not seem logical that the leader would believe that subordinates would get satisfaction from work if the leader did not.
8. Theory Y leaders are disposed to believe that workers are resourceful and receptive to responsibility. This disposition is directly drawn from McGregor (1960) who states that the average person will not only accept, but will seek responsibility

(McGregor, 1960). Theory Y also holds that people have the capacity to exercise a high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in solving problems (McGregor, 1960). These eight leadership dispositions were used as a basis for the dispositions instrument that was administered in this study.

Problem Statement

The current educational climate in America is one that emphasizes accountability. Schools are expected to produce results, as measured by student success on a standardized test. Therefore, schools are constantly seeking methods to improve student learning and increase student success. The role of the leader of the school cannot be overlooked in this process. In fact, in their qualitative study of twelve schools, Harris, Day, and Hadfield (2003) found that educational leaders played a central role in the achievement of school effectiveness and school improvement. Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) determined that four categories of core practices led to successful school leadership. These practices were building vision and setting directions, understanding and developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing teaching and learning (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Practices or behaviors are guided by values and beliefs (Mallory & Melton, 2009). Further, values and beliefs are two of the major factors influencing dispositions (Reavis, 2008). However, the problem is that there are no empirical data that provide evidence that any particular leadership dispositions lead to behaviors associated with high levels of student success. Therefore, this study attempted to partially fill this gap by creating and validating a instrument that measures Theory Y leadership dispositions. This instrument can be used in subsequent studies to determine if

Theory Y leadership dispositions are associated with student success or any number of other variables.

Purpose Statement

A search of the literature revealed only one instrument that measured Theory X and Theory Y leadership. This instrument was published by Kopelman, Protzas, and Davis (2008). This instrument, however, was designed to be completed by the leader rather than the subordinates, and did not address the specific dispositions being measured in this study. Also, no studies focused particularly on educational leaders, but focused on business and industry instead. Therefore, to fill this gap in the literature, the purpose of this quantitative study was to create a valid and reliable instrument that measures the principal's level of Theory Y leadership dispositions.

Research Questions

The overarching research questions that guided this study were as follows:

- R₁: Do scores from the Theory Y Leadership Dispositions (TYLD) instrument demonstrate evidence of reliability per disposition?
- R₂: Do scores from the TYLD instrument demonstrate evidence of internal structure corresponding to the eight dispositions?
- R₃: Do scores from the TYLD instrument display inter-disposition correlations that are consistent with Theory-Y predictions?
- R₄: Do scores from the TYLD instrument demonstrate predictable associations, and therefore display evidence of construct validity, with variables theoretically linked to leadership dispositions?

Significance of the Study

The principal of a school affects every aspect of the organization. Specifically, Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) reviewed eighteen years of empirical studies and discovered that leadership accounted for approximately one fourth of the total difference

in all school variable affecting differences of student learning and achievement. Though instruments of leadership exist, no empirical evidence found includes a instrument that can be used to measure Theory Y leadership dispositions. Therefore, this study sought to fill this gap in the knowledge. The results of this study could create a substantial contribution to the knowledge base, in that a valid and reliable instrument to measure Theory Y leadership dispositions was developed for use in future studies.

Procedures

Because the research questions revolve around the creation and validation of a instrument, this research was quantitative in nature. After reviewing the literature, the researcher developed a instrument based on the eight previously identified Theory Y leadership dispositions. The development and subsequent pilot study were based on a model followed by Menon (2001) and Schulte and Kowel (2005). According to Menon (2001), the first stage in instrument development is to develop a large list of potential questions based on available research. The researcher used this suggestion to develop questions for each disposition. After the first draft of the instrument was created, a panel of three experts in Theory Y leadership reviewed the instrument to determine face validity. The experts were asked to identify any items that were vague, ambiguous, or difficult for the average teacher to answer. Also, following Menon (2001) and Schulte and Kowel's (2005) recommendation, the experts were asked to evaluate each question on a scale of one to three, with one meaning the question does not address the disposition for which it was created and three meaning the question is a good match for the disposition for which it was created. The researcher utilized the responses to make any suggested changes. Once the necessary changes were made, the researcher submitted the

study to the Georgia Southern University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval. Once approval was obtained, the researcher had a sample of forty-three teachers conduct a pilot test of the instrument. In addition to answering the questions on the instrument, the teachers were asked to identify any of the questions that seemed repetitive or confusing. The researcher utilized SPSS to find the correlation coefficients for the questions per disposition and to determine the factor loadings for each disposition. Based on these results, necessary changes were made.

The final form of the instrument was then distributed to all 1,073 teachers in one school system in the southeast. These teachers were utilized as participants for this study. The researcher chose to use teachers for two significant reasons. First, there are many more teachers than principals, so the number of participants for the study was greatly increased over just using principal responses. Also, asking the principals to judge themselves may lead to a tendency to answer the questions the way the principals think the researcher wants them to answer or to answer the questions based on how the principals wish they felt. In fact, in his study of 200 subordinates and their 10 leaders, Fiman (1973) found that all of the leaders rated themselves as Theory Y, whereas not all of the subordinates rated their leaders in such a manner. By using the teachers, the researcher hoped to obtain a more complete and truthful profile of each principal's tendency toward Theory Y dispositions. This system contained one pre-kindergarten center, eight elementary, three middle, and two high schools. This system was chosen because it was easily accessible to the researcher and had a sufficient number of teachers. The final version of the instrument was administered via *SurveyMonkey*©. The instrument was available for a period of two weeks. In order to increase response rate, the

researcher resent the instrument to the teachers at the beginning of the second week. The sampling technique for this study was convenience sampling and the researcher utilized all valid responses from the instrument. Of the 1,073 teachers emailed, 260 responded, for a response rate of 24.2 percent.

Definition of Terms

Dispositions: For the purposes of this study, dispositions were defined as “a proclivity or inclination to act in a certain way in a given situation; a preference to act in certain ways, usually guided by a set of beliefs or values” (Reavis, 2008).

Theory Y Leadership: For the purposes of this study, Theory Y leadership referred to leaders who are ethical, hold high expectations for student growth and instructional leadership, are open and honest, promote active engagement of all members of the school community, recognize growth, value individuals, enjoy work, believe that workers are competent, believe that workers are resourceful, and believe that workers can set goals and solve problems (McGregor, 1960).

Limitations

As with all research, some limitations were inherent in this study. The instrument was distributed electronically. Electronic distribution decreases the percentage of respondents. However, the instrument was asking respondents to be open and honest about their principals. The researcher believed that the respondents would be more likely to be open and honest if they knew that their principal had no way to access or view their responses. A paper copy of the instrument might give a principal the opportunity to view the responses. The researcher also had to assume that participants were being open and honest in their responses because the instrument was in a self-reporting format. Another

limitation of this study is that the dispositions were synthesized from the existing literature and focused solely on education. Further, subordinates were asked to describe administrator beliefs by using observable behaviors. It is possible that the observable behaviors did not necessarily indicate the administrator's true beliefs.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to one district in the southeast.

Chapter Summary

In an era of increasing accountability, student scores on standardized tests are the most commonly utilized measure of school effectiveness. The role of the principal in increasing school-wide student success is critical. As defined for principals in this study, dispositions form the basis for leader behaviors, as the behaviors that people exhibit are based upon deep inner assumptions (Schein, 1974). Therefore, it is imperative to determine if any specific dispositions might lead to student success. Some literature has suggested that one set of dispositions, Theory Y leadership dispositions, could lead to improved student test scores. However, no valid, reliable instrument exists that measures these particular Theory Y leadership dispositions of principals. This study sought to fill this gap in the knowledge by creating a valid, reliable instrument that can be used to determine a principal's level of Theory Y leadership dispositions. Once the instrument was developed, future research could seek to determine if principal Theory Y leadership dispositions lead to behaviors associated with higher levels of student success.

After a review of the literature and creation of a pilot instrument, a panel of experts reviewed the instrument. Then, teachers who were easily accessible to the researcher completed the pilot version of the instrument. Finally, *SurveyMonkey*© was

utilized to distribute and collect data from the revised instrument. The participants included all of the teachers in one school district in the southeast. The data was analyzed using SPSS to calculate correlation coefficients and factor loadings per disposition as well as to determine correlations to the external variables of job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Any organization, regardless of its constitution or type, must have some form of leadership. Scientific research about leadership, however, did not begin until the twentieth century and one definition of leadership is yet to be determined (Yukl, 2005). Schools are no exception to the rule that organizations need leadership. One type of leadership approach is Theory Y leadership. Theory Y leaders believe that the average person likes work, can derive satisfaction from work, and will work toward organizational goals without coercion if they are in line with personal goals (McGregor, 1960). Those who hold Theory Y leadership beliefs, or dispositions, exhibit these beliefs through their actions. A more recent conceptualization of Theory Y leadership is found in the theory of transformational leadership.

Leadership

Though questions about leadership arose many centuries before, it was not until the twentieth century that scientific research on the topic began (Yukl, 2005). Since then, behavioral scientists have attempted to discover what traits, abilities, behaviors, sources of power, or situations determined how well a leader influenced subordinates (Yukl, 2005). However, scholars continued to disagree on a specific definition of leadership. In fact, leadership has been described in many different ways, such as behaviors that move others to group goals, as a power relationship in which one person has the right to direct another's actions, as interpersonal influence that leads to the attainment of a specified goal, or even as the process of guiding group activities toward the achievement of a goal

(Yukl, 2005). The common theme was that leadership generally involved groups of people and an influence process (Yukl, 2005). Northouse (2007) provided a synthesis of the definitions of leadership using the statement that leadership is a process through which an individual influences others toward a common goal. Hoy and Miskel (2008) agreed, stating that leadership involves a social influence process whereby an individual intentionally influences others to structure relationships and activities, specifically establishing direction and motivating and inspiring others. They added that leaders establish direction, and align, motivate, and inspire people (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). However, Goldberg (2006) contended that there is no template for exemplary leadership under all circumstances.

Educational Leadership

Evident in the literature was the fact that schools, like other organizations, required leadership. Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) stated that leadership was a catalyst that was required in order for good things to happen. In fact, in their qualitative study of twelve schools, Harris, Day, and Hadfield (2003) found that educational leaders played a central role in the achievement of school effectiveness and school improvement. Further, Day, Sammons, Hopkins, Leithwood, and Kington (2008) claimed that school leadership was the second most important influence on student learning, following only classroom instruction. Additionally, Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) reviewed eighteen years of empirical studies and discovered that leadership accounted for approximately one fourth of the total difference in all school variables affecting differences of student learning and achievement.

Many researchers identified characteristics or actions that led to more effective school leadership. Specifically, Harris, Day, and Hadfield's (2003) analysis revealed that effective school leaders were reflective, caring, highly principled, and emphasized the human aspect of the organization. Further, effective leaders viewed their roles as holistic and values driven, and concerned themselves with cultural, rather than structural change (Harris, Day, & Hadfield, 2003). Harris, Day, and Hadfield also concluded that effective educational leaders were focused on vision development and encouraging and motivating the staff. Reese (2004) added that effective school leadership required communication, negotiation, and time management skills. They added that improvement of staff performance was the key leadership task for influencing student learning (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) determined that four categories of core practices led to successful school leadership. These practices were building vision and setting directions, understanding and developing people, redesigning the organization, and managing teaching and learning (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). More specifically, building a vision included making sure the vision was shared, fostering the acceptance of group goals and demonstrating expectations for high performance (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Understanding and developing people included building knowledge and skills of teachers as well as building teacher dispositions that allow for the application of the knowledge and skills (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Redesigning the organization included building collaborative cultures, restructuring the organization, and building relationships with parents and the community (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). Included in managing teaching and learning was

staffing the school, providing teacher support, monitoring school activity, and insulating the staff from distractions (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008).

However, the literature also stated that becoming an effective school leader was difficult because leading schools is “feverish and consuming,” requiring long hours at a physically exhausting pace (Hoy & Miskel, 2008, p. 421). Also, since the duties of an educational leader varied widely, school administrators were required constantly to change gears and tasks at a rapid pace with little time for concentration and reflection (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Further, school leaders were required to face a wide array of challenges and to serve in a large range of roles (Goldring & Schuermann, 2009). These challenges included increased accountability demands, the time to focus on a learner-centered leadership focus, data analysis, competition and school choice, and expectations for community engagement (Goldring & Schuermann, 2009). Managerial duties also account for a large portion of a school leader’s time. Managerial duties include tasks such as responding to requests for information, meeting with subordinates and with people from outside of the organization, dealing with political requests and pressures, signing documents, presiding at meetings and events, providing guidance and motivation to subordinates, reading reports, memos, or emails, disseminating information, dealing with sudden crises, budgeting and allocating resources, formulating short and long term plans, writing schedules, or responding to questions or complaints (Yukl, 2005).

Even though the list of tasks required of a school leader is long and difficult, the pressures from federal legislation, especially the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), require that principals focus on quality instruction in their schools (Ylimaki, 2007). Ervay (2006) illustrated this fact, stating that NCLB’s focus on adequate yearly

progress requires current principals to focus on academic leadership, rather than on traditional managerial duties. Further, Reese (2004) added that instruction is one of the critical areas in which schools need leadership. According to the provisions of this act, principals are at risk of losing their jobs if their students do not perform well on standardized tests for several years in a row (Ylimaki, 2007).

Theory X Leadership

Douglas McGregor (1960) pioneered the study of Theory X and Theory Y leadership. In his book, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, McGregor defined and discussed the key concepts and differences in these leadership approaches. McGregor began his book with a discussion of the prevailing management philosophy of the time, which he called Theory X (McGregor, 1960). According to the assumptions of Theory X, the average human disliked work, and would avoid it if he could, thus management had to counteract this human tendency to avoid work with coercion, control, direction, and the threat of punishment (McGregor, 1960). Further, Theory X held that the average human preferred to be directed, wished to avoid responsibility, had little ambition, and desired security above all else (McGregor, 1960). Further, a supervisor's assumptions and behavior were formed by past experience, personal idiosyncrasies, and one's values and beliefs, which were most often shaped by Theory X beliefs because that is how they were taught (Argyris, 1971; Sergiovanni, 1975).

Strong leaders were considered to be those who control and manage others, and do not form close relationships with others or become too self-conscious (Argyris, 1971). Serviovanni (1975) went one step farther, dividing Theory X leadership beliefs into those which were considered hard X, and those which were considered soft. Hard X leaders

were no-nonsense, strong leaders who believed in tight control and close supervision (Sergiovanni, 1975). Soft X leaders, conversely, relied on buying, persuading, or winning people through good human relations and benevolence (Sergiovanni, 1975). However, this benevolence and paternalism were superficial means to make subordinates more compliant and accepting of supervisor directions (Sergiovanni, 1975). Further, the emphasis of both remained on manipulation, control, and management of people (Sergiovanni, 1975).

Theory X leadership beliefs were deemed inadequate for several reasons. First, they did not fit with motivation research, which found that man puts forth effort and works to satisfy his needs (McGregor, 1960). Once basic needs were met, man would then work to satisfy needs for belonging, association, acceptance, friendship, and love (McGregor, 1960). The Theory X philosophy of direction and control would not be adequate to motivate employees because it does not meet man's higher order needs (McGregor, 1960). Theory X leaders would instead view these needs as a threat to the organization, when, in fact, a tightly knit group could become more effective than an equal number of separate individuals (McGregor, 1960). Theory X beliefs also did not fit the idea of human nature that social scientists were developing at the time (Argyris, 1975; Schein, 1974). These ideas were that behaviorism and external reinforcements were not the only factors affecting subordinates, but that interactions, symbols, and perspectives of employees were also important (Brannigan & Zwerman, 2001). Sabanci (2008) added that leaders who led based on Theory X assumptions created organizations based on self-fulfilling prophecies, training their employees to be lazy, self-protective, and self-

seeking. Thus, these organizations became control-oriented and doomed to fail in a quickly changing world (Sabanci, 2008).

Additionally, the Hawthorne studies showed that human relations were as important as pay or working conditions (Sabanci, 2008). Brannigan and Zwerman (2001) described the Hawthorne studies as “the single most important investigation of the human dimensions of industrial relations in the early 20th century” (p. 55). Franke and Kaul (1978) claimed that insights from the experiments became the basis for studies in human relations and leadership. The purpose of the studies was to examine the effects of social and physical factors on work efficiency (Franke & Kaul, 1978). The studies were conducted in Chicago from 1924 until 1933 and began with an investigation as to whether lighting levels on the factory floor increased productivity (Brannigan & Zwerman, 2001; Franke & Kaul, 1978). However, instead of discovering any impact due to lighting level, the research team discovered that, because the workers knew the experiment was being conducted and their outputs were being compared, a competitive atmosphere emerged and all groups had increased output (Brannigan & Zwerman, 2001). Thus, the researchers concluded that worker motivation was more influenced by the social dimension of work, rather than by behavioral factors such as fatigue or material aspiration (Brannigan & Zwerman, 2001). When the researchers introduced changes such as rest periods, provision of snacks and lunches, shorter work days and weeks, and a friendly supervisor, productivity increased again and the workers became more likely to socialize outside of work (Brannigan & Zwerman, 2001). Further, absenteeism declined, morale improved and workers were more likely to help each other (Brannigan & Zwerman, 2001). The results of these experiments led to humanitarian and human

relations approaches to work and upon a focus on worker satisfaction (Franke & Kaul, 1978). Douglas McGregor's Theory Y was one such approach.

The general supervisory theories that prevailed when McGregor published his work were all based upon what he identified as Theory X concepts (Unruh, 1975). The first was the classical autocratic philosophy, which held that subordinates were simply extensions of the management, hired only to carry out specific and pre-determined duties (Unruh, 1975). The emphasis was on control, accountability, and efficiency (Unruh, 1975). This type of leader adopted an autocratic style based on power due to position, and led subordinates to low-level performance, high absenteeism, and frequently being late for work (Sabanci, 2008).

The second general theory was human relations supervision, in which subordinates were considered people, rather than just objects to be used by administrators (Unruh, 1975). The premise of this theory was that supervisors could create satisfied workers by showing an interest in them as people, which would lead to harder work and subordinates who were easier to control (Unruh, 1975). This type of leadership followed more closely the premises of Soft X. The third theory was Neo-scientific management, which focused on control, accountability, and efficiency, with emphasis on competencies, performance objectives, and cost-benefit analysis (Unruh, 1975). However, none of these theories were able to release a worker's initiative, responsibility, creativity, internal commitment, or motivation, which Unruh (1975) believed was the job of the supervisor. In any case, the leader who followed Theory X assumptions would be conceptually limited and inflexible, as well as more disposed toward autocratic solutions (Schein, 1974).

Theory Y Leadership

Douglas McGregor's theory of leadership was a break from the aforementioned theories in that it offered an alternative view to Theory X beliefs. Contrary to Theory X, Theory Y behavior is developmental, focusing on identifying and building commitment to objectives which are worthwhile, providing the opportunity for subordinates to participate in decision making, and upon building mutual trust and respect (Kopelman, Prottas, & Davis, 2008; Sergiovanni, 1975). According to Theory Y, the average person does not dislike work, but work is as natural as play or rest and can be a source of satisfaction (McGregor, 1960; Sergiovanni, 1975). In fact, in his study of 200 secretaries, Fiman (1973) discovered that the secretaries who rated their bosses as Theory Y had a significantly higher job satisfaction when compared to those who rated their bosses as Theory X. Theory Y holds that man will exercise self-direction and self-control when working toward objectives to which he is committed, therefore eliminating the need for external control and threat of punishment (McGregor, 1960). Thus, man is not essentially bad, but is basically good (Nord, 1978). According to Theory Y beliefs, the commitment to objectives is determined according to the rewards associated with their achievement and the average person will not only accept, but will seek responsibility (McGregor, 1960). Theory Y also holds that people have the capacity to exercise a high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in solving problems (McGregor, 1960). Therefore, managers must create conditions that will allow members of the organization to achieve their personal goals by working toward organizational goals (McGregor, 1960). Thus, the organization will suffer if it ignores the personal needs and goals of the employees (McGregor, 1960). The organization will also suffer if it does not accept individual

differences and emphasize collaboration (Nord, 1978). Leaders should also allow employees the opportunity to actively participate in decisions that affect their careers (McGregor, 1960). Further, Theory Y leaders are more likely to be able to examine a full range of alternatives available in a situation and make a wise decision (Schein, 1974). Thus, the focuses of Theory Y leadership are the nature of relationships and the creation of an environment which will lead to commitment to organizational objectives, while allowing employees to exercise initiative, ingenuity, and self-direction (McGregor, 1960).

Though literature suggests that Theory Y leadership dispositions motivate and inspire followers, some research criticizes parts of the theory. Schein (1974) stated that workers who unite to work against management prove that Theory Y leadership might not be effective. However, Schein (1974) then counters this proposition by stating that peer alignment is proof that Theory Y leadership is effective. In peer alignment, the workers choose to follow a Theory Y leader who is one of their peers, rather than the formally identified leader (Schein, 1974). Nord (1978) adds that Theory Y has not been applied more fully because the theory does not fully address the complexity of organizations, such as when there is fierce competition for limited jobs or resources. Further, the discrepancies in the power of individuals in an organization often lead to behavior that is inconsistent with Theory Y assumptions (Nord, 1978). Graham (1980) posits that the environments that will bring forth higher levels of human motivation are difficult to create.

Dispositions

Just as there is no single definition of leadership, there is also no single definition of dispositions. Several researchers have, however, offered definitions with similar characteristics. Perhaps the least specific definition would be that dispositions are a world view or set of assumption about human nature (Schein, 1974). McGregor (1960) added that these beliefs are deep-seated and perhaps even unconscious. Cudahy, Finnan, Jaruszewicz, and McCarty (2002) defined dispositions as values, commitments, ethics, or beliefs that are inherently held and externally exhibited. Similarly, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has defined professional dispositions as attitudes, values, and beliefs which are demonstrated through both verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Mallory & Melton, 2009). Wasicsko, Callahan, Hyndman, Sexton, and Wirtz (2004) also included attitudes, beliefs, and values in their definition, but add interests, appreciations, and modes of adjustment. More recently Reavis (2008) defined dispositions as a proclivity or inclination to act in a certain way in a given situation. Additionally, according to Reavis (2008), this proclivity is guided by beliefs and values, and may be influenced by personality, beliefs, culture, values, organizational commitment, self perception, and self efficacy.

Adding to the definitions are practical implications of dispositions. Individual dispositions predict how a person will behave (Sockett, 2009). Wasonga and Murphy (2007) stated that to understand the behavior of leaders, their dispositions must first be understood. Hogan and Hogan (2001) added that understanding leadership required an emphasis on personality, which is expressed through actions, which are controlled by dispositions. Examples of dispositions included honesty, listening, co-operation,

endurance, trust, humility, and resolution (Wasonga & Murphy, 2007). Specifically, school leaders must have dispositions that allow them to lead their schools to be able to deal with complexity and diversity, as well as to be innovative (Goldring & Schuermann, 2009).

Some research suggests that dispositions can be changed. Schein (1974) believed that leaders can change from Theory X to Theory Y leaders, but only through significant growth or experiences. Because assumptions about human behavior are learned very early in life, strong disconfirming evidence is necessary to change the assumptions (Schein, 1974). Path-goal theory holds that effective leaders adjust and adapt their styles according to the situation (Sabanci, 2008). Situational leadership also proposes that a leader's behavior should change depending on the readiness of the followers (Sabanci, 2008). Further, contingency theory supports a leader considering the effectiveness, environment, or maturity of followers before determining which leadership style to adopt (Sabanci, 2008). This theory holds that leaders can be trained in different styles which are interchangeable (Sabanci, 2008). Therefore, if Theory Y is preferable to Theory X, then perhaps some sort of training program could be implemented to this end.

Theory Y Leader Dispositions

From the literature, the dispositions research team at Georgia Southern University developed a list of eight dispositions held by Theory Y leaders (Green, Mallory, Melton, & Reavis, 2009).

1. Theory Y leaders are disposed to taking risks and confronting conflict for what is ethical, both for the common good and the individual. This disposition correlates with Theory Y beliefs, as Theory Y leaders are willing to accept the views of others, as they

believe that subordinates have valuable knowledge and skills (McGregor, 1960).

Allowing subordinates to be involved in decision making will necessarily involve taking risks and confronting conflict.

2. Theory Y leaders are disposed to relentless expectations for student growth and instructional leadership from those internal and external to the organization. This disposition correlates to Theory Y beliefs because Theory Y leaders know that, given effective leadership, their subordinates can and will work toward organizational goals (McGregor, 1960). In a school, the top priority or goal is student achievement, which requires exemplary instruction. In order to meet these expectations, a leader will ask parents, community groups, and civic groups for support for teaching and learning and will be curious about student learning in the school (Mallory & Melton, 2009).

3. Theory Y leaders are disposed to openness and honesty, which is also referred to as transparency. This openness and honesty is an outward expression compatible with the fact that a Theory Y leader focuses upon building mutual trust and respect (Sergiovanni, 1975). There is no need to second guess why this type of leader made a certain decision, as motives are clear (Mallory & Melton, 2009).

4. Theory Y leaders are disposed to active engagement of all members of the school community through democracy-centered practice. This democracy-centeredness follows from the Theory Y belief that the average person will not only accept, but will seek responsibility (McGregor, 1960). Theory Y also holds that people have the capacity to exercise a high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in solving problems (McGregor, 1960).

5. Theory Y leaders are disposed to reward and recognize growth, not just performance. Therefore, these leaders agree with the Theory Y assumption that one major purpose of leadership is to assist subordinates in reaching their full potential (Kopelman, Prottas, & Davis, 2008).
6. Theory Y leaders are disposed to value individual dignity and worth. Theory Y leaders believe that people are inherently good, and are therefore worthy of trust and respect (McGregor, 1960).
7. Theory Y leaders are disposed to enjoy work. Theory Y leaders believe that subordinates derive satisfaction and fulfill their higher order needs through work (McGregor, 1960). Therefore, these same leaders must also believe that they derive satisfaction and satisfy higher order needs through work. It does not seem logical that the leader would believe that subordinates would get satisfaction from work if the leader did not.
8. Theory Y leaders are disposed to believe that workers are resourceful and receptive to responsibility. This disposition is directly drawn from McGregor (1960) who states that the average person will not only accept, but will seek responsibility (McGregor, 1960). Theory Y also holds that people have the capacity to exercise a high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in solving problems (McGregor, 1960). These eight leadership dispositions were used as a basis for the dispositions instrument that will be administered in this study.

Transformational Leadership

A more recent conceptualization of many aspects of Theory Y leadership is transformational leadership. In fact, Mallory and Melton (2009) state that leaders who

possess Theory Y dispositions are predisposed to adopt a transformational approach to leadership. The theory of transformational leadership became popular in the 1990s as school leaders were expected to be visionary leaders who bring changes to schools (Bogler, 2001). Just as Theory Y holds that employees must be involved in decision making and culture building (McGregor, 1960), transformational leadership holds that effective leaders are able to inspire and motivate their subordinates toward organizational goals (Bogler, 2001). Transformational leadership has both a direct and an indirect influence on teacher practices, motivation, capacity, and work setting (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). All transformation approaches emphasize emotions and values, and aim to develop higher levels of personal commitment to organizational goals, just as McGregor posited in his Theory Y (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006). James MacGregor Burns is credited with formulating the components of transformational leadership in the late 1970s (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). However, the model did not become highly influential until the 1990s, with the advent of school restructuring (Hallinger, 2003). This model focuses on building an organization's capacity to innovate, and on finding problems and their solutions, while increasing participants' level of commitment (Hallinger, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003). Further, transformational leadership is concerned with emotions and values, and involves assessing the motivations of the followers, satisfying their needs, and treating them as human beings (Northouse, 2007). It is a process through which a leader and his followers create a connection that increases motivation and morality in all who are involved (Northouse, 2007).

Transformational leaders attempt to inspire and motivate followers by appealing to higher morals such as liberty, justice, and equity (Yukl, 2005). In doing so, these

leaders activate the higher order needs of the followers (Yukl, 2005). Attending to higher order needs was also emphasized by McGregor (1960) in his conceptualization of Theory Y leadership. These leaders often challenge teachers to rethink their assumptions about teaching and to rework their instructional processes (Marks & Printy, 2003). They also establish high expectations for pedagogy and support teachers' professional growth (Marks & Printy, 2003). At the organizational level, these leaders mobilize power to change social systems and to reform institutions through shaping, expressing, or mediating conflict between groups of people (Yukl, 2005).

Transformational leaders usually have strong internal values and are effective at motivating followers (Northouse, 2007). They will risk losing respect and affection in order to do what is right for the organization, and will make tough, unpopular decisions (Bass & Avolio, 1994). These leaders assist followers in realizing personal goals through the pursuit of organizational goals (Burns, 1978; McGregor, 1960). In fact, in a study of 500 schools, Leithwood and Jentzi (2006) discovered that transformational leadership had strong direct effects on teachers' work settings and motivation, and significant, but weaker effects on teacher classroom practices. In this motivational process, the four I's of transformational leadership are followed (Burns, 1978). First, idealized influence involves trust and respect building between the leader and followers, so that the motivation and ability to make changes are possible (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Then, inspirational motivation occurs when the organization's members come to believe that the organization's problems can be solved (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). In this process, transformational leaders create motivation by making the future seem appealing or optimistic, emphasizing ambitious goals, and creating and communicating idealized

visions that can be obtained (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Intellectual stimulation occurs when leaders move followers to be innovative and to question their current assumptions, traditions, and beliefs (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Individualized consideration means that leaders address each follower's needs for achievement and growth (Hoy & Miskel, 2008). Transformational leaders create new learning experiences and a supportive climate, recognize individual differences, utilize two way communication, and interact personally with others in order to create individualized consideration (Hoy & Miskel, 2008).

Transformational leaders also create a climate that values and stresses follower collaboration and continuous professional learning, thus creating an environment in which people are willing to address both problems and opportunities with creativity and personal commitment (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Hallinger, 2003). From this it may be inferred that theorists believe that McGregor (1960) was correct in his assessment that followers can be creative and effective in their problem solving. Therefore, followers of transformational leaders feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect for the leader because the leader makes them more aware of the importance of a task (Yukl, 2005). Transformational leaders also serve as coaches, mentors, and teachers to their followers (Yukl, 2005).

Chapter Summary

Like all other organizations, schools perform better when they have effective leadership. However, to date, no one theory of effective leadership exists. Douglas McGregor's conceptualization of Theory Y leadership offers one possible alternative. In Theory Y leadership, the leader assumes that humans are naturally motivated to work, that followers are imaginative and creative in problem solving, and that subordinates can

be motivated to align their goals with the goals of the organization (McGregor, 1960).

Dispositions are the inclinations to act in certain ways, and are shaped by a person's

beliefs. A particular type of disposition creates an inclination toward Theory Y

leadership. Theory Y leadership dispositions are reflected in the more recent leadership

theory, transformational leadership.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

The focus of this study was to design and validate a instrument to measure a principal's Theory Y leadership dispositions. In this chapter, the participants, instrument development, data collection and data analysis procedures were thoroughly explained.

Research Questions

The overarching research questions that guided this study were as follows:

- R₁: Do scores from the Theory Y Leadership Dispositions (TYLD) instrument demonstrate evidence of reliability per disposition?
- R₂: Do scores from the TYLD instrument demonstrate evidence of internal structure corresponding to the eight dispositions?
- R₃: Do scores from the TYLD instrument display inter-disposition correlations that are consistent with Theory Y predictions?
- R₄: Do scores from the TYLD instrument demonstrate predictable associations, and therefore display evidence of construct validity, with variables theoretically linked to leadership dispositions?

Research Design

The purpose of the study was to design and validate a instrument that measures the level of Theory Y leadership dispositions. In order to achieve this purpose and to answer the research questions, several steps were taken.

Construct Conceptualization

As a basis for the development of the instrument, eight leadership dispositions which are held by Theory Y leaders were used.

1. Theory Y leaders are disposed to taking risks and confronting conflict for what is ethical, both for the common good and the individual.

2. Theory Y leaders are disposed to relentless expectations for student growth and instructional leadership from those internal and external to the organization.
3. Theory Y leaders are disposed to openness and honesty, which is also referred to as transparency.
4. Theory Y leaders are disposed to active engagement of all members of the school community through democracy-centered practice.
5. Theory Y leaders are disposed to reward and recognize growth, not just performance.
6. Theory Y leaders are disposed to value individual dignity and worth.
7. Theory Y leaders are disposed to enjoy work.
8. Theory Y leaders are disposed to believe that workers are resourceful and receptive to responsibility.

Item Development

In developing an instrument that measured these dispositions, an instrument development and validation model based upon Menon (2001) and Schulte and Kowel (2005) was used. According to Menon, the first stage in instrument development is to develop a large list of potential instrument items based on available research. Items were developed following this approach.

The first disposition related to taking risks, confronting conflict, and being ethical. These behaviors are straightforward and readily observable. Therefore, direct statements related to those behaviors were developed for the first disposition. For example, one item read “My principal is concerned with the common good of the school.” Another stated

“My principal is ethical.” A third item read “My principal confronts conflict when it is necessary to make the school better.”

The second disposition is concerned with instructional leadership. Instructional leadership mainly focuses on the role of school principals in coordinating, controlling, supervising, and developing curriculum and instruction in schools (Hallinger, 2003; Marks & Printy, 2003). These principals develop curriculum, provide professional development, ensure implementation of new learning in classrooms, maintain high visibility in the school, provide incentives for teachers, monitor student progress, and create positive school learning cultures with high student expectations and student incentives for learning (Hallinger, 2003; Ylimaki, 2007). This disposition also leads to behaviors such as a principal being visible and curious about student learning and encouraging students to participate in competitions such as science fairs, social studies fairs, and inter-school contests (Mallory & Melton, 2009). Consistent with this research, a number of items about instructional leadership were developed. For example, one item read “My principal supports my growth as a teacher.” Another stated “I often see my principal in the hall and he/she is curious about student learning.” A third read “My principal’s main focus is on teaching and learning.” Yet another item stated “My principal provides for meaningful staff development for the teachers.”

The third disposition involves the openness, honesty, and transparency of a leader. This disposition is mostly straightforward and can be revealed in readily observable behaviors. Therefore, direct items related to those behaviors were developed. The third disposition also included items dealing with predictability and motivations for decisions, which were based on Mallory and Melton’s (2009) work. One item for disposition three

read “I can trust what my principal says.” Another stated “My principal is open, honest, and truthful.” A third item read “My principal communicates to all stakeholders his/her reasons for making certain decisions.”

The fourth disposition involved democracy centered practice in decision making. According to Mullen (2008), democracy centered practice includes teachers and other stakeholders being able to contribute their beliefs before decisions are made. This central concept was used to develop the questions for this disposition. For example, one item read “My principal encourages active engagement and input from teachers in the decision making process.” Another stated “My principal listens to and acts upon the concerns of others.” A third item stated “My principal is democratic in his/her leadership.”

The fifth disposition is another straightforward disposition. The only factor in this disposition is whether or not a principal rewards growth. Therefore, questions directly related to rewarding growth were included. For instance, one item read “My principal provides incentives for students who improve their learning.” Another was “My principal provides incentives for teacher improvement.” Another read “My principal makes sure to recognize students who have made great improvements, rather than only those who are at the top of their class.”

The sixth disposition involves dignity and worth. Dignity involves a feeling of self-respect and worthiness, while worth is something that is good and important enough to justify. A principal who values dignity and worth would treat others with respect and as individuals. One item for this disposition was “My principal values his/her staff.” Another stated “My principal treats others with respect even when they disagree with

him/her.” A third read “My principal values dignity, or self-respect, of others.” A fourth stated “My principal promotes self-worth, or a feeling of importance in others.”

The seventh disposition is a measure of the principal’s work satisfaction. However, since teachers were being asked to answer the instrument, work satisfaction had to be measured through observable characteristics. According to Stricherz (2001), a major hindrance to principal work satisfaction is too many tasks to accomplish and not enough time. The item “My principal complains about having too much to do and not enough time,” addressed this issue. The other questions refer to outward expressions that may be used to assume that an individual is happy. For example, one question read “My principal is positive and upbeat,” while another read “My principal smiles often.”

The eighth disposition deals with a staff’s receptivity to responsibility and resourcefulness. Once again, these factors are readily observable, so the researcher utilized questions that directly asked about responsibility and resourcefulness. For example, one item stated “My principal involves teachers in solving problems at the school.” Another stated “My principal believes that his/her faculty is receptive of responsibility.” Yet another item was “My principal provides resources that are necessary for teachers to solve problems and take responsibility at the school.”

Expert Review

Once the instrument was complete, the initial draft of the instrument was mailed to a panel of three Theory-Y dispositions experts. This panel of experts reviewed the instrument to determine if the items assessed the identified disposition. The experts determined if there were any redundant or ambiguous questions, or any questions that a teacher would have trouble understanding (Menon, 2001; Ragheb & Beard, 1982). A

procedure set forth by Schulte and Kowel (2005), in which the experts graded each question on a scale from one to three, based on how well the question matched the disposition was followed. Once the experts completed their review of the instrument, necessary changes were made. The original instrument consisted of 73 items. From the expert review, 19 of these items were either deleted or combined due to overlap, ambiguity, or a poor match of the item to the disposition. Four items were added based on recommendations of the expert panel. The changes resulted in a total pool of 57 items which were used for the pilot study. Once these changes were made, the study was submitted to the Georgia Southern University IRB for approval. Once IRB approval was gained, the pilot study segment of the research began.

Pilot Study

For the pilot study, 43 teachers completed the revised instrument. The teachers were selected based on convenience, as they were colleagues and there was a reasonable expectation that most, if not all, of the instruments would be returned. All of the instruments were returned. The teachers in the pilot study were also asked to comment on any redundancy, ambiguity, or difficulty with the questions. SPSS was utilized for data analysis once the teachers returned the instruments. Cronbach's alpha values for the items per disposition were obtained. Some of the alpha values were lower than the accepted level of .7 (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1995). The items that performed below this level were not eliminated at this point. Instead, they were reworded to make them clearer. A total of four items were revised in this manner. Factor analysis per disposition was also calculated to determine the number of factors per disposition. All of the

dispositions loaded to either one or two factors, so none of the questions were eliminated at this point. A more complete discussion of data analysis is provided in chapter four.

Field Test and Participants

Once the instrument was revised (see Appendix B), the questions were typed into *SurveyMonkey*© (www.surveymonkey.com) and the instrument was emailed as a link to all teachers in one school district in the southeast. The district had 14 schools, one pre-kindergarten center, eight elementary, three middle, and two high schools. There were a total of 1,073 teachers among the 14 schools. The sample for this study was all teachers who completed the instrument. Since the teachers in this district were chosen based on convenience, convenience sampling was utilized (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1995). The teachers were given two weeks, from February 1 until February 13, 2010, to respond to the instrument. At the end of the first week, the instrument was resent to all 1,073 teachers. The instrument could not be sent only to those who had not responded because the Georgia Southern IRB disallowed IP tracking. IP tracking occurs when the computer records the IP address from which a particular instrument response came. IP tracking would allow the identification of the computer used to answer the instrument, and could compromise the anonymity of the instrument. Since IP tracking was disabled, there was no way to determine who had and had not responded. The purpose of resending the instrument was to increase response rate. At the conclusion of the response period, 260 teachers had completed the instrument. Therefore, the response rate was 24.2 %.

In order to address construct validity, three external factors were included in this study. The three external factors included in this study were job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate. These three variables were used because they

were all expected to positively correlate to Theory Y leadership. Utilizing external factors allows further testing of the validity of the scores for the instrument. While Theory Y leadership is not directly linked to job satisfaction in the literature, a more recent conceptualization of Theory Y leadership is transformational leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Hallinger, 2003; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2006; Mallory & Melton, 2009; Yukl, 2005). Transformational leadership is related to job satisfaction. According to Yang (2009), transformational leadership enhances employee job satisfaction by providing inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and charisma. Further, transformational leaders create and communicate a vision for an organization, bringing employees together to work for common goals, and thus increasing satisfaction (Yang, 2009). In his study of 492 business managers and sales employees, Yang found a statistically significant correlation at the 0.01 level of 0.586 between transformational leadership and job satisfaction. Bogler (2001) added that involvement in decision making, such as that which occurs in Theory Y-led schools, leads to greater job satisfaction. Also, in an open and democratic climate, which are also hallmarks of Theory Y-led schools, job satisfaction is higher (Bogler, 2001). Bogler studied 745 teachers and discovered that teacher job satisfaction was influenced by the teacher's perception of the principal's leadership style. Specifically, the correlation of .51 between transformational leadership and job satisfaction was significant at the .0001 level. In their study of 60 police officers and in their study of 102 corporate employees, Singer and Singer (1990) mirrored these results, finding a statistically significant correlation between job satisfaction and transformational leadership. In the study of

police officers, the correlation of .59 was significant at the 0.01 level, while in the study of corporate employees the correlation of .62 was also significant at the 0.01 level.

Climate is also related to leadership. Climate is most positive when faculty members can participate in governance and decision making (August & Waltman, 2004). This participation occurs when a Theory Y leader is in charge of an organization. Further, Volkwein and Zhou (2003) hold that in environments where satisfaction is higher, the workplace climate is more positive. In a study of 770 nurses, Sellgren, Ekvall, and Tomson (2008) discovered a statistically significant correlation between leadership style and positive work climate, a weaker, but still statistically significant correlation between leadership style and job satisfaction, and a statistically significant correlation between job satisfaction and work climate. The correlations between leadership style and job satisfaction ranged from .22 to .51, but were all significant at the 0.001 level. The correlations between leadership style and work climate ranged from .28 to .58 and were all statistically significant at the 0.001 level. The correlations between job satisfaction and work climate were also all statistically significant at the 0.001 level, and ranged from .41 to .65. In a study of 229 teachers, Xiaofu and Qiwen (2007) discovered a statistically significant relationship at the .01 level between school climate and job satisfaction. Specifically the correlation value was .303. Therefore, since job satisfaction is related to Theory Y leadership, work climate should also be related.

There are fewer literature references for satisfaction with one's leader than for job satisfaction or climate. However, two empirical studies found a preference for transformational leadership. In a study of 60 police officers, Singer and Singer (1990) discovered a statistically significant preference for transformational leadership rather than

transactional leadership. In a second study of 102 business employees, Singer and Singer (1990) found the same statistically significant preference for transformational leadership. In the study of police officers, the correlation of .59 was significant at the 0.01 level, while in the study of corporate employees the correlation of .62 was also significant at the 0.01 level.

Chapter Summary

The purpose of this research was to develop a reliable and valid instrument that measured a school principal's Theory Y leadership dispositions as observed by school faculty. A review of the literature provided pertinent information for development of a instrument. A panel of three experts reviewed the instrument and made suggestions from which the instrument was amended. After obtaining IRB approval, the revised instrument was distributed to forty three colleagues, all of whom returned the instrument. From the suggestions of these colleagues, minor changes in wording were made and *SurveyMonkey*© was utilized to distribute the instrument to all 1,073 teachers in one school system in the southeast. Two hundred sixty teachers, or 24.2% completed the instrument.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the collected data to address the following four research questions.

- R₁: Do scores from the Theory Y Leadership Dispositions (TYLD) instrument demonstrate evidence of reliability per disposition?
- R₂: Do scores from the TYLD instrument demonstrate evidence of internal structure corresponding to the eight dispositions?
- R₃: Do scores from the TYLD instrument display inter-disposition correlations that are consistent with Theory-Y predictions?
- R₄: Do scores from the TYLD instrument demonstrate predictable associations, and therefore display evidence of construct validity, with variables theoretically linked to leadership dispositions?

Data Analysis

Once data were collected by *SurveyMonkey*®, they were entered into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). In order to analyze the data, factor analysis for each disposition was conducted. According to Pedhazur and Schmelkin (1991), factor analysis is the most useful technique for studying the internal structure of a data set. Factor analysis identifies the factors, or dimensions, that account for the relationship between items (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). In factor analysis, the relationship between the item and the underlying factor is given and is called a factor loading; the higher the factor loading, the stronger the relationship between the item and the factor (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Internal consistency was then measured by using SPSS to calculate Cronbach's Alpha for the items for each disposition. The purpose of Cronbach's Alpha is to determine if the responses within each disposition seem consistent; in other

words, to see if the items for the disposition are providing similar scores (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). An alpha value can range from -1.00, which indicates a completely negative relationship, to 1.00, which indicates a completely positive relationship (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Generally, alpha values higher than .7 are considered good (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). In this study, any items that negatively affected the disposition's alpha value were eliminated. Inter-disposition correlations were then found by utilizing SPSS to calculate Pearson's correlation coefficients. Logically, all dispositions would be expected to have positive correlations, since they are all measuring the same theory. Based on the research previously cited, each disposition should also correlate positively to job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate.

Findings

Research Questions One and Two

For each disposition, Cronbach's alpha (α) was calculated to assess internal consistency. To further measure internal consistency, factor loadings per disposition were calculated. The number of respondents for each disposition differs because any instruments that did not have a response for all of the items measuring the particular disposition were not included in the data analysis.

Principal axis extraction with direct oblimin rotation was utilized for factor analysis (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Table one shows the factor loadings for disposition one, which was a measure of a principal's tendency to take risks and confront conflict for what was ethical. As shown in the table, the last two items, numbers 31 and 38, had factor loadings that were much lower than the others, and one was even negative,

indicating that it did not load on the factor at all. For this disposition, the original nine questions had an alpha value of .838. After two questions, numbers 31 and 38, were deleted, the final alpha value was .897. Since these were the same two items that performed poorly on factor analysis, they were deleted from the instrument.

Table 1

Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Disposition One, Ethically Taking Risks and Confronting Conflict Using Principal Axis Extraction with Direct Oblimin Rotation (n = 213)

Item	Factor Loadings	
	Ethics, Risk Taking and Confronting Conflict	Risk Avoidance
18. My principal is ethical.	.944	-.159
29. My principal is concerned with the common good of the school.	.862	.049
37. My principal cares about me.	.802	.103
44. My principal makes decisions which I think are not ethical. (reverse scored)	.772	-.184
17. My principal confronts conflict when it is necessary to make the school better.	.729	.115
6. My principal does not seem to care about his/her staff members. (reverse scored)	.589	.107
3. My principal will do what he/she thinks is good for the school, even if it means taking risks.	.457	.432
31. My principal avoids risks. (reverse scored)	.114	.616
38. My principal does not like conflict. (reverse scored)	-.059	.314
Eigenvalue	4.595	1.310
% of Variance	51.054	14.556

Note: Factor loadings drawn from pattern matrix.

In order to determine the factor loadings of each item per disposition for disposition two, instructional leadership, and thus answer research question two, the researcher utilized principal axis extraction with direct oblimin rotation. The results of this factor analysis for disposition two are reported in table two. According to this factor

analysis, the same two items that were decreasing the alpha value also had the lowest factor loadings. For disposition two, which is a measure of a principal's instructional leadership, the original nine questions had an alpha value of .880. After two questions, numbers 20 and 47, were deleted, the final alpha value was .886. The removal of these two items did not affect the content validity of this disposition, so they were removed.

Table 2

Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Disposition Two, Instructional Leadership, Using Principal Axis Extraction (n = 191)

Item	Factor Loadings
	Instructional Leadership
41. My principal supports my growth as a teacher.	.869
25. I often see my principal in the hall and he/she is curious about student learning.	.744
11. My principal's main focus is on teaching and learning.	.742
10. My principal provides leadership opportunities for teachers and students.	.739
54. My principal provides for meaningful staff development for the teachers.	.722
1. My principal has high expectations for teaching and learning at our school.	.704
46. My principal encourages student participation in academic competitions, such as science fair, social studies fair, media festival, or inter-school contests.	.659
20. My principal does not focus on teaching and learning. (reverse scored)	.586
47. My principal will not accept a lack of individual student growth.	.446
Eigenvalue	4.870
% of Variance	54.116

Disposition three is a measure of a principal's tendency to be open, honest, and transparent. The factor loadings for disposition three, openness, honesty, and transparency, are shown in table three. From the information shown in table three, it was

determined that the last two questions, numbers 26 and 51, should be deleted from the instrument. There is a large decrease in the factor loading for these last two questions, and the questions were not so pivotal to the instrument that they could not be dropped. Deletion of the two items also did not affect the content validity of the disposition. The original seven questions for disposition three yielded an alpha value of .894. After two questions, numbers 51 and 26, were deleted, the final alpha value was .896. Therefore, the same two items that performed the poorest on factor analysis for disposition three were the items that reduced the alpha value.

Table 3

Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Disposition Three, Openness, Honesty, and Transparency Using Principal Axis Extraction (n = 192)

Item	Factor Loadings
	Openness and Honesty
12. I can trust what my principal says.	.934
14. My principal is open, honest, and truthful.	.921
23. I feel that I can talk to my principal about my concerns.	.784
4. My principal lies. (reverse scored)	.742
30. My principal withholds some information that may be instrumental to problem solving. (reverse scored)	.712
51. My principal communicates to all stakeholders his/her reasons for making certain decisions.	.569
26. My principal is secretive. (reverse scored)	.566
Eigenvalue	4.398
% of Variance	62.829

The factor loadings for disposition four, democracy centered practice, are given in table four. The original seven questions for disposition four yielded an alpha value of .897. When one question, number 55, was deleted, the final alpha value was .904. The

factor loadings in Table 4 also led the researcher to omit the last item, number 55. Not only did the item have a lower factor loading than the others, but it also reduced Cronbach's alpha for the set of questions.

Table 4

Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Disposition Four, Democracy Centered Practice, Using Principal Axis Extraction (n = 195)

Item	Factor Loadings
	Democracy Centered Practice
45. My principal encourages active engagement and input from teachers in the decision making process.	.847
28. My principal listens to and acts upon the concerns of others.	.835
42. My principal works hard to promote parental involvement to improve student achievement.	.829
39. My principal is democratic in his/her leadership.	.750
48. My principal works hard to promote community involvement to improve student achievement.	.723
16. My principal sets aside time to meet with parents and community leaders.	.678
55. My principal makes major decisions without consulting others. (reverse scored)	.544
Eigenvalue	4.347
% of Variance	62.094

Table five shows the factor loadings for the six instrument items that measured disposition five, rewarding growth. As shown in the table, question five had the lowest factor loading. For disposition five, the original six questions gave an alpha value of .840. After one question, number five, was deleted, the final alpha value was .867. Since item five performed the poorest on factor analysis and decreased the alpha value, it was deleted from the instrument.

Table 5

Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Disposition Five, Rewarding Growth, Using Principal Axis Extraction (n = 191)

	Factor Loadings
Item	Rewarding Growth
52. My principal provides incentives for students who improve their learning.	.796
33. My principal provides incentives for student improvement.	.777
19. My principal provides incentives for teacher improvement.	.750
36. My principal provides incentives for teachers who improve student learning.	.747
50. My principal makes sure to recognize students who have made great improvements, rather than only those who are at the top of their class.	.711
5. My principal is only concerned with student performance level, rather than with individual growth. (reverse scored)	.316
Eigenvalue	3.407
% of Variance	56.789

Table six shows the factor loadings for the seven instrument items that measure disposition six, valuing individual dignity and worth. Disposition six's original seven questions gave an alpha value of .955. Due to the strong factor loadings and to the strong Cronbach's alpha for disposition six, all questions for this disposition were retained.

Table 6

Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Disposition Six, Valuing Individual Dignity and Worth Using Principal Axis Extraction (n = 200)

Item	Factor Loadings
	Value of Individual Dignity and Worth
27. My principal values his/her staff.	.910
13. My principal treats others with respect even when they disagree with him/her.	.904
22. My principal values dignity, or self-respect, of others.	.902
9. My principal treats others with respect, regardless of socioeconomic status, gender, or ethnicity.	.900
32. My principal promotes self-worth, or a feeling of importance in others.	.897
49. My principal makes me feel important.	.834
57. My principal "talks down to" his or her staff. (reverse scored)	.758
Eigenvalue	5.571
% of Variance	79.579

Table seven shows factor loadings for the five instrument items that measure disposition seven, a principal's enjoyment of work. As shown on the table, item 53 had the lowest factor loading. Disposition seven's original five questions gave an alpha value of .872. After one question, number 53, was deleted, the final alpha value was .893. Therefore, the same question that lowered the alpha value also had the lowest factor loading and this item was deleted, as it did not affect the content validity of the items that addressed this disposition.

Table 7

Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Disposition Seven, a Principal's Enjoyment of Work Using Principal Axis Extraction (n = 201)

Item	Factor Loadings
	Enjoys Work
21. My principal is positive and upbeat.	.872
7. My principal appears to enjoy work.	.864
15. My principal smiles often.	.797
34. My principal appears to dislike his/her job. (reverse scored)	.738
53. My principal complains about having too much to do and not enough time. (reverse scored)	.573
Eigenvalue	3.377
% of Variance	67.539

Table 8 shows factor loadings for the seven instrument items that measure disposition eight, a principal's belief that workers are resourceful and receptive to responsibility. As shown on the table, items 24 and 43 had the lowest factor loadings. The original alpha value for the seven questions for disposition eight was .777. After two questions, numbers 24 and 43, were deleted, the final alpha value was .862. These were the same two items that performed the poorest on factor analysis. Since the removal of these two items did not affect content validity, numbers 24 and 43 were deleted from the instrument.

Table 8

Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for Disposition Eight, a Principal's Belief that Workers are Resourceful and Receptive to Responsibility Using Principal Axis Extraction with Direct Oblimin Rotation (n = 189)

Item	Factor Loadings	
	Workers are Resourceful and Receptive to Responsibility	Unknown Second Factor
8. My principal provides resources that are necessary for teachers to solve problems and take responsibility at the school.	.946	-.299
2. My principal involves teachers in solving problems at the school.	.758	-.044
56. My principal believes that his/her faculty is receptive of responsibility.	.734	.115
35. My principal believes school improvement is possible within the school.	.717	-.040
40. My principal does not allow teachers to help solve problems at the school because he/she feels the faculty cannot effectively solve problems.	.686	.386
24. My principal believes that his/her faculty is not resourceful in solving problems and therefore emphasizes compliance with board rules and requirements. (reverse scored)	.368	.307
43. My principal often seeks resources external to the school such as bringing in outside experts and relying on outside creativity because he/she does not believe the staff has the knowledge and/or skills to solve problems on their own. (reverse scored)	-.022	.287
Eigenvalue	3.583	1.072
% of Variance	51.183	15.307

Note: Factor loadings drawn from pattern matrix.

The final, reduced form of the instrument is reported in Appendix C.

Research Question Three

Mean composite disposition scores were calculated using the items that were retained as described above. These means were then used to calculate inter-disposition

correlations, and to calculate the correlation coefficients between each disposition and the variables of job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate. As was described in chapter three, based on previous research, Theory Y leadership should have correlated positively with all three variables (August & Waltman, 2004; Bogler, 2001; Singer & Singer, 1990; Tomson, 2008; Volkwein & Zhou, 2003; Xiaofu & Qiwen, 2007; Yang, 2009). Just as expected, a positive correlation between each disposition and all three factors were, in fact, found. Table 9 shows all of the correlation coefficients, as well as the Cronbach's alpha values for the instrument items for the eight dispositions based upon the reduced form of the instrument. Because the means for each disposition were relatively high, there was a concern that the instrument did not truly differentiate between the dispositions or between the schools. Therefore, Table 10 shows the means and standard deviations of each disposition for each school. As shown, the means are higher for some schools, but lower for others. Therefore, the instrument does differentiate between schools, but none of the principals were rated very low.

Table 9

Correlation and Descriptive Statistics for Each Disposition

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Disposition 1	---							
2. Disposition 2	.810*	---						
3. Disposition 3	.852*	.777*	---					
4. Disposition 4	.852*	.889*	.828*	---				
5. Disposition 5	.660*	.777*	.635*	.773*	---			
6. Disposition 6	.876*	.851*	.882*	.875*	.711*	---		
7. Disposition 7	.757*	.736*	.725*	.782*	.651*	.796*	---	
8. Disposition 8	.833*	.844*	.753*	.856*	.721*	.813*	.724*	---
M	4.98	4.92	4.96	4.66	4.32	4.88	4.79	4.86
SD	.92	.93	1.00	1.04	1.17	1.13	.93	.97
N	213	191	192	195	191	200	201	189
Scale Min/Max Values	1 to 6	1 to 6	1 to 6	1 to 6	1 to 6	1 to 6	1 to 6	1 to 6
Cronbach's α	.897	.886	.896	.904	.867	.955	.893	.862

* $p < .01$

Note: Disposition one is taking risks and confronting conflict. Disposition two is instructional leadership. Disposition three is openness, honesty, and transparency. Disposition four is democracy centered practice. Disposition five is rewarding growth. Disposition six is valuing individual dignity and worth. Disposition seven is a principal's enjoyment of work. Disposition eight is a principal's belief that workers are resourceful and receptive to responsibility.

This table shows that all eight dispositions had a significantly positive correlation to each other. The strongest correlation ($\alpha = .889$) occurred between dispositions two, instructional leadership, and four, democracy centered practice. The weakest correlation ($\alpha = .635$) occurred between dispositions three, transparency, and five, rewarding and recognizing growth.

Table 10
Means and Standard Deviations for Each Disposition Separated by School

Disposition	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
School 1 M	4.48	4.51	4.48	4.09	3.79	4.21	4.25	4.45
School 1 SD	1.08	0.93	1.17	1.13	1.12	1.23	0.98	1.10
School 2 M	5.16	5.29	4.97	4.78	4.64	5.00	4.81	5.29
School 2 SD	1.08	1.07	1.11	1.16	1.46	1.37	1.42	0.93
School 3 M	5.31	5.28	5.31	5.05	4.56	5.20	5.14	5.06
School 3 SD	0.69	0.64	0.72	1.00	1.02	0.86	0.67	0.89
School 4 M	5.47	5.47	5.74	5.26	5.01	5.72	4.94	5.35
School 4 SD	0.40	0.51	0.31	0.59	1.13	0.37	0.70	0.44
School 5 M	5.00	5.24	4.97	4.79	4.69	4.96	4.98	5.00
School 5 SD	0.81	0.47	0.91	0.71	0.67	1.07	0.82	0.59
School 6 M	4.99	5.05	4.72	4.80	4.77	5.02	5.08	4.94
School 6 SD	0.93	0.92	1.07	0.86	0.93	1.06	0.82	0.93
School 7 M	4.80	4.57	4.98	4.22	3.75	4.76	4.09	4.27
School 7 SD	0.93	0.72	0.89	0.95	1.21	0.92	1.01	0.98
School 8 M	4.77	4.58	4.45	4.43	3.47	4.59	4.48	4.86
School 8 SD	1.09	0.95	1.13	1.18	1.13	1.35	0.93	1.03
School 9 M	5.61	5.46	5.63	5.61	5.59	5.88	5.71	5.47
School 9 SD	0.35	0.50	0.34	0.29	0.44	0.14	0.39	0.53
School 10 M	4.62	4.60	4.56	4.09	3.5	4.35	4.71	4.49
School 10 SD	0.92	0.97	1.06	0.99	1.01	1.23	0.86	0.90
School 11 M	5.09	5.07	5.04	4.99	4.99	5.15	5.06	4.91
School 11 SD	0.78	1.00	0.88	1.13	1.01	0.92	0.75	1.14
School 12 M	4.90	4.56	4.94	4.49	4.26	4.70	4.86	4.73
School 12 SD	0.91	1.04	0.95	1.02	1.01	1.05	0.72	0.90
School 13 M	5.63	5.66	5.56	5.36	4.66	5.68	5.44	5.55
School 13 SD	0.52	0.44	0.51	0.60	0.91	0.53	0.65	0.68
School 14 M	5.19	5.07	5.03	4.88	4.40	4.70	4.65	5.14
School 14 SD	0.85	0.93	0.96	0.96	1.09	1.25	0.99	0.82

Research Question Four

In order to answer research question four, correlations between each disposition and the three variables of job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate were calculated. Table 11 shows the correlations of each disposition to the variables of job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate.

Table 11

Correlations for Each Disposition and the External Variables of Job Satisfaction, Satisfaction with One's Principal, and School Climate

	Job Satisfaction	Satisfaction With Principal	School Climate
Disposition 1	.553*	.749*	.695*
Disposition 2	.560*	.742*	.701*
Disposition 3	.521*	.711*	.649*
Disposition 4	.533*	.705*	.658*
Disposition 5	.451*	.662*	.591*
Disposition 6	.594*	.806*	.749*
Disposition 7	.543*	.676*	.666*
Disposition 8	.563*	.731*	.670*
M	4.96	4.93	4.69
SD	1.033	1.204	1.213
N	207	207	207
Scale Min/Max Values	1 to 6	1 to 6	1 to 6

* $p < .01$

Response to Research Questions

Research Question One

Research question one asked if the items for each disposition displayed evidence of internal consistency per disposition. As shown in the alpha values, all eight dispositions demonstrated internal consistency (see Table 9). According to Pedhazur and

Schmelkin (1991), an alpha value of at least .7 is considered sufficient. Since the lowest alpha value in this study was .862, all eight dispositions meet the standard to be considered internally consistent (see Table 9). Therefore, the instrument developed in this study produced scores that were internally consistent per disposition.

Research Question Two

Research question two was concerned with internal structure. Internal structure was assessed using exploratory factor analysis, since factor analysis is the most widely useful method for determining the internal structure of a set of items (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). In general, a factor loading of at least .4 or .5 is considered meaningful (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). The lowest factor loading of retained questions for disposition one was .589, for disposition two was .659, for disposition three was .712, for disposition four was .678, for disposition five was .711, for disposition six was .758, for disposition seven was .738, and for disposition eight was .686. All of these factor loadings were higher than the recommended factor loading of at least .4 to .5. Further, once items were removed from the instrument, each disposition formed a single factor, which is critical to showing internal structure per disposition. Therefore, the results of the factor analysis led to the determination that the final instrument, which includes a total of 46 items, meets the established standards for internal structure.

Research Question Three

Research question three sought to determine if the dispositions correlated to each other as predicted. All eight dispositions were subcomponents of Theory Y leadership. In other words, if one is a Theory Y leader, then he or she holds these eight dispositions in varying degrees. Since the dispositions would be held in varying degrees, a perfect

correlation would not be expected. However, since they are all subcomponents of Theory Y leadership, they would be expected to all have positive correlations. All of the dispositions did, in fact, have statistically significant, positive correlations with each other. Therefore, the instrument behaved as expected, and displayed inter-disposition correlations that were consistent with expectations.

Research Question Four

Research question four asked if scores from the TYLD instrument demonstrated predictable associations, and therefore displayed evidence of construct validity, with variables theoretically linked to leadership dispositions. In this study, these variables included job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate. From the review of research presented in Chapter Three, the researcher concluded that the eight dispositions should positively correlate with all three external variables. As was shown in Table 10, not only did each disposition correlate positively with all three external factors, but all of the correlations were also statistically significant. Therefore, the researcher concluded that the instrument did, in fact, provide scores that demonstrated evidence construct validity.

Chapter Summary

After reviewing the relevant literature and constructing an instrument to measure Theory Y leadership dispositions, the researcher began statistical analyses to determine if the instrument displayed reliability and validity. In order to answer the research questions, correlation coefficients of the questions for each disposition were calculated, factor loadings per disposition were calculated, inter-disposition correlations were determined, and correlations of each disposition with the external factors of job

satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate were determined. All of the data behaved as expected. Therefore, the researcher concluded that the instrument, in final form, was both reliable and valid.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

Summary

The purpose of this quantitative research was to develop a reliable and valid instrument that measured a school principal's Theory Y leadership dispositions. The researcher first conducted a thorough review of the literature and used information found to develop a first draft of the instrument. This draft contained 73 questions, which were sent to a panel of three experts in Theory Y leadership. The panel was asked to determine if the questions were a good fit for the disposition they were measuring, and to identify any questions that were ambiguous or vague. The panel was also asked for any suggestions as to questions that needed to be added. From the recommendations of this panel, the researcher deleted or combined several questions and reworded others. The new draft of the instrument consisted of 57 questions. From these recommendations, the researcher also added four items. After obtaining IRB approval, this revised instrument was distributed to forty-three colleagues of the researcher, and all were completed and returned. From the responses of these colleagues, the researcher changed the wording on four items to make their meaning more clear. The researcher then entered the questions into *SurveyMonkey*© and electronically distributed the instrument to all 1,073 teachers in one school district in the southeast. Of the instruments distributed, 260 were completed, for a response rate of 24.2 percent. Once the responses were collected, the researcher used SPSS to conduct statistical analyses that would enable the researcher to determine if the instrument was reliable and valid. These statistical methods included calculating correlation coefficients for the questions per disposition, determining factor loadings of

the questions per disposition, calculating inter-disposition correlation coefficients, and calculating correlation coefficients between each disposition and the external factors of job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate.

Analysis of Research Findings

The most significant finding in this study is that the instrument, in its final form, indicates evidence of reliability and validity. The correlation coefficients for the questions in each disposition were all well over the minimum accepted value of .7, indicating that the Theory Y Leadership Dispositions (TYLD) instrument demonstrated evidence of reliability per disposition. The factor loadings for the retained items were all well over the recommended value of .4 to .5, indicating that the TYLD instrument demonstrated evidence of internal structure. The inter-disposition correlations were all positive, which was consistent with predictions. The dispositions also correlated as expected with the external variables of job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate, indicating evidence of construct validity.

Discussion of Research Findings

The basic premises of Theory Y leadership were set forth in McGregor's (1960) seminal work *The Human Side of Enterprise*. According to McGregor, Theory Y leaders believe that people actually like work, as work can be a source of satisfaction, and people will exercise self-direction and self-control if they are committed to the organization's objectives (McGregor, 1960). Also, according to Theory Y, people have the capacity to apply a high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in solving problems (McGregor, 1960). Although this theory was set forth in 1960, little empirical research about it existed in the literature. Of the research that did exist, all was in the area of

corporate business (Finman, 1973), with none being in the area of education. Therefore, this study was undertaken to fill a gap in the literature and to relate Theory Y leadership to educational administration. Specifically, the purpose of the research was to develop an instrument that was both reliable and valid to measure the level of Theory Y leadership dispositions held by a school principal. The research began with a study of dispositions, or assumptions about human behavior that guide a person's actions (Schein, 1974). If dispositions guide a person's actions, then observing a principal's actions in terms of dispositions could lead to an overall assessment of the principal's disposition to be a Theory Y leader. Further, teachers were chosen as the participants of the study for two major reasons. First, using teachers, rather than principals, greatly increased the pool of potential responses. Also, asking the principals to judge themselves could lead to a tendency to answer the questions the way the principals thought the researcher wanted them to answer, or to answer the questions based on how the principals wished they felt. For example, in his study of 200 subordinates and 10 leaders, Finman (1973) discovered that all of the leaders rated themselves as Theory Y, whereas not all of the subordinates rated their leader similarly. Therefore, by using the teachers, the researcher expected to obtain a more complete and accurate profile of each principal's tendency toward Theory Y dispositions.

Eight Theory Y leadership dispositions that were developed by a research team at Georgia Southern University were used to guide the development of the instrument in terms of observable behaviors (Green, Mallory, Melton, Reavis, 2009). These eight dispositions were:

1. Theory Y leaders are disposed to taking risks and confronting conflict for what is ethical, both for the common good and the individual.
2. Theory Y leaders are disposed to relentless expectations for student growth and instructional leadership from those internal and external to the organization.
3. Theory Y leaders are disposed to openness and honesty, which is also referred to as transparency.
4. Theory Y leaders are disposed to active engagement of all members of the school community through democracy-centered practice.
5. Theory Y leaders are disposed to reward and recognize growth, not just performance.
6. Theory Y leaders are disposed to value individual dignity and worth.
7. Theory Y leaders are disposed to enjoy work.
8. Theory Y leaders are disposed to believe that workers are resourceful and receptive to responsibility.

From these dispositions and a review of relevant literature (Hallinger, 2003; Mallory & Melton, 2009; Marks & Printy, 2003; Mullen, 2008; Stricherz, 2001; Ylimaki, 2007), and based on models set forth by Menon (2001) and Schulte and Kowel (2005), the researcher developed a instrument intended to measure a principal's tendency toward Theory Y leadership dispositions.

Once the instrument was complete and the researcher collected responses, SPSS was utilized to perform statistical analyses on the data. The analyses showed that the questions displayed evidence of internal reliability per disposition, as all Cronbach's alpha values were higher than the recommended level of .7 (Pedhazur & Schmelkin,

1991). The questions also showed evidence of internal structure as all of the factor loadings were higher than the recommended level of .4 to .5 (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). The instrument also performed as expected in reference to inter-disposition correlations. Since the dispositions all measure the same theory of leadership, it makes logical sense to conclude that the dispositions would positively correlate to each other.

The data analysis for correlations between each disposition and the external factors of job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate also behaved as expected from the literature review. Many studies, including Yang (2009), Bogler (2001), and Singer and Singer (1990) found that a higher level of transformational leadership, which is a more recent conceptualization of Theory Y leadership, led to higher levels of job satisfaction. Therefore, the statistically significant positive correlation between each disposition and job satisfaction found in this study concurs with the findings of existing literature. Studies by August and Waltman (2004), Volkwein and Zhou (2003), Sellgren, Ekvall, and Tomson (2008), and Xiaofu and Qiwen (2007) found that leadership style related climate to leadership style. These studies also related job satisfaction to work climate. Therefore, the statistically significant positive correlation between each disposition and school climate found in this study concurs with the findings of existing literature. Though the literature on satisfaction with one's leader was more sparse than the literature for job satisfaction and workplace climate, two separate studies by Singer and Singer (1990) did find a statistically significant preference for transformational leaders. Therefore, the statistically significant positive correlation between each disposition and satisfaction with one's principal found in this study concurs with the findings of existing literature.

Conclusions

The most important conclusion drawn from this study is that the instrument that was developed exhibited both reliability and validity. Face validity was addressed through a thorough review of the literature which was then used to develop the initial instrument. Further, content validity was ensured through the expert review of the initial items on the instrument and the revisions made from their recommendations, as well as through the pilot study and subsequent revisions. Internal consistency, or reliability, was shown through the calculation of Cronbach's alphas for the questions per disposition. All alpha values were higher than the recommended level of at least .7, thus the questions for each disposition demonstrated evidence of reliability. Further evidence of reliability was demonstrated through factor analysis per disposition, as all factor loadings exceeded the recommended value of at least .4 to .5. The factor analysis also addressed validity. Validity was also evidenced through the inter-disposition correlations, as the dispositions correlated to each other as expected. Validity was further evidenced through the correlations between the dispositions and the external variables of job satisfaction, satisfaction with one's principal, and school climate, as all correlations behaved as expected based on the literature review.

Implications

This study contributes to the field of educational leadership in a significant way. The instrument developed, which was shown to be both reliable and valid, can now be utilized in future leadership studies or to evaluate current or aspiring school leaders' dispositions.

Recommendations

Recommendations for future research would involve the use of the instrument developed in this study. Studies could attempt to replicate the results of this study. Future researchers can utilize the instrument as a measure of Theory Y leadership dispositions, and can then relate or attempt to correlate a principal's Theory Y leadership dispositions to other factors, such as student success or school improvement. Future studies may also focus on comparing the dispositions of principals at high and low performing schools.

Dissemination

The results of this study will be of particular interest in leader preparation programs and to those conducting leadership research. In order for the results of this study to be disseminated to these groups, the researcher will electronically publish the dissertation. The researcher also hopes to publish the instrument in an academic journal.

REFERENCES

- Argyris, C. (1971). *Management and organizational development: The path from XA to YB*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- August, L., & Waltman, J. (2004). Culture, climate, and contribution: Career satisfaction among female faculty. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(2), 177-192. Retrieved December 24, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher jobsatisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(5), 662-683. Retrieved December 24, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Brannigan, A., & Zwerman, W. (2001). The real "Hawthorne Effect". *Society, 38*(2), 55-60. Retrieved November 21, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc.
- Cudahy, D., Finnan, C., Jaruszewicz, C., & McCarty, B. (2002). *Seeing dispositions: Translating our shared values into observable behavior*. Paper presented at the First Annual Symposium on Educator Dispositions, Richmond, KY.
- Day, C., Sammons, P., Hopkins, D., Leithwood, K., & Kington, A. (2008). Research into the impact of school leadership on pupil outcomes: Policy and research contexts. *School Leadership and Management, 28*(1), 5-25. Retrieved October 3, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Ervay, S. (2006). Academic leadership in America's public schools. *NASSP Bulletin, 90*(2), 77-86. Retrieved September 3, 2008, from ERIC database.

- Fiman, B. G. (1973). An investigation of the relationships among supervisory attitudes, behaviors, and outputs: An examination of McGregor's Theory Y. *Personnel Psychology, 26*(1), 95-105. Retrieved October 25, 2009, from Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection database.
- Franke, R. H., & Kaul, J. D. (1978). The Hawthorne experiments: First statistical interpretation. *American Sociological Review, 43*(5). Retrieved November 21, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Goldberg, M. F. (2006). The right leader at the right time. *School Administrator, 63*(10), 32-35. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from Professional Development Collection database.
- Goldring, E., & Schuermann, P. (2009). The changing context of k-12 education administration: Consequences for Ed.D. program design and delivery. *Peabody Journal of Education, 84*(1), 9-43. Retrieved September 13, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Graham, R. J. (1980). On the death of Theory Y. *Interfaces, 10*(3), 76-79 Retrieved October 23, 2009, from Psychology and Behavioral Science Collection database.
- Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 33*(3), 329-351. Retrieved September 11, 2008, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Harris, A., Day, C., & Hadfield, M. (2003). Teachers' perspectives on effective school leadership. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 9*(1), 67-77. Retrieved September 1, 2008, from Academic Search Complete database.

- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1), 40-51. Retrieved September 13, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (2008). *Educational administration theory, research, and practice*. Boston: McGraw Hill Higher Education.
- Kopelman, R. E., Prottas, D. J., & Davis, A. L. (2008). Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Y: Toward a construct-valid measure. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20(2), 255-271. Retrieved October 23, 2009, from Psychology and Behavioral Science Collection database.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Hopkins, D. (2008). Seven strong claims about successful school leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 28(1), 27-42. Retrieved October 3, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 17(2), 201-227. Retrieved October 3, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Mallory, B. J., & Melton, T. D. (2009, October). *Leadership dispositions, behaviors, and strategies to support teachers*. Paper presented at the Phi Delta Kappa International Summit on Quality Educator Recruitment and Retention, Indianapolis, IN.
- Marks, H. M., & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An

- integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370-397. Retrieved September 11, 2008, from Academic Search Complete database.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.
- Menon, S. T. (2001). Employee empowerment: An integrative psychological approach. *Applied Psychology*, 50(1), 153-180.
- Mullen, C. A. (2008). Democratically accountable leadership: A social justice perspective of educational quality and practice. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 35(4), 137-153. Retrieved November 23, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Nord, W. (1978). Theory Y assumptions in a non-Theory Y world. *Interfaces*, 8(2), 61-66. Retrieved October 23, 2009, from Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection database.
- Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership theory and practice* (4th ed.). London: SAGE Publications.
- Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, Design, and Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ragheb, M. G., & Beard, J. C. (1982). Measuring leisure attitude. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 14(2), 155-167.
- Reavis, C. (2008). Occasional paper #2: Thoughts on dispositions and Theory Y. Statesboro, GA: Georgia Center for Educational Renewal.
- Reese, S. (2004). Effective school leadership. *Techniques*, 79(6), 18-21. Retrieved September 1, 2008, from Academic Search Complete database.

- Sabancı, A. (2008). School principals' assumptions about human nature: Implications for leadership in Turkey. *Educational Management, Administration, and Leadership*, 36(4), 511-529. Retrieved October 23, 2009, from <http://ema.sagepub.com>.
- Schein, E. H. (1974). *In defense of Theory Y*. Paper presented at the Western Electric Conference, Chicago: IL. Retrieved October 23, 2009, from Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection database.
- Schulte, L. E., & Kowal, P. (2005). The validation of the administrator dispositions instrument. *Educational Leadership and Administration*, 17, 75-87.
- Sellgren, S. F., Ekvall, G., & Tomson, G. (2008). Leadership behavior of nurse managers in relation to job satisfaction and work climate. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 16(5), 578-587. Retrieved December 24, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1975). Human resources supervision. In T. J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), *Professional supervision for professional teachers* (pp. 9-31). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Singer, M. S., & Singer, A. E. (1990). Situational constraints on transformational versus transactional leadership behavior, subordinates' leadership preference, and satisfaction. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 130(3), 385-396. Retrieved December 24, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Sockett, H. (2009). Dispositions as virtues: The complexity of the construct. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(3), 291-303. Retrieved September 13, 2009, from Ebsco Electronic Journals Service.
- Stricherz, M. (2001). School leaders feel overworked, survey finds. *Education Week*,

- 21(12), 5. Retrieved November 23, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Unruh, G. G. (1975). Forward. In T. J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), *Professional supervision for professional teachers* (pp. 1-8). Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Volkwein, J. F., & Zhou, Y. (2003). Testing a model of administrative job satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education, 44*(2), 149-171. Retrieved December 24, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Wasicsko, M., Wirtz, P., Callahan, C., Erickson, P., Hyndman, J., & Sexton, L. (2004). *Dispositions: The third eye of teaching*. Paper presented at the Third Annual Symposium on Educator Dispositions, Richmond, KY.
- Wasonga, T. A., & Murphy, J. F. (2007). Co-creating leadership dispositions. *International Studies in Educational Administration, 35*(2), 20-32. Retrieved September 13, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Xiaofu, P., & Qiwen, Q. (2007). An analysis of the relation between secondary school organizational climate and teacher job satisfaction. *Chinese Education and Society, 40*(5), 65-77. Retrieved December 24, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Yang, Y-F. (2009). An investigation of group interaction functioning stimulated by transformational leadership on employee intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction: An extension of the resource-based theory perspective. *Social Behavior and Personality, 37*(9), 1259-1278. Retrieved December 24, 2009, from Academic Search Complete database.
- Ylimaki, R. M. (2007). Instructional leadership in challenging US schools. *International*

Studies in Educational Administration, 35(3), 11-19. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from ERIC database.

Yukl, G. A. (2005). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

APPENDIX A
IRB APPROVAL

Georgia Southern University
Office of Research Services & Sponsored Programs
Institutional Review Board (IRB)
Phone: 912-478-0843 Veazey Hall 2021
P.O. Box 8005
Fax: 912-478-0719 IRB@GeorgiaSouthern.edu Statesboro, GA 30460
To: Patricia K. Krumnow
1513 Old Macon Darien Road SE
Ludowici, GA 31316
cc: Charles E. Patterson
Associate Vice President for Research
From: Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs
Administrative Support Office for Research Oversight Committees
(IACUC/IBC/IRB)

Date: January 27, 2010

Subject: Status of Application for Approval to Utilize Human Subjects in Research

After a review of your proposed research project numbered: **H10159**, and titled “**The Development and Validation of the Theory Y Leadership Dispositions Instrument**”, it appears that your research involves activities that do not require full review by the Institutional Review Board according to federal guidelines. According to the Code of Federal Regulations Title 45 Part 46, your research protocol is determined to be exempt from full IRB review under the following exemption category(s):

Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:

(I) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (II) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

*Therefore, as authorized in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to notify you that your research is exempt from IRB approval. **You may proceed with the proposed research.***

Sincerely,
Eleanor Haynes

Compliance Officer

APPENDIX B
INSTRUMENT USED FOR THE STUDY

Theory Y Leadership Dispositions Instrument

1. My principal has high expectations for teaching and learning at our school.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

2. My principal involves teachers in solving problems at the school.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

3. My principal will do what he/she thinks is good for the school, even if it means taking risks.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

4. My principal lies.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

5. My principal is only concerned with student performance level, rather than with individual growth.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

6. My principal does not seem to care about his/her staff members.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

7. My principal appears to enjoy work.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

8. My principal provides resources that are necessary for teachers to solve problems and take responsibility at the school.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

9. My principal treats others with respect, regardless of socioeconomic status, gender, or ethnicity.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

10. My principal provides leadership opportunities for teachers and students.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

11. My principal's main focus is on teaching and learning.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

12. I can trust what my principal says.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

13. My principal treats others with respect even when they disagree with him/her.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

14. My principal is open, honest and truthful.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

15. My principal smiles often.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

16. My principal sets aside time to meet with parents and community leaders.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

17. My principal confronts conflict when it is necessary to make the school better.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

18. My principal is ethical.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

19. My principal provides incentives for teacher improvement.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

20. My principal does not focus on teaching and learning.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

21. My principal is positive and upbeat.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

22. My principal values the dignity, or self-respect, of others.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

23. I feel that I can talk to my principal about my concerns.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

24. My principal believes that his/her faculty is not resourceful in solving problems and therefore emphasizes compliance with board rules and requirements.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

25. I often see my principal in the hall and he/she is curious about student learning.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

26. My principal is secretive.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

27. My principal values his/her staff.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

28. My principal listens to and acts upon the concerns of others.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

29. My principal is concerned with the common good of the school.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

30. My principal withholds some information that may be instrumental to problem solving.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

31. My principal avoids risks.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

32. My principal promotes self-worth, or a feeling of importance, in others.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

33. My principal provides incentives for student improvement.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

34. My principal appears to dislike his/her job.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

35. My principal believes school improvement is possible within the school.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

36. My principal provides incentives for teachers who improve student learning.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

37. My principal cares about me.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

38. My principal does not like conflict.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

39. My principal is democratic in his/her leadership.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

40. My principal does not allow teachers to help solve problems at the school because he/she feels the faculty cannot effectively solve problems.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

41. My principal supports my growth as a teacher.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

42. My principal works hard to promote parental involvement to improve student achievement.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

43. My principal often seeks resources external to the school, such as bringing in outside experts and relying on outside creativity.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

44. My principal makes decisions which I think are not ethical.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

45. My principal encourages active engagement and input from teachers in the decision making process.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

46. My principal encourages student participation in academic competitions, such as science fair, social studies fair, media festival, or inter-school contests.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

47. My principal will not accept a lack of individual student growth.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

48. My principal works hard to promote community involvement to improve student achievement.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

49. My principal makes me feel important.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

50. My principal makes sure to recognize students who have made great improvements, rather than only those who are at the top of the class.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

51. My principal communicates to all stakeholders his/her reasons for making certain decisions.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

52. My principal provides incentives for students who improve their own learning.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

53. My principal complains about having too much to do and not enough time.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

54. My principal provides for meaningful staff development for the teachers.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

55. My principal makes major decisions without consulting others.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

56. My principal believes that his/her faculty is receptive of responsibility.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

57. My principal “talks down to” his or her staff.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

58. I am satisfied with my job.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

59. I am satisfied with my principal.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

60. My work environment (school climate) is positive overall.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

APPENDIX C
FINAL INSTRUMENT

Theory Y Leadership Dispositions Instrument

1. My principal has high expectations for teaching and learning at our school.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

2. My principal involves teachers in solving problems at the school.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

3. My principal will do what he/she thinks is good for the school, even if it means taking risks.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

4. My principal lies.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

5. My principal does not seem to care about his/her staff members.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

6. My principal appears to enjoy work.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

7. My principal provides resources that are necessary for teachers to solve problems and take responsibility at the school.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

8. My principal treats others with respect, regardless of socioeconomic status, gender, or ethnicity.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

9. My principal provides leadership opportunities for teachers and students.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

10. My principal's main focus is on teaching and learning.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

11. I can trust what my principal says.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

12. My principal treats others with respect even when they disagree with him/her.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

13. My principal is open, honest and truthful.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

14. My principal smiles often.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

15. My principal sets aside time to meet with parents and community leaders.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

16. My principal confronts conflict when it is necessary to make the school better.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

17. My principal is ethical.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

18. My principal provides incentives for teacher improvement.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

19. My principal is positive and upbeat.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

20. My principal values the dignity, or self-respect, of others.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

21. I feel that I can talk to my principal about my concerns.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

22. I often see my principal in the hall and he/she is curious about student learning.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

23. My principal values his/her staff.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

24. My principal listens to and acts upon the concerns of others.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

25. My principal is concerned with the common good of the school.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

26. My principal withholds some information that may be instrumental to problem solving.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

27. My principal promotes self-worth, or a feeling of importance, in others.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

28. My principal provides incentives for student improvement.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

29. My principal appears to dislike his/her job.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

30. My principal believes school improvement is possible within the school.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

31. My principal provides incentives for teachers who improve student learning.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

32. My principal cares about me.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

33. My principal is democratic in his/her leadership.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

34. My principal does not allow teachers to help solve problems at the school because he/she feels the faculty cannot effectively solve problems.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

35. My principal supports my growth as a teacher.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

36. My principal works hard to promote parental involvement to improve student achievement.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

37. My principal makes decisions which I think are not ethical.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

38. My principal encourages active engagement and input from teachers in the decision making process.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

39. My principal encourages student participation in academic competitions, such as science fair, social studies fair, media festival, or inter-school contests.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

40. My principal works hard to promote community involvement to improve student achievement.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

41. My principal makes me feel important.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

42. My principal makes sure to recognize students who have made great improvements, rather than only those who are at the top of the class.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

43. My principal provides incentives for students who improve their own learning.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

44. My principal provides for meaningful staff development for the teachers.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

45. My principal believes that his/her faculty is receptive of responsibility.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------

46. My principal “talks down to” his or her staff.

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Almost Always	Always
-------	--------	-----------	-------	---------------	--------