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Abstract

The 21st Century school leadership style “is not for the faint of heart and, as with any organization, a school is only as successful as their leadership” (East 2012, p. 1). The mantle of leadership weighs heavily upon the shoulders of the principal. Acknowledging the complexity of the role and responsibilities of the principalship requires examining the leadership style necessary to lead, yet lessen the intricacies of developing and maintaining a positive school climate and maximizing student achievement. Principals are faced with a series of unique challenges and sacrifices that confront school morale, culture, and practice. Yet, a principal’s leadership style guides their approach and response to the varying demands of being named the leader.

The issues and challenges facing today’s principal are not getting any easier; in fact, they are becoming more complex and more convoluted. The principal must be prepared to make definitive, thoughtful decisions, devote sizeable amounts of time to the job, and to endure hefty criticism when things go amiss and faultfinders complain. The principal serves as the lightning rod for all accounts of the school’s movement. Because of the surmountable pressures, principals can achieve high measures of success with followers if they understand the relationships between transformational and transactional leadership. The researcher surveyed certified high school teachers about their opinions regarding the characteristics of an ideal principal. In this study, we explore the idea that transformational leadership and the principal’s leadership immensely influence the culture of a suburban school district. The suburban Midwestern school district included two high school sites in one county. The two high schools serve approximately 3,600 students, approximately 300 teachers, and over 500 classified faculty. District X is 82% white and 18% other subgroups, such as black, Asian, Hispanic and special needs
students. Through an analysis of more than 100 teachers in District X, the most effective and respected principals were discovered to be instructional change agents, talent managers, and culture builders.
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Chapter One

Introduction

State-driven education dominates the United States, and we accept the evident consensus that public schools should exist, and we form a better society when we raise the average literacy and education level of the populace. In that light, Anthony Muhammad (2009) offers a summary of U.S. dissatisfaction with the state of public education:

For more than a century, educators, scholars, politicians, and citizens have debated the purpose of our public school system and how best to reform it. Ironically, our public school system has undergone sweeping changes in the 20th century and beyond, yet it has remained largely the same, and there is still a lack of clear consensus about what is needed to ensure that all of our schools perform at high levels, and all of our students achieve success. (p. 5)

Muhammed’s assertions do not reflect an existential question, but one of efficiency and efficacy: there is a widespread belief that public schools need to be better. The central ghost which haunts this dissertation is, in fact, the “sweeping changes” that Muhammed mentions: for in an ever-changing society with a constantly-revolving reformation of education law, what characteristics remain constant? The most obvious target is the infrastructure; even in very different educational systems like Montessori education (with the notable exception of the modern home-school movement) there are teachers leading classrooms, intertwined with some administration which supports them,
and that administration generally has one single leader at the per-building level: the principal.

Traditionally, the school principal’s primary role has been to deal with student discipline and manage the day-to-day affairs of the school. The No Child Left Behind Act, however, both forced school district officials to reevaluate the qualities of an effective principal and abandon the roles of the building leader (NCLB, 2001). While NCLB changed the national expectations for education, it has more recently been revised into the Every Student Succeeds Act, or ESSA, which again modifies the expectations for building principals.

While there are no universal standards chaining districts to specific curriculum guidelines and frameworks, these new laws foster a *de facto* expectation that the building leaders are also to be instructional leaders. The laws and the society appear to be redesigning the role of the principal, with an understanding that this individual is required to do more than monitor lunch duty, create master schedules, and assign consequences for school policy violations. The principal’s purpose has shifted to include providing quality professional development and improving student achievement. Today’s building principal must be first and foremost a fervent instructional leader who understands the importance of building a culture of engagement, creating collaborative opportunities for teachers, and leading staff members through building-level decisions.

Two core models of leadership and administration are often contrasted; they may be called command-and-control vs. a systems approach (Castiglione, 2006) or transactional vs. transformational (Judge, 2004). Essentially these archetypes can be viewed as the administrative methods of a general versus a janitor. The general’s
administrative style can be called top-down, command-and-control, or transactional. In this style, the administrator sets goals and expectations for the institution and its individuals. Judge (2004) summarizes three major mechanisms of transactional leadership in this way:

1. Clearly communicating individuals’ goals, and the rewards for meeting them
2. Actively monitoring subordinates for problematic behavior and intervening before it can become a problem
3. Passively waiting for other behaviors to cause problems within the institution, then addressing them as they arise. (p. 755-756)

A different administrative style is perhaps best exemplified by the janitor, whose leadership action is bottom-up, supportive, or transformational. In this style, the administration creates an environment that inspires better performance from the employees in the organization. Judge (2004) specifies four key aspects of this leadership style:

1. Charismatically setting an example of proper behavior, both acting with conviction and appealing to other employees on an emotional level
2. Articulating a clear vision for where the organization should be, setting a high standard, and contextualizing present tasks by explaining them in terms of where the institution is supposed to go
3. Encouraging contributions and suggestions for administration from all levels, challenging employees’ assumptions to draw creative solutions to administrative problems from the people being led
4. Listening to each individual’s concerns and needs, responding sympathetically
and mentoring or coaching them with a personal touch. (p. 755)

Like a janitor, the transformational leader “cleans up” the environment and interacts with others in the organization at a much more peer-to-peer level, rather than using their latent authority to set concrete goals and expectations. Authority is communicated by showing a vision of how the organization should be (in a literal janitor’s case, clean and organized), and encouraging others that their efforts are meaningful because they support that vision.

This latter model of “leading by serving” is increasingly supported as an effective way to lead, and good leadership itself is proving to be a resilient positive influence despite the changing legal framework. In his research, Hattie (2002) noted the principal must move away from the role of overseeing operations and rather “be the lead adult learner in the school community” (p. 16). Building principals must possess transformational leadership skills to lead their staff through the 21st Century and beyond. Researchers have concluded in many cases that transformational leadership is more efficient than transactional leadership. Building leaders are now moving in a direction to create an environment conducive to shared decision-making and promoting staff to assume a measure of ownership in the vision and mission of the school. If this is true, its effectiveness should be able to be evaluated in District X, a typical suburban school district in the Midwest of the United States.

**Background**

Research studies show that school leadership is directed towards the collective total of student achievement results, making the principal's leadership second only to classroom teachers and instruction among factors that affect student achievement.
DuFour (2013) claimed that principals are being asked to improve student learning (p. 34). The role of the principal has changed from managing bus and cafeteria duty to creating collaborative master schedules and proactively directing student discipline. Under federal reform initiatives, the 21st Century principal's primary role is to be a change agent, a role model, and an instructional leader who can significantly improve student achievement growth.

Statement of the Problem

Over the years, principals in District X have been hired by the district-level administration with a distinct lack of knowledge about what teachers expect from them. Despite the affluent and elite reputation of District X, its schools were still seen to be plagued with multiple challenges in the way of becoming a premier school organization. One such challenge was the overabundance of leadership styles present within the district. During the three years prior to this survey, there was a major shift in leadership roles and leadership styles, from the superintendent of schools to the assistant superintendent of academic services, the director of secondary education, the curriculum coordinator, and building leaders, including both principals and assistant principals. Teachers had been exposed to a vast array of leadership styles. Some teachers responded to the old leadership style, transactional leadership, while others are more responsive to the new leadership style, transformational leadership. The leadership team in District X therefore needs to determine which style of leadership works best among teachers, and which leadership style is most effective in nurturing teacher morale and creating positive school culture.
Purpose of the Study

The first purpose of this study was to confirm a relationship between principal leadership practices, school culture, and staff morale. A second purpose was to see what sorts of factors naturally group the survey questions due to factor analysis, and to determine which of these factors was most significant: this is Research Question 1 below. The third purpose was to determine whether there are any patterns of differences among teacher opinions of an ideal principal, based on that teacher’s gender: this is Research Question 2. Fourth, the researcher wanted to know whether the teachers’ opinions change with the duration of their service in the field: this is Research Question 3. In summary, the overall purpose of this study was to isolate which leadership characteristics are preferred and essential to the ideal principal, and whether this varies by teachers’ genders or durations of employment.

Significance of the Study

DuFour and Marzano (2011) asserted that a principal’s leadership style affects the outcome and effectiveness of school climate, culture, teacher morale, and student achievement. The theory behind this study is that there is a strong connection between a principal’s leadership behaviors and practices, a transformational leadership style, and the school’s outcome as determined by culture, climate, and morale. Moreover, this study examined the perceptions of teachers and their opinions of an ideal principal. There are multiple variables that outline a school’s environment. Evidence in this study may support the relationship between the practices and behaviors of the principal and the health of the school as a whole. Results of this study may also suggest how the leadership skills of a principal can be further developed to usher in continuous school
improvement, an ongoing positive culture, and elevated teacher morale. Research by DuFour and Mattos (2013) on leadership behavior and professional learning communities focused on social factors such as the ways in which staff morale, group interaction, and supportive relationships have a significant impact on productivity and the success of both students and teachers. If the challenge of finding the best practices in principalship in District X is to be conquered, these factors must be taken into consideration.

Moreover, District X is a steadily growing community and is slowly becoming more diverse. The student population is experiencing cultural changes, adding pockets of diversity to the once nearly homogenous white classroom. Two student populations in particular, namely students requiring special services and African–American students, have grown over the past three years. At the time of this study, white students comprised 82% of District X and groups of other ethnicities claimed the remaining 18% of the District X student population. Because of the continual growth in diversity, the principals’ and district administrators’ leadership styles must change to meet the needs of all learners now in their care.

Because principals have such a direct effect on school culture, it is imperative to pinpoint and evaluate the leadership styles and characteristics that support and nurture a school environment to become most conducive to learning. The principal’s leadership behavior is arguably the most important characteristic responsible for developing, maintaining, and fostering positive school cultures and promoting positive teacher morale. Both positive school climate and teacher morale are essential in teacher efficacy, creating a successful building environment that trickles down to impact every student in attendance. School administrators must carefully examine their leadership styles often
and aim at continual self-reflection to boost the overall school climate, nurture teacher morale, and promote a steady gain in student achievement. Furthermore, because of the continual growth in diversity, the principals’ and district administrators’ leadership styles must change as well to meet the needs of all learners.

The results of this study provide building level and district office administrators with increased knowledge of factors that have significant relationships and connections with school improvement, specifically related to positive culture and high teacher morale. Results from the study add to the body of research used to advise professional development efforts among building leaders in an ever-changing world of school reform. Additionally, this study can help provide building administrators with a guide for improving school culture and teacher satisfaction. The research from the study may increase the effectiveness of building level and district level leadership to meet the needs of all learners and to meet the leadership needs of secondary teachers.

Definition of Terms

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) advised researchers to define significant terms central to this research study, allowing readers to understand and other researchers to better replicate the study.

Culture. In this study, school culture was defined as “an underground flow of feelings and folkways wending its way within schools in the form of vision and values, beliefs and assumptions, rituals and ceremonies, history and stories, and physical symbols” (Deal and Peterson, 1999, p. 7-8). A school’s culture is defined by the collective attitude and general atmosphere found among faculty, students, and all who occupy the building.
Leadership. For the purpose of this study, leadership was defined as

[A] set of processes that creates organizations in the first place or adapts them to significantly changing circumstances. Leadership defines what the future should look like, aligns people with that vision, and inspires them to make it happen despite the obstacles. (Kotter, 1996, p. 28)

Leadership is decision-making, process-starting, and burden-shouldering. There are many styles of leadership practiced by varying leaders worldwide.

Practice. For the purpose of this study, practice, whether of a leader, teacher, or principal, is defined as “a routinized type of behaviour which consists of several elements, interconnected to one another: forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, ‘things’ and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge.” (Reckwitz, 2002, p. 249)

Principal. For the purpose of this study, the principal was “a properly certified person who is assigned as the chief administrative officer of a school” (Schultz, 2011, p. 12). The principal is the building-level leader of a school. He or she oversees daily operations, staff efficacy and encouragement, and student discipline and well-being.

Teacher Morale. For the purpose of this study, teacher morale was described as “a state of mind encompassing all the feelings determined by an individual’s anticipation of the extent of satisfaction with those needs which s/he perceives as significantly affecting his/her total work situation” (Evans, 1998, p. 30). Whether a teacher feels seen and heard, noticed and listened to, acknowledged and supported – all of these factors influence teacher morale.
**Transformational Leadership.** In this study, transformational leadership was defined by Lunenburg and Ornstein (2008) as “Creating a productive culture by getting followers to transcend self-interests for the sake of the team, and developing structures to foster participation in decisions” (p. 26). Transformational leaders seek to raise up and empower team members rather than lord power over them. They seek to create genuine change and lasting health in the culture among those they lead, and actively include followers in decisions and building the future of their organization.

**Delimitations**

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) also advised that clear boundaries, called “delimitations,” should be established; these are “self-imposed boundaries set by the researcher on the purpose and scope of the study” (p. 134). For this study, the researcher has set the following delimitations:

1. This study was conducted in secondary high schools. The results of this study potentially cannot be generalized to middle and elementary schools.

2. This study was limited to one suburban school district in the Midwest.

3. This study was conducted among teachers who teach mostly upper middle-class students with relatively stable families. The results of this study potentially cannot be generalized to include lower or higher-income school districts that serve families of vastly different socioeconomic status.

4. This study was limited to the brevity of the 20-question leadership traits survey used to measure teachers’ opinions. Results gleaned from longer or shorter survey instruments may reflect different findings.
Assumptions

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) also advised that researchers should be clear about their “assumptions,” defined as “postulates, premises, and propositions that are accepted as operational for purposes of the research” (p. 135). The following assumptions were made in this study:

1. Respondents to survey understood the vocabulary and survey questions.
2. Respondents to the survey answered honestly and truthfully.

Research Questions

Creswell (2008) advised that researchers should formulate boundaries as research questions (RQ), which “shape and specifically focus the purpose of the study” (p. 132). Three factors emerged from the factor analysis that was performed on the survey results, leading to three identifiable factors uniting the responses to different survey items: some items had to do with morale, some with culture, and some with practice. Within these boundaries, three research questions were posed.

RQ1. What is the highest expectation teachers have for principals: morale, culture or practice?

RQ2. To what extent does teacher gender affect expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal?

RQ3. To what extent do teacher years of service affect expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal?

Overview of the Methodology

The population in this study included two secondary public high schools in a suburban Midwest school district (District X). Each high school had a student population
of over 1,800 students, and the high schools combined employed nearly 400 teachers. Both high schools had support staff including administrative assistants, counselors, social workers, paraprofessionals, nurses, maintenance, and cafeteria staff members. However, only certified teachers of grades 9-12 were included in the research for this study. In the two high schools in District X, a Leadership Traits Survey (see Appendix A) was administered to certified teachers. To determine a principal’s leadership efficacy toward the creation of a positive school climate and teacher morale, results were analyzed to determine the most significant and ideal characteristics of effective leadership.

**Organization of The Study**

In chapter one, this report introduced the topic of study: the problem of teachers’ expectations for their principals in District X. The scope of the research and the associated purpose of the study were discussed, along with why the information targeted by the study is important. Also provided in this chapter were boundaries in the form of assumptions, delimitations, definitions of what was studied, and research questions that were the subject of focus. The chapter concludes with an overview of the methodology and this overview of the report itself.

Chapter two includes a literature overview of prior research in the field, especially including the topics of transformational leadership, principals’ roles in teacher morale and school culture. Chapter three contains the study’s methodology in significantly greater detail than the brief overview in the last section. Chapter four includes the basic results of the research questions. Detailed analysis of the items of the survey is also available in Appendix D. Chapter five concludes the study with interpretations of these results and relates the findings to the literature discussed in chapter two.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Historically, research has captured that the essence of the role of the principal has gradually transitioned from being the organizer of master schedules to an operational manager, and now, in the 21st century, an instructional leader. Deal and Peterson (2009) found:

All schools have histories. The nucleus of beliefs and values remains stable and the accumulation of key experiences around the core is communal. Schools are vulnerable to the educational fads of the moment. Without a well-known historical map the school loses its way. (p. 45)

Principal leadership is analogous to the center of a nucleus, the heart of the human body, or the transmission of an automobile. Each of these examples is the core component that keeps the function of the entire organization moving, processing and operating. Without its presence and effective pulsation, the organization ultimately dies and becomes inoperable.

The academic study of leadership is a relatively modern invention. Khurana (2010) researched the history of this field and discovered it was essentially a postwar collaboration between military researchers and economy-boosters, saying, “Academic concern with the study of leadership began in 1945 with a research program at Ohio State University, under the aegis of the federal government's War Manpower Commission and the Department of Labor” (p. 356). He also observed that, in the field as a whole, there is a “lack of coherence in leadership research [which] is reflected in the pedagogy of research as well” (p. 358). This review of the literature focuses on several more-pertinent sub-issues where there is a bit more consensus: morale, transformational leadership, and
some of the better-known characteristics of effective leaders. Within each of these subjects, this review follows the general historical trajectory of each subfield.

The purpose of this study was to determine teachers’ perspectives on which of a principal's leadership behaviors and practices have a significant impact on school culture. This question fits into a much broader context where culture impacts morale, which generates better student achievement. The remaining sections are included because culture is strongly impacted by a particular leadership style known as transformational leadership, as well as the particular characteristics of effective leaders in general. These serve as a backdrop for the leadership traits survey administered in this study.

**Teacher Morale, Principals’ Leadership, and School Culture**

Campbell’s (1956) early study of the effects of leadership on a business revealed some leadership decisions that produce high morale, including: supporting the actions and decisions of staff members, showing interest in their work and offering assistance with it, and allowing their work to be self-directed, while showing confidence in their abilities. Finally, morale was bolstered when employees could contribute to broader administrative decision-making.

Studies conducted by Napier (1966) and Ellenburg (1972) soon found similar effects in schools, finding that school administrations can boost morale simply by standing behind teachers and supporting them. These researchers found that a teacher’s opinion of whether their administration appreciates and understands them significantly impacted their morale. This finding recurs throughout later literature.

Washington and Watson (1976) provided a short article summarizing general wisdom of the time, noting that many school leaders may not have a conscious awareness
that they directly affect teacher morale, and may not even be able to define it. “All too often principals do not realize that high teacher morale does not just happen in the course of daily events. It must be cultivated, developed, and nurtured by creative, receptive principals. It requires time, effort, and planning” (Washington & Watson, 1976, p. 4).

They highlighted that morale must be an intentional and consistent goal, pursued both daily and across the course of a principal’s leadership. Actions which bolster morale were similarly listed, including but not limited to: preferring face-to-face communication over written interactions, praising and giving credit, encouraging a teacher’s professional growth, and limiting the length of faculty meetings. Not only do they reinforce that principals set the tone of the school, but also that they must model the tone that they are setting: if principals are going to be effective in developing and maintaining high teacher morale, they must possess high morale themselves.

Further studies confirmed that teachers, like all humans, need to know they are important and appreciated. Morale may suffer if teachers believe that an administrator is unconcerned about their welfare (Cook, 1979). When teachers are convinced that their principal honestly takes their needs seriously and genuinely cares about their success as a professional and a person, discontent cannot likely prevail. Moreover, recognition received from administrators, supervisors, and the community has a strong positive relationship to career status, work ethic, and longevity (Chapman, 1982). Some of the most important research in these early years established that, in addition to managing the day-to-day operations of the building, principals had a strong opportunity to recognize teachers’ ongoing achievements and provide them simple recognition to bolster morale.

Some research of this period also concerns specialization: every school is in a
unique position. Klopf et al. (1982) observed that the conditions of schools and the needs of teachers and students constantly change from year to year and even month to month. So in this new role of management, principals must frequently check and monitor the feelings of teachers, students, and the school community. As well, they must know that each school has needs that are unique to that school at that time. Other research showed that a consistently positive attitude from educational leaders is paramount. For example, Parks (1983) observed that the educational leader sets and establishes the tone for the entire organization. The school leader can make the school either a pleasant, attractive place to work or only a place for which time is exchanged for income. In addition, Wood et al. (1985) recommended that a principal support high teacher morale by building an orderly educational program where all can participate and be involved.

Higher achievement was also studied in the late 1980s. According to Hoy and Miskel (1987), in healthy school environments with high teacher morale, teachers not only feel good about themselves and others but they also feel a sense of achievement. In their research, high morale correlates with other positive qualities in both the individual teachers as well as the school as a whole, including the administration and broader community. According to Hoy and Miskel, high morale was correlated with four specific criteria which likely caused it: the administration’s appreciation of the teacher as an individual, the administration’s confidence in the teacher’s competence, the participation of teachers in developing school policies, and the administration’s support in the context of student discipline problems. They found that teachers’ treatment by administrators was a significant factor for three out of four of the above criteria (Hoy and Miskell 1997, p. 114).
Coulson (1988) followed up by noticing that leadership is not merely about procedures and rules, but also depends largely on the personalities of principals and the relationships they cultivate with their teachers. This set of circumstances necessitates leading by example as well as holding and promoting key values. Moreover, Clough (1989) both reiterated that the effectiveness of leadership is the single most important factor in staff morale, and provided an advice list of 10 keys to developing good supervisory relations with the staff:

1. Treat your teachers as individuals, get to know them as people;
2. Give your teachers as much opportunity for growth and change as possible;
3. Refrain from getting involved in their personal lives;
4. Compliment them frequently and thank them for their good work;
5. Organize their work and make certain they have all the information they need to do a good job;
6. Allow them to express their creativity;
7. Establish a relaxing atmosphere by using your sense of humor;
8. Give them work they are capable of completing, make reasonable goals;
9. Allow them to work;
10. Remain available for them. (p. 6)

Point 4 above was also reiterated by Elam (1989), who administered a survey asking teachers about the one thing that would improve their “working health:” they overwhelmingly expressed a need for more positive reinforcement and recognition from both their principals and the communities in which they worked.
There is a subtle contradiction in the above studies, between Wood et al. (1985) advice that the principal should make the environment orderly and item 6 above, where Clough (1989) desires more free-ranging creativity. In fact, this contradiction has been noticed in the academic literature by Bower (1989), as a general paradox of leadership: “Leaders encourage followers to be spontaneous and orderly, creative and precise, imaginative and factual” (p. 222). Bower further summarized leaders in two parts: first determining that leaders send signals to their subordinates to define the success of the school, sending ten sorts of essential signals:

1. Of what is expected, appreciated and preferred by “being with” rather than “being around” people,
2. Through questioning that promotes the belief that subordinates are the experts,
3. Through the selection and installation of new members,
4. By nurturing a defined cultural core causing members to remain faithful,
5. Informally through the network of cultural carriers,
6. Through open, inclusive, and high-variety communication,
7. Through a common vocabulary keyed to an ethic of service and a spirit of collaboration,
8. Through the content and manner of staff development,
9. By maintaining the facility to highlight values of pride, care, and commitment to quality,
10. By serving themselves as signals of what is important. (Bower, 1989, p. 222)

However, Bower expounded on these types of varied communication to surmise that the successful principal sends “mixed signals” to staff, and this helps create a level of
responsible ambiguity through which wise leadership can shine. The paradox is essential; any institution needs to function in an orderly fashion, but the people inside must have a great deal of creative freedom to be happy in their roles there.

Finally, principals need to remember the “little things” that create effective schools and boost teacher morale. Responding to daily human needs is imperative for the principal or supervisor. Barth (1990) found, "No characteristic of a good school is more pervasive than a healthy teacher-principal relationship and no characteristic of a troubled school more common than a troubled, embattled administrator-teacher relationship" (p. 19). Wentworth (1990) suggested several such gestures which vastly improve the culture:

1. Saying hello to teachers and using their names;
2. Sending a note or word of congratulations for a job well done, achievement on an excellent job, a birthday;
3. Asking others for their opinions and listening;
4. Scheduling time for regular visits to the classroom;
5. Letting teachers know what is going on;
6. Following through on teachers’ requests;
7. Asking for help when you need it;
8. Dropping by teachers’ rooms for lunch. (p. 3)

Wentworth (1990) also recognized 13 essential factors of educational leadership that together determine high teacher morale.

1. Allow teachers to have input into decision-making that directly affects curriculum, instruction, and school climate;
2. Recognize and appreciate teacher and student achievement;
3. Promote a school climate that reflects a feeling of unity, pride, cooperation, acceptance of differences, and security;
4. Maintain good communication;
5. Promote opportunities for meaningful, professional growth;
6. Encourage clear, shared goals;
7. Endorse strong, supportive leadership;
8. Provide quality time for collegial interaction--planning, educational dialogue, decision-making, problem-solving;
9. Provide a well-maintained physical environment;
10. Encourage good human relations, both within school and between school community;
11. Encourage and reward risk-taking, innovation, and good teaching;
12. Give attention to professional needs such as salary and benefits;
13. Give attention to personal needs such as stress management, good health, and social interaction. (p. 2)

By following these tips, the elevated morale causes the school to function more as a community, as a whole. This means that students work together for mutual success and learning, because they care about their peers. Good risk-taking behaviors—the sort that lead to instructive mistakes or else great personal achievements—become the norm. So a school culture is fostered with bounded conflicts, open communication, and a diversity of individual voices whose very differences are respected and encouraged (Wentworth, 1990). Adams (1992) summarized these ideas by stating, “Rather than focus on the inner
workings of individual teachers, there may be greater utility in focusing on those aspects of the organization, the work environment, that can create a positive sense of morale for all teachers” (p. 346). This general pattern is also reinforced by Blasé and Kirby (1992), who stated,

Based on the reports of our teachers, it appears that effective transformational principals are quite creative and aggressive in standing behind their teachers. Principals support their schools’ instructional goals by serving as resource providers and guardians of instructional time. They assist teachers with student discipline matters, allow teachers to develop discipline codes, and support teachers’ authority in enforcing policy. (p. 77)

Effective principals are servants to the teachers; they serve as guardians of instructional time, help teachers with discipline matters, empower teachers to develop discipline procedures and codes, and then support teachers as they enforce the policies they developed.

In Herzberg’s (1993) research regarding human motivation to work, the top five factors reported by high-morale workers are “achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, and advancement.” According to the professionals surveyed, all of these led to a more positive attitude toward their jobs. Herzberg also found that “the data support the belief that job attitudes are potent and that positive attitudes are more potent than negative ones” (p. 90). These findings support the administrator’s goal in fostering positive attitudes among teachers – because the positive attitude is more potent, it contributes to an overall high-morale school culture that is difficult to break down. The National Center for Education Statistics released a study by Choy et al. (1993) which
further revealed many factors that contribute to a productive working environment for education professionals. Choy identified positive school culture as coming from the autonomy of teachers, a supportive administration, and effective leadership.

The reality seems clear from the above studies that, at the very least, leadership styles impact morale significantly among teachers, building up or ruining a school’s culture. Small acts of gratitude carry large payoffs across the whole school. Because few teachers enter the profession for prestige, high levels of monetary compensation, or material benefits, the influence of extrinsic motivation on these individuals is often underestimated (Choy et al., 1993, p. 126). In fact, with so few external advantages to teaching as a profession, it becomes a matter of increased importance to create a supportive and satisfying school environment and positive building culture. This task falls to administrators.

People who feel empowered in the work they do generally possess higher morale. When people are more personally invested in their work and workplace, they genuinely have some control over what happens to them. In return, their work has a larger sense of personal meaning and they tend to serve a higher purpose (Maehr, Midgley, & Urdan, 1993). A simple increase in recognition can be one of the greatest motivators available and often leads to higher staff morale (Scarnati, 1994). Moreover, individuals are motivated to participate in activities that appear to be oriented toward job satisfaction, and increased job satisfaction leads to higher morale (Evans, 1998). Teachers who were given positive feedback on their work by those who administer and supervise continually reported higher levels of job satisfaction, morale, and motivation than those who were not.
The actuality must be noted, of course, that teachers are individuals and also have some control over their own feelings. Lumsden (1998) acknowledged this, showing that teachers can definitely take steps to build their own morale both personally and professionally, but there was also value in external stimuli, so that teachers should also be nurtured, supported, and valued by all involved in the educational process. Lumsden pointed out a great importance of teachers being provided with whatever they require to remain enthusiastic and inspired about teaching and learning. In the end, both teachers and students are the beneficiaries of this sort of service.

Further insight was given by Whitaker (2000), who concluded that in addition, there is a deep need for administrators to comprehend the dynamics present in a working environment, and that they are important to morale. These have a system-wide effect, according to Whitaker, when all of the teachers in the whole school have high morale, further transformation occurs. Students feel better about the school and therefore become more willing to perform assigned tasks. Everyone feels happier, more disciplined, and confident. Both students and teachers feel that they contribute to decision-making in the administration, increasing school pride. And they return to the “simple niceties” mentioned above: the single most important factor for principals in cultivating positive morale might be acknowledging and reinforcing the many positive things that occur in their schools every day (Whitaker, 2000).

Additional research emphasized the principal’s role in promoting a culture that leads to student success. Even though morale is intimate and personal, cultivated by employees within themselves, leaders have a role in nurturing it and bringing it out (Cotton, 2003). Therefore, administrators must clearly understand that they play a
pivotal role in the success of the school and the morale of the individual members.

Brewster and Railsback (2003) summarized three large-scale studies of trust in school communities and found that teachers’ relationships with the principal were instrumental in developing their morale level and feelings of teacher efficacy, and further, that these relationships even contribute to positive interactions with other staff:

Findings suggested that when there was a greater perceived level of trust in a school, teachers had a greater sense of efficacy - the belief in their ability to affect actions leading to success. Trust tended to be pervasive: when teachers trusted their principal, they also were more likely to trust staff, parents, and students. (p. 8)

Because trust is so essential to the development and upkeep of building-wide morale, and morale contributes significantly to educator efficacy, it is of high importance for building leaders to be committed to cultivating and nurturing an environment of trust. Teacher efficacy then feeds back into building-wide morale, contributing to a whole-school impression of success and the encouragement it creates. Leadership that is not only supportive but effective fulfills this requirement and becomes an incentive for good teachers to continue teaching at their best.

In a 2007 study on principals in their dual role as managerial facilitators and educational leaders, Heystek found that in addition to being visionary leaders, good principals still need to develop the basic skill of “being effective managers...able and effective when it comes to implementing what is prescribed and delegated to them” (p. 502). When a principal is equipped, willing, and effective at taking care of managerial matters extraneous to the classroom, teachers are free to do their jobs: to teach, and not
become saddled with unnecessary additional constraints to their instructional availability and effectiveness.

Other research shows that a negative teacher can unintentionally create a negative school experience for a student. “Negative teacher influences have a greater impact than positive ones, in that students can be turned into non-learners and experience a loss of self-concept in a matter of weeks as a result of a hostile or intimidating teacher” (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2008, p. 447). If simple acts performed by principals can boost morale and make teachers less negative, this sort of calamity can be artfully sidestepped.

Rowland (2008) expressed that four out of the five best-practice leadership strategies studied strongly correlate with positive teacher morale. These practices, similar to the others discussed in this chapter, are for the principal to “model the way, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart” (p. 39). Deal and Peterson (2009) went one step further in suggesting that the practice of involving teachers in a leadership role goes a long way in deeply strengthening the efficacy and culture of a school: “Ideally, everyone should share leadership. Leadership in successful schools is parceled out generously to staff. Leadership at its best is shared, with everyone pulling together in a common direction” (p. 199). Moreover, Deal and Peterson highlighted that in our current educational setup, principals must shape and structure teacher morale and school culture in eight essential daily roles:

1. Historian: seeks to understand the social and normative past of the school.

2. Anthropological sleuth: analyzes and probes for the current array of cultural traditions, values, and beliefs.
3. Visionary: works with others, including leaders in the neighboring community, to characterize a portrait of the ideal school.

4. Icon: affirms values through dress, behavior, attention, actions, and routines.

5. Potter: shapes and is shaped by the school’s symbolic webbing of heroes, rituals, traditions, ceremonies, symbols; brings in staff who share core values and helps them find the right seat “on the bus.”

6. Poet: uses expressive language to reinforce values and sustains the school’s best image of itself.

7. Actor: improvises in the school’s predictable drama, comedies, and tragedies.

8. Healer: oversees transitions and changes; heals the wounds of conflict and loss. (p. 200)

Research consistently shows the principal’s leadership style has the greatest impact on shaping a school’s environment and teacher morale. Good leadership is critical to the impact and influence of a teacher (DuFour & Marzano, 2011).

**Transformational Leadership**

Transformational leadership was first studied by Burns (1978) in a political context, reflecting an interest purely in those politicians who make a substantial impact on their nations. His central distinction between transformational and transactional leadership, has now become a standard classification in the field. However, it could have gone unappreciated had it not been for a second book seven years later by Bass (1985), who insisted that the difference was both quantifiable and psychological in origin. The difference is, therefore, quantifiable in how the followers of the leader feel. If they feel like they are serving a message and purpose larger than themselves, that is
transformational; if they feel like they are just doing what it takes to get paid, that is transactional. If they feel creative and dynamic and like they have creative latitude to create change in their environment, that is transformational; if they feel stifled or like they do not want to rock the boat, that is transactional. Finally, Bass invented a four-fold model of to analyze the common properties of transformational leaders: in the first place, considering qualities that made the leaders personally charismatic and trustworthy; then Bass grouped together characteristics of inspiration that raised the expectations and goals of their employees; then he considered aspects of leaders which invited their employees to be intellectually stimulated and creative problem solvers; finally Bass observed a cluster of traits which showed how effective leaders treated each employee as a valued individual.

Soon after, Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) noted that transformational leadership is “made possible when a leader’s end values (internal standards) are adopted by followers, thereby producing changes in the attitudes, beliefs and goals of followers” (p. 653). This idea is probably one of the clearer litmus tests for transformational versus transactional leadership. Furthermore, according to Bryman (1992), transformational management necessitates both followers and leaders by raising each other’s sense of purpose and motivation. So there is the opportunity to measure by whether leaders and followers are interdependent or independent.

Main measures of transformational leadership are nurturing the recognition of group goals, expressing a vision, offering individualized consideration and support, and forming behaviors in line with the expressed image (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, & Bommer, 1996). Research supports the theory of transformational leadership and its positive effect
on teacher morale, student achievement, and school culture. The fact is not just that the prior section on morale echoes strongly several selling points of the transformational paradigm, but as Horan (1999) asserted, “The overriding element of successful leadership is to involve people in the process of leading” (p. 21). Transformational leadership is about getting everyone involved in decision-making. Inasmuch as the transformational leader seeks to reach these needs of the follower, the leader’s aim also “extends to reaching the higher level needs through empowerment and inspiration” (Rowland 2008, p. 13).

Theories of transformational leadership have the following five common leader characteristics: creative, interactive, visionary, empowering, and passionate (Hackman and Johnson, 2000). Evidence supports the idea that transformational leadership improves performance and productivity (Bass et al., 2003). Transformational leadership has the overall effect of followers and leaders establishing a united understanding to succeed.

Hushin and Hussin (2006) followed the above studies by looking at the relationship between leadership and job satisfaction. The results of their study indicated that the most desirable leadership practices that provide high job satisfaction for teachers were practices of transformational leadership. Moreover, according to Hallinger’s (2007) study on leadership approaches in an organization, transformational leadership was the best leadership style for inspiring actual change in the behavior of the organization’s members.

Research by Lunenburg and Ornstein (2008) reinforced that “Transformational leaders raise organizational members’ levels of personal commitment to achieve
organizational goals, resulting in greater productivity” (p. 115). Their research showed that transformational leadership nurtures the individual and enables him or her to feel valued and respected within the organization. Such leadership also allows for mutual respect between principal and teacher and deepens their ability to work collaboratively and positively towards common goals, a shared vision, and set purpose. The results of further research showed that there is a correlation between transformational leadership practices and principals’ and teachers’ job satisfaction. Furthermore, Lunenburg and Ornstein’s research indicated that there is a significant relationship between the principal’s transformational leadership proficiency and teachers’ commitments to their work.

Similarly, Abdullah (2009) found positive effects of transformational leadership on teachers’ psychology and behavior and the achievements of their students. The results of the study showed that transformational leadership both fosters positive changes in an institution and alters the perceptions of teachers, making them more satisfied with completed work and increasing feelings of job satisfaction. Additionally, Abdullah also reported a moderate relationship between teachers’ commitment and principals’ transformational leadership levels among principals with teachers’ commitment. In the same year, Isa (2009) emphasized three important aspects related to job satisfaction, which were the type and quality of the work itself, the employee’s salary, and the quality of the employee’s relationship with their employer. These two studies were in line with each other, as both found a significant relationship between the level of a principal’s transformational leadership and teachers’ job satisfaction and commitments.

Seibert, Wang, and Courtright (2011) stated that transformational leaders increase
the followers’ intrinsic value of performance and confidence, leading to higher motivational levels. This idea was ultimately summarized relatively recently by Mahdinezhad, Bin Suandi, Bin Silong, and Bintiomar (2013):

Transformational leadership attracts intellectual attention to imminent problems.
It encourages innovation and learning thus improving the overall performance…
Transformational leaders have formed a clear image and attainable vision for the future and affected and others to implement and share the image despite the resisting and restraining conditions. (p. 30-32)

This statement was consistent with Selamat, Nordin, and Adnan (2013) who noted that “a transformational leader is a change agent who will drive change in the organization or school. School organization is in dire need of a leadership formula like this, especially in terms of judgments and teacher development as an individual” (p. 6).

Transformational leaders act as examples of the right behavior to their followers, which inspires both enthusiasm and commitment. Commitment variables were used to measure employees’ relationship with their workplace, as related to their loyalty, obedience, and satisfaction towards the organization (Ibrahim, 2014; Selamat, Nordin, & Adnan, 2013). These findings were also consistent with Aydin, Savier, and Uysal (2013), which also found a significant relationship between the principal’s transformational leadership style and the level of the teachers’ commitment toward the organization. A charismatic leader is needed to transform the organizational structure and also induce transformation of individuals’ thoughts, attitudes, and levels of commitment to the school organization. Ali (2014) stated, “The level of the teachers’ commitment is influenced by the type of task assigned in addition to administrator’s transformation practice.” The
results of a study by Wahab et al. (2014) indicated:

The results of the Leadership Practices Inventory study support the findings of Menon [et al.]…which showed that one of the most important factors that respondents indicate in job satisfaction is the transformational leadership practices of the principal. [A transformational] leader is capable of working and influencing teachers to work together in achieving the mission and vision of the school. Transformational leaders will support and strengthen the individual who is always ready to excel. If the practice of transformational leadership can be enhanced, job satisfaction of teachers in schools will also be enhanced, and work potential can be developed to achieve organizational goals. (p. 6)

**Characteristics of an Effective Principal**

One consistent theme in the literature reviewed was that much of it consisted of valuable advice on leadership, usually in the form of itemized lists. In the interest of evaluating the Leadership Practices Inventory (Posner & Kouzes, 1988) and also in the interests of being valuable to the broader readership base, some representative advice is presented here. The research in previous sections has shown that the principal has an immense amount of influence on a school’s success and effectiveness – therefore, the principal must be empowered and effective if the school is to be successful. Campbell (1997) phrased succinctly the balance of factors that contribute to an effective principal when he said, “Traits plus motivation equals leadership” (p. 52). Motivation alone is not enough; an effective principal must possess certain traits, and to acquire those traits, we must study and understand them.
In prior sections of the current study, additional factors that lead to an effective principal were reviewed, including empowering teachers, building relationships and modeling an example of integrity and servant leadership. Additional research supported the point that a principal’s philosophies and emphasis on instructional leadership and collaboration also supported and strengthened relationships with teachers. Principals that can delegate duties build a sense of trust among teachers as well. Furthermore, Maxwell (1999) stated, “The ability to work with people and develop relationships is absolutely indispensable to effective leadership” (p. 77).

In a well-known transformational theory, Kouzes and Posner (2002) listed and described exemplary leaders as interactive, visionary, creative, empowering, and passionate. In detail, they phrased this as five practices that effective leaders embody: they respectively “model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart” (p. 14). Modeling the way refers to leading by example; in this practice, exemplary leaders motivate others by setting an example through their direct involvement in the organization’s mission. Inspiring a shared vision refers to the ability to formulate, verbalize, and create enthusiasm for their vision of the future of the organization. Challenging the process refers to a practice where the leader encourages those beneath them to contribute suggestions of inefficiencies and how they may be addressed, thus enhancing the effectiveness and operation of the institution. Enabling others to act requires the leader to build a safe, comfortable environment where those who are reluctant to contribute are actively incorporated into the institution’s vision, gradually feeling more capable and powerful. Encouraging the heart refers to a
so-called “personal touch:” effective leaders nurture their employees and appear caring and concerned for them beyond their employee role, treating them as individuals.

Further, Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson and Wahlstrom (2004) reviewed the literature on school leadership and identified core leadership practices:

1. Developing people - enabling teachers and other staff to do their jobs effectively, offering intellectual support and stimulation improve the work, and providing models of practice and support.

2. Setting the direction for the organization – developing shared goals, monitoring organizational performance, and promoting effective communication.

3. Redesigning the organization – creating a productive school culture, modifying organizational structures that undermine the work, and building collaborative processes. (p. 8)

Researchers at the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute (2005) reported the three characteristics of a principal’s role that most impact student achievement were developing a deep understanding of how to support teachers, maintaining the curriculum in ways that promote student learning, and developing the ability to transform schools into more effective organizations that foster powerful teaching and learning for all students. The principal seems to have an interesting role as the catalyst of the school and sets the tone for the school’s success. An effective principal, according to Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005), consistently does the following:

1. Recognizes that teaching and learning is the priority of the school.

2. Communicates the school’s vision clearly and consistently to students, teachers, parents and community.
3. Provides clear goals and monitors progress on those goals.

4. Spends time in classrooms observing teaching and working with teachers on improving their teaching.

5. Nurtures and sustains a climate of trust.

6. Lacks tolerance for poor and/or ineffective teaching. (p. 98)

Item 5 above is a particularly recurring thread: trust. Trust ties together effective and successful learning environments, as has been presented throughout this chapter. The 2007 Walker Loyalty Report, which gave insight on workplace loyalty, brought forth the idea that “trust, especially in leadership, is the single biggest factor in worker retention” (Baldoni, 2007). The study analysis provided several ways leaders can establish trust with their employees:

1. Do not make promises that cannot be kept.

2. Back your people when it counts.

3. Take responsibility and be publicly self-reflective when times are tough.

4. Hold regular and public celebrations for the accomplishments of both teachers and students.

5. Stay away from the limelight, and exhibit true humility.

6. Do not violate rules you expect others to follow and for which you hold them accountable.

7. Frequently use the pronoun we when publicly discussing the accomplishments or future plans of the school.

8. Make good on your word. Do what you promise you will do.

9. Do not ostracize others for holding different opinions. Guarantee them a right
to their opinion in a way that preserves their dignity, even if you philosophically disagree with them. (p. 9)

Muhammad (2009) cited some additional practices of effective leadership skills with the following:

1. Know your stuff. Stay well versed in the evolving knowledge base of education.
2. Lead teachers in the process of learning. Expose them to knowledge that enlightens their practices and give them a new context.
3. Familiarize yourself with the history of the school and community, and articulate a vision that will inspire others to think in new ways.
4. Continue to improve your skills and credentials. Nothing says competence like a person who exhibits the quality of lifelong learning. (p. 92)

Hill (2009) further expounded upon effective leadership when she said “Effective leadership is much more than simply giving assignments and direction. It requires vision, collaboration, planning and practice. And this all takes time and a lot of hard work.” (p. 13)

Research consistently supports the overall message of this literature review: that there are universal characteristics of an effective principal. Furthermore, the effectiveness of a principal drives and formulates the productivity and efficient of teachers and supports student achievement. Additional research from Williamson (2011) supported these conclusions when recalling, “When effective leadership is present, students and teachers are more likely to achieve” (p. 1).

In studying the qualities of effective leaders, researchers’ more recent findings
support honesty as being among the most important traits a leader can possess. In his report of several characteristics of successful leaders, Economy (2013) stated, “Research shows that the top thing that employees want from their leaders is integrity. Be honest, fair, candid and forthright, and treat everyone in the same way that you yourself would want to be treated” (p. 1). The results of a Pew Research Center (2014) study on the most important characteristics of leaders found that 84% of respondents cited honesty as the most crucial quality for a leader to have. Zenger and Folkman (2014) also describe successful leaders as utilizing “strategic vision,” the ability to visualize change and lead others forward efficiently and in a decisive direction. Desirable leaders, according to recent research, are also organized and compassionate, displaying an overall sense of conscientiousness (Owens, 2015). Moving forward into the future of leadership as we know it, the most current research supports the idea that truly effective leadership is entirely transformational, and the best leaders will turn organizations upside down to create positive change. Berkowicz and Myers (2016) boldly said, “Mending a broken system or incrementally improving an archaic one is not inspirational work. Both demand staying with the original, making little space for creativity. It is innovation that excites workplaces. Relevance engages students and energizes partnerships.”

This generic leadership advice adds some very important details: while it is suggested that the most-requested quality from teachers of their leaders is compassion and recognition, it can now be seen that integrity and honesty are also important. Other important qualities are perception of competence in the educational field and having a strategic vision for the school as a whole. These traits are tremendously important for a successful principal, and set the stage for a survey asking how teachers prioritize these
different values.

**Summary**

In this chapter, research was examined regarding topics applicable to the study. First, research was explored surrounding the relationship between a principal’s leadership behaviors and the effect on teacher morale. Secondly, research was presented regarding the impacts of transformational leadership as it relates to building teacher leadership and loyalty capacities. Lastly, research was examined that targeted the characteristics of an effective principal. Through the research presented in this chapter, connections were established in the literature between principals’ leadership behaviors, teachers’ productivity and effectiveness, and essential traits of an effective leader.

The clear consensus of the literature is that principals in their new role as leaders of the building have a massive opportunity to shape the culture of their schools, and that this is best done with both an inspiring vision and the active collaboration of their teachers at all levels: hence, a transformational leadership approach is appropriate. The principal needs to be a model citizen of the greater school ecosystem, a cheerleader for the teachers, a bulwark against potential parent-teacher conflicts, and an encourager of creativity at all levels. The gap that the rest of this present study targets concerns how teachers prioritize all of these different important features of a good principal, how these priorities change over time as those teachers become more experienced, and whether those priorities are different for teachers of different genders. The following chapter contains a survey methodology and background related to the particular district that the survey was conducted in.
Chapter Three

Methods

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a correlation between principal leadership expectations and staff morale. The second purpose was to determine whether there is a correlation between teacher gender and teacher expectations for an ideal principal. The third purpose was to determine whether there is a correlation between teacher years of service and teacher expectations for an ideal principal. The final purpose of this study was to determine the most important teacher expectations for the ideal principal.

Research Design

This study was a quantitative, non-experimental study using a descriptive survey about leadership traits. Data results from the study enabled inferences about teachers’ preferences for leadership traits in an ideal principal to be made. Additionally, a survey design was chosen because of the economy of the design and rapid turnaround in the collection of data (Creswell, 2008). The use of a survey design allowed for confidentiality of participants responding to the survey. Participants of the survey were asked specific questions about the ideal principal and the ideal leadership traits the participant’s perceived principals should possess. District X is steadily growing and becoming more diverse. The student population continues to change culturally, adding pockets of diversity to the once nearly homogenous white classroom. All student populations, including special services and African–American students, have grown over the past three years. District X now serves 82% of white students with other ethnicities claiming 18% of the District X student population. The survey was administered to
District X certified teachers in grades 9-12. The two high schools combined have approximately 3,600 students. The survey was conducted during the Spring 2016 semester. The survey was designed to be self-administered and was distributed electronically through Survey Monkey. The Leadership Inventory was composed of 20 questions designed to describe the ideal principal.

**Population and Sample**

The suburban Midwestern school district included two high school sites in one county. There were two high schools with approximately 3,600 students combined between the two schools and approximately 300 teachers self-selected as volunteer participants. The participants of the study were certified teachers of grades 9-12 in District X.

**Sampling Procedures**

Lunenburg and Irby (2008) specified that purposive sampling is a type of random sampling used when the researcher identifies subgroups in a population that is represented in the sample in the same manner they serve in the study population. A total of 300 certified teachers of grades 9-12 were included in the sample.

**Instrumentation**

The Leadership Traits Survey was used to describe teachers’ opinions of what traits comprise the ideal principal. The survey was a variant of the survey developed by Obrero (2014). These questions were originally used to confirm that a leadership program had been effective among students who participated in it, therefore each element was expected to be a positive leadership quality. The use of this survey to extract factors that define leadership, examine gender and tenure differences in teacher expectations, and
summarize which of these qualities are the most important, are novel to the present study. The instrument survey included 20 questions (these can be viewed in chapter four and Appendix A). All 20 items of the Leadership Traits Survey used a four-point Likert scale that measured the degree of agreement with the statement in question: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) disagree, or (4) strongly disagree. For the purpose of this study, a reverse coding system was used for item numbers in which agreement represented a high degree of teacher morale, so that a response of “(4) strongly disagree” represented low morale and a response of “(1) strongly agree” represented high morale for all 20 questions. By adding the numeric responses of all items for a given factor, it was possible to create scores for each of the survey questions. The Leadership Traits Survey was used to measure 20 items specific to leadership traits.

**Measurement.** The Leadership Traits survey was used as the data collection measurement. The Leadership Traits Survey was developed by the researcher and was established as valid and reliable by a panel of experts from Baker University. The Leadership Traits Survey was developed to measure the perceptions of certified teachers grades 9-12 and their opinions of the ideal characteristics of a principal.

**Validity and reliability.** Reliability refers to the “degree to which an instrument consistently measures whatever it is measuring” (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 182). The internal reliability of a survey refers to the relationship between the response to each item on the survey and the overall response or score for the instrument itself (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008). The revised survey has no known validity and reliability. Both were determined as part of this study. Factor Analysis was used to determine construct validity. A panel of experts established face and content validity and reliability were
determined using Cronbach’s Alpha. A criterion of 0.70 correlation score was used to calculate correlation coefficients for the cumulative score and comparison for each category. The results were then evaluated to determine statistical significance for each of the relationships evaluated by the hypotheses.

To calculate the correlation coefficients for the three research questions, a Factor Analysis was used to determine construct validity. A panel of experts established face and content validity and reliability were determined using Cronbach’s Alpha. A criterion of 0.70 correlation was used to calculate correlation coefficients for the cumulative score and comparison for each category.

Data Collection Procedures

Teachers of this Midwestern suburban school district were requested to complete the Leadership Inventory. Approximately 300 surveys were sent out to certified teachers. This survey included two school sites. To collect the necessary data, surveys were sent out to each high school teacher in the district. Teachers volunteered to complete the Leadership Inventory. An electronic permission letter, cover letter, informed consent documents, and copies of all survey instruments were given to district officials. With permission from the superintendent of schools, assistant superintendent of academic services, and building principals from each school, the Leadership Inventory was sent to each participant to complete. An electronic cover letter was given to all participants that informed them of their role in the study. All participants were informed by both cover letter and announcement that their contribution and responses would remain anonymous, and participation was strictly on a voluntary basis. The Leadership Traits Survey was administered to all teachers. Summary Statistic, ANOVA and Factor Analysis were used
to determine if there were correlations between leadership practices and staff morale.

To protect the confidentiality of all participants, access to all surveys was restricted and redacted to only to the researcher. Individual survey results were never used, only referred survey results as a collective whole, thus further ensuring respondents’ confidentiality and anonymity. At no point were individual teachers referred to by name to protect each from identification. All statistical analysis is presented in summary form with only district data. The research proposal is included in Appendix B and its approval document is included in Appendix C.

**Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing**

Factor analysis was used to determine construct validity. A panel of experts established face and content validity and reliability was determined using Cronbach’s Alpha. A criterion of 0.70 correlation was used to calculate correlation coefficients for the cumulative score and comparison for each category. The results were then evaluated to determine the statistical significance of each of the relationships evaluated by the hypotheses. Factor analysis was calculated to test the hypotheses and evaluate the research questions for the study.

**Research Questions and Hypotheses**

**RQ1.** What is the highest expectation teachers have for principals: morale, culture or practice?

**H1.** Teachers’ expectations will vary.

**RQ2.** To what extent does teacher gender affect expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal?

**H2.** A relationship exists between gender and expectations of what constitutes an
ideal principal.

**RQ3.** To what extent do teachers’ years of service affect expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal?

**H3.** A relationship exists between teachers’ years of service and their expectations of what constitutes an ideal principal.

**Limitations**

Limitations of a study are “factors that may have an effect on the interpretation of the findings or on the generalizability of the results” (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 133). The researcher does not control limitations. Limitations of this study included the following:

1. The research was limited to a single suburban school district in northwest Missouri.
2. The data collected were limited to the spring semester of the public school calendar with the knowledge that morale shifts from season to season as well as from year to year.
3. The measurement of teacher morale was limited to the variable measured by the Leadership Traits Survey. This required the teachers to respond honestly and openly to the questions on the survey.
4. The measurement of leadership traits was limited to traits identified in the Leadership Traits survey. This required teachers to respond honestly and openly to questions on the survey.
5. Results of this study might not be generalized to other populations.
Summary

This chapter included the purpose of the study, research questions, research design, population, instrumentation, data collection procedures, analysis of the data, and limitations. This study was a non-experimental quantitative study used to describe the characteristics of an ideal principal. Careful attention was given to the collection of data results, analysis of data, and obtaining relevant findings. Specific care was used to identify and determine the validity and reliability of instruments used in data collection, as well as the ability to generalize the study. The next chapter discusses the results of the survey, and the chapter following presents conclusions and implications.
Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this research was to determine the highest and largest expectation teachers hold for principals: is it cultivating morale, creating a positive building culture, or demonstrating strong leadership practice? An additional purpose of the study was to determine to what extent teacher gender affects expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal. Thirdly, a purpose of the study was to determine to what extent teacher years of service affects expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal.

The respondents for this study included 100 secondary teachers from a suburban school district. In previous chapters, the background of the study was clarified, relevant literature was reviewed, the methodology was identified, and research questions and hypotheses were stated. In this chapter, descriptive statistics are provided for the study’s variables, and the results of the qualitative analysis are presented for each of the study’s research questions. Also included in this chapter are additional analyses of the individual survey items.

Descriptive Statistics

The Leadership Traits survey was used as the measure of data collection. The Leadership Traits survey consisted of 20 questions with a response code of a four-point Likert-type scale that measures the degree of agreement with the statement using the following options: (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) disagree, and (4) strongly disagree. Additionally, three constructs were identified using Factor Analysis Methods. Cronbach’s Alpha was .928, more specifically .903 on morale cluster, .825 on culture cluster, and .814 on practice cluster. The Sum Cluster scores were computed to determine teacher expectations of morale, culture, and practice. The average score was computed for each
by adding item scores and dividing by the number of items. The reliability was computed using Cronbach’s Alpha. A strong reliability alpha was obtained.

Table 1

*The Nine Survey Items that Define Morale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Would effectively plan and present programs (special project and others)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Would be well organized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Would work with agency personnel to determine resources and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Would accept and utilize suggestions to improve performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Would work within agency philosophies, frameworks, and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Would demonstrate flexibility by adapting to different situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Would develop practical and realistic programs for school improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Would maintain an appropriate appearance and behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Would be enthusiastic and motivated in performing duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1 are the nine survey questions that define morale. These questions are the sum cluster of morale.
Table 2

*The Seven Survey Items that Define Culture*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Would perform tasks and competently and effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Would display an awareness of people’s feelings and behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Would act with integrity in all areas of human relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Would demonstrate good communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Would demonstrate good interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Would demonstrate positive leadership qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Would perform, model, and support the duties of teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shown in Table 2 are the survey question items that define culture. The questions are the sum cluster of morale.

Table 3

*The Four Survey Items that Define Practice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Would accept responsibility for his/her actions while working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Would use proper time management techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Would solve problems practically and realistically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Would analyze problems and arrive at appropriate solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis Testing**

With these clusters of leadership traits identified, we were able to approach the research questions and evaluate our hypotheses.
RQ1. What is the highest expectation teachers hold for principals: morale, culture, or practice?

H1. Teachers’ expectations will vary.

Table 4

RQ1, H1: Overall Descriptive Statistics Analysis Results by Rank Order (Smaller = Higher Expectations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mdn</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Morale</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>2.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Practice</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Culture</td>
<td>1.883</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>3.110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4, the highest expectation that teachers hold for principals was to create positive morale. Total morale ($M = 1.149$) was ranked highest.

RQ2. To what extent does teacher gender affect expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal?


As shown in Table 5, there was no significant difference in two of the clusters regarding gender affecting the expectations teachers hold for principals. The analysis of the culture cluster was not significant: $F(1.3149) = 2.472, p = 0.118)$. The analysis of the morale cluster was significant: $F(1. 1.49) = 0.087, p = .769)$. The analysis of the practice cluster was not significant: $F(1.149) = 4.371, p = .038)$. Women had a higher preference for principals that cultivated morale than men. Also, as shown in Table 5, there was no significant difference in gender affecting the expectations teachers held for principals.
Table 5

Summary Results for ANOVA Analysis for Culture, Morale and Practice Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.822</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.934</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/149</td>
<td>2.472</td>
<td>0.118 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/149</td>
<td>4.371</td>
<td>0.038 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.197</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/149</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.769 No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RQ3. To what extent do teacher years of service affect expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal?

H3. A relationship exists between teachers’ years of service and their expectations of what constitutes an ideal principal.

As shown in table 6, there was no significant difference in years of experience affecting the expectations teachers held for principals. The analysis of culture cluster was significant: \( F(3/147)=4.346, p=0.006 \). The analysis of morale cluster was not significant: \( F(1. 149) = 0.255, p=0.858 \). The analysis of the practice cluster was not significant: \( F(1. 149) = 1.505, p=.216 \). Teachers with more years of experience had lower preferences for principals that cultivate culture. Overall, teachers had a stronger preference for principals that cultivated morale, regardless of teachers’ years of experience. Table 6 also shows that there was no significant relationship between teachers’ years of service and expectations for principals in the areas of morale and practice. There was a significant relationship between teacher expectations in the area of
culture and teacher experience among teachers who had five or fewer years of experience.

Table 6

Summary Results for ANOVA Analysis for Culture, Morale and Practice Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Years Exp</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$sd$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$Df$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>1.887</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>1.936</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>1.958</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3/147</td>
<td>4.346</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale</td>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3/147</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>0 to 5</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>0.316</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 to 10</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 15</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3/147</td>
<td>1.505</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Analyses

An item analysis was conducted and was included in Appendix D. A total of 20 items were analyzed using $\chi^2$ analysis methods. None of the items were significantly in agreement between the four career length categories: 0-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, and 16 or more years of experience teaching.

Summary

The primary purpose of this research was to determine the highest and largest expectation teachers hold for principals: morale, culture, or practice. A second purpose
of the study was to determine to what extent teacher gender affects expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal. Thirdly, the purpose of the study was to determine to what extent teacher years of service affects their expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal. The population for this study included 100 secondary teachers from a suburban school district.
Chapter Five

Interpretation and Recommendations

The first chapter of this study introduced the conceptual framework and background for the research as well as the problem, purpose, and significance of the investigation. The second chapter presented a review of relevant literature, including teachers’ expectations for principals in the areas of morale, culture and practice. The third chapter reviewed the methodology for the study, including the sampling procedures, instrumentation used, and data collection procedures. In the fourth chapter, the results of descriptive statistics, hypothesis testing, and additional analyses were presented. In this fifth chapter, a brief review of the problem, purpose, methodology, and major findings was presented. Additionally, the major findings were connected to the relevant literature, and implications for action as well as recommendations for future study were given.

Study Summary

In this section, a brief overview is given of chapters one through four of the study. The overview contains a review of the problem, the purpose statement and research questions, a review of the methodology, and the major findings of the study. Relating those properties to the literature from chapter two is saved for the subsequent section.

Overview of the problem. The problem under study is a lack of knowledge by school officials about teacher expectations for new principals. Over the years, principals have been hired by district-level administrators with a distinct lack of knowledge regarding what teachers expect from principals. Despite the affluent and elite reputation of District X, it is still plagued with multiple challenges in the way of becoming a premier school organization. One of these challenges is the overabundance of leadership styles present within the district. Within the past three years, there has been a major shift
in leadership roles and leadership styles – from the superintendent of schools to the assistant superintendent of academic services, the director of secondary education, the curriculum coordinator, and including building leaders, both principals and assistant principals. Teachers have been exposed to this vast array of leadership styles. Some teachers respond to the “old” leadership style, transactional leadership, while others are more responsive to the “new” leadership style, transformational leadership. The leadership team of District X needs to determine which style of leadership works best among teachers by asking: Which leadership style is most effective in nurturing teacher morale and creating positive school cultures?

Because principals have such a direct effect on school culture, it is imperative to pinpoint and evaluate the leadership styles and characteristics that support and nurture a school environment to become most conducive to learning. The principal’s leadership behavior is arguably the most important characteristic responsible for developing, maintaining, and fostering positive school culture and promoting positive teacher morale. Both positive school climate and teacher morale are essential in teacher efficacy, creating a successful building environment that trickles down to impact every student in attendance.

**Purpose statement and research questions.** The first purpose of this study was to determine the highest and largest expectation teachers have for principals: morale, culture, or practice? The second purpose was to determine whether there is a difference in teacher gender with regard to expectations of an ideal principal. The third purpose was to determine whether there is a difference in teachers’ years of service with regard to expectations of an ideal principal.
Three research questions were posed to determine the relationships between the following: What is the highest expectation teachers have for principals (morale, culture or practice)? To what extent does teacher gender affect expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal? And finally, to what extent do teacher years of service affect expectations regarding what constitutes an ideal principal?

**Review of the methodology.** This qualitative study examined all certified high school teachers in the Liberty Public School District. A Leadership Questionnaire was used for this study. That survey’s results were used in a factor analysis, which was then analyzed to discover those factors’ relative importances to survey respondents.

**Major findings.** The researcher utilized a questionnaire consisting of 20 survey items. Factor analysis grouped these into three clusters based on teacher responses. Those clusters were judged to measure morale, culture, and practice. The morale cluster consisted of nine items, the culture cluster consisted of seven items, and the practice cluster consists of four items. The survey instrument, using Cronbach’s Alpha, was shown to be reliable, as were each of the clusters. Additionally, a panel of experts approved the instrument to be valid. The researcher studied the highest expectation teachers have for principals. The results indicated that, of the three clusters studied, the highest-ranked was the morale cluster. The next highest-ranked was the practice cluster, followed by the culture cluster.

The researcher also examined the relationship between teachers’ opinions regarding the expectations of the principal and teacher gender. The results of this study indicated there was no significant difference between genders regarding the expectations teachers have for principals. Both genders judged culture to be the least preferred.
Morale was judged by both genders to be the most preferred expectation for principals, with practice close behind. Genders had a significant difference in opinion regarding morale; women preferred it more than men. Men and women equally had the highest preference for principals that cultivated morale and had a high degree of preference for principals with a strong work ethic, or practice. The relationship between teachers’ expectations of principals and teacher years of service was also examined. The results of the data indicated there was a significant difference in expectations for principals in teachers with years of service between 0-5 years, namely that, on average, their opinion was that culture was more important than morale or practice. Newer teachers had a higher expectation that the principal will cultivate positive building culture. Additional analysis was completed to determine survey item clustering.

**Findings Related to the Literature**

This study allowed us to examine whether the highest expectation teachers have for principals is morale, culture, or practice. Additionally, the researcher examined the relationship between teachers’ opinions regarding the expectations of a new principal, and teacher gender and years of service. The teachers included in this study were certified high school teachers in District X. The results of data analysis indicated that there was not a significant relationship between teacher gender and teachers’ expectations of principals. The results further indicated that there was a marginally significant relationship between teacher years of service and expectations of principals, namely that those teachers with 0-5 years of service held the opinion that building culture was more important than morale or leadership practice. Looking to the core of the research, then, the search for the most important qualities of principals who aim to become successful
leaders revolves around the total percentages of teachers who ranked each quality as essential to their expectations for principals. In the itemized analysis of each survey question (see Appendix D), it was evident that certain expectations of principals ranked much higher among surveyed teachers as a whole when considered by relative importance to the other expectations listed.

When utilizing a simple grading scale to express the importance of each expectation listed in the survey to the teachers who responded, a short list of qualities essential to success as a building leader emerged. The grading scale used to express importance was as follows: Traits to which 90% of teachers or higher responded “strongly agree” when asked if it was among their expectations for a new principal can be considered Essential Characteristics. Traits to which 80-89.9% of teachers responded “strongly agree” when asked if it was among their expectations for a new principal can be considered Important Characteristics; these leadership markers are still foundational to the success of a new principal in the eyes of teachers, but not as pivotal as the Essential Characteristics. These Essential Characteristics, which teachers verified are the most valued aspects of a new building leader, have one thing in common: they are characteristics of those who practice transformational leadership.

Five characteristics emerged among teacher expectations as Important Characteristics (criterion: 80-89.9% “strongly agree” responses) of a successful new principal: being a good communicator, possessing good interpersonal skills, exhibiting a positive leadership style, supporting the duties of teachers, and performing tasks effectively. As seen in Appendix D, Table D9, 85.2% of teachers surveyed reported that good communication skills were something they “strongly agree” was among their
expectations for a building leader. In chapter two, Wentworth (1990) was cited as recognizing 13 essential factors of transformational leadership that determine high morale in schools, and one of those 13 essential factors was maintaining good communication (p. 2). In Appendix D, Table D10, 85.9% of teachers surveyed responded that good interpersonal skills were something they “strongly agree” was among their expectations for a new principal, as well. In the review of literature, Whitaker’s (2000) suggestion was mentioned that transformational leaders in the workplace, in this case, administrators and principals, must understand the dynamics and relationships that exist in the working environment and that they are essential elements to school improvement and teacher morale. Further, Maxwell (1999) stated, “The ability to work with people and develop relationships is absolutely indispensable to effective leadership” (p. 77). Clearly interpersonal skills are a critical element of an effective transformational leader. A positive leadership style is further highlighted by 85.3% of teachers surveyed, who responded “strongly agree” when asked if this was an important trait for a building principal to possess (Appendix D, Table D11). Bryman (1992) suggested that transformational leadership is an inherently positive leadership style, as he notes, “transformational management necessitates both followers and leaders by raising each other’s sense of purpose and motivation.” Adams (1992) reinforced this idea: “Rather than focus on the inner workings of individual teachers, there may be greater utility in focusing on those aspects of the organization, the work environment, that can create a positive sense of morale for all teachers” (p. 346).

Another expectation reported by teachers as an Important Characteristic for building leaders was the principal’s support for the duties of teachers. A high percentage
of teachers surveyed, 82.1%, cited this support as an element that they “strongly agree” was something they expected from a principal (Appendix D, Table D19). According to research conducted by Hoy and Miskel (1987), high teacher morale was associated with four criteria: the appreciation of the teacher as an individual by the administration, confidence from the administration in the teacher’s competence, the presence of administrative support when dealing with student discipline problems, and teacher participation in the development of school policies (p. 114). Support from the administration is a longstanding and proven factor in the mélange of ideas surrounding the issue of how to create and maintain high morale for teachers in school workplace environments, and remains an important criterion for teachers when listing their expectations for successful principals.

The final Important Characteristic of principals that emerged through the survey given was that the principal can be expected to perform tasks effectively and efficiently. Of teachers surveyed, 82.1% cited this as an expectation they held for an effective principal (Appendix D, Table D4). These characteristics were all ranked highly in the results of the analysis, as could reasonably be expected from leadership characteristics in general; however they did not as a whole rank as highly as the Essential Characteristics we identified.

Two items emerged as Essential Characteristics for principals as reported by teachers surveyed. To reach the level of being deemed an Essential Characteristic, each expectation needed to reach a response rate of 90% of teachers or higher who answered “Strongly Agree.” The two leadership qualities considered to be Essential Characteristics of successful principals were integrity and the ability to accept responsibility for one’s
actions. These two criteria for principals directly reflect the body of ideas and research surrounding transformational leadership. Brewster and Railsback (2003) reviewed three large-scale studies of trust in school environments and found that trust is instrumental to the success of a school and, by extension, a school leader:

Findings suggested that when there was a greater perceived level of trust in a school, teachers had a greater sense of efficacy - the belief in their ability to affect actions leading to success. Trust tended to be pervasive: when teachers trusted their principal, they also were more likely to trust staff, parents, and students. (p. 8)

Trust is directly fostered by integrity; where the latter does not live, the former cannot grow. It is no surprise that, across the barriers of age and gender, 91.3% of teachers surveyed for this study reported that integrity was an unwavering expectation they held for their principals (Appendix D, Table D8). The other Essential Characteristic for building leaders that emerged from these teacher responses, with 92.1% of teachers surveyed answering that they “strongly agree” that it was an expectation they had for a principal, was the leader’s ability to take responsibility for his or her actions (Appendix D, Table D1). Interestingly, according to research, this characteristic also ties back to the essential element of trust in the school workplace environment. The Walker Loyalty Report, which reports on workplace loyalty, asserted the idea that “trust, especially in leadership, is the single biggest factor in worker retention” (Baldoni 2007, p. 9). The study cited several ways leaders can establish trust with their employees, one of which is to “Take responsibility and be publicly self-reflective when times are tough” (p. 9).
The findings of this study clearly fill an absence in the current landscape of research. By pinpointing the two Essential Characteristics for effective leadership as reported by teachers, and five additional Important Characteristics, another resource is provided for the principal seeking to grow as a transformational leader. District and building level administrators can further use the results of this study to improve hiring practices and plan appropriate professional development for their school faculties.

Conclusions

This final section of chapter five provides closure to the study. In this section, implications for action are presented based on the major findings of the study. Suggestions were given for future research to extend the study, and concluding remarks were made. A valid and reliable instrument was used. Men and women’s opinions of the three clusters, morale, culture and practice were similar. Both men and women had low expectations for culture and had high expectations for morale and practice, indicating that they expected principals to work hard and get along with others. Teachers, regardless of years of experience, had high expectations for principals in the morale and practice clusters. Interestingly, non-tenured teachers had a higher expectation for culture as compared to tenured teachers. Men and women had equal expectations of principals with no ostensible differences in the way each gender as a whole formulated their expectations. There did seem to be an apparent experience gap between tenured and non-tenured teachers. Men and women, regardless of years of experience, held similar expectations of principals in the clusters of morale, culture, and practice. Lastly, the findings concluded that teachers did in fact have high and ordered expectations for principals.
**Implications for action.** District and building level administrators are challenged with hiring high-quality personnel, including principals. The demands of the principalship require a diverse skill set. The results of this study give insight into what teachers expect from principals and their leadership characteristics. The results from this study can be used to determine ways for principals to impact staff morale positively, build an efficacious school culture and community, and define teachers’ expectations for ideal principal practices.

District and building level administrators can use the results of this study to inform professional development and hiring practices regarding their faculties. One implication for action for district and building level administrators is the potential to use the Leadership Traits Survey to screen administrative applicants. The potential also exists to use the Leadership Traits Survey as an induction tool for principals.

**Recommendations for future research.** Herein, the researcher examines the relationship between the highest expectation teachers hold for principals; morale, culture or practice. Additionally, the relationship is examined between teachers’ opinions regarding the expectations teachers have for principals, divided by gender and years of service. The teachers included in this study were certified high school teachers in District X. Recommendations for future research to improve and extend this research include the following:

1. A researcher could conduct a case study of high-performing schools in which high collective teacher expectations for principal leadership are present, and the resulting impact on staff morale and school climate. In the case study, a researcher could examine the school culture and determine behaviors of the faculty and students that result in high-
level collective expectations for principal leadership.

2. A researcher might conduct a quantitative study instead of a qualitative study to determine the differences in impact upon staff morale and school climate by the numbers.

3. A researcher could change the location of the study to a larger or smaller school district and survey a larger or smaller population of teachers, including middle school and/or elementary teachers for varying levels of teachers’ opinions regarding the expectations for new principals.

4. A researcher could conduct the study in a different area and/or demographic to determine if teachers’ expectations of principal leadership varied with the socioeconomic status of the district and student clientele.

5. A researcher might expand the study to include multiple secondary schools in Missouri rather than focusing specifically on one suburban school district.

6. While this study focused on certified high school teachers, a researcher might expand the study by including classified personnel as well.

7. A researcher might use the instrument to determine the expectations specific subgroups of teachers would have for principals.

8. A researcher might use the instrument to determine the expectations parents have for principals.

**Concluding remarks.** This study was conducted to determine whether highest expectation teachers hold for principals was morale, culture, or practice. Additionally, the researcher examined the relationship between teachers’ expectations of a new principal and teacher gender and years of service. The teachers included in this study
were certified high school teachers in District X that voluntarily participated in a leadership questionnaire.

The results of data analysis indicated there was not a significant difference in opinion between genders regarding teachers’ expectations of principals. The results further indicated there was an apparent relationship between teacher years of service and expectations of the principal, and this relationship was that teachers with 0-5 years of service held the opinion that school culture was more important than morale or practice.

The data also revealed two Essential Characteristics of effective principals as reported by teachers and five additional Important Characteristics. This information adds to the body of current research surrounding transformational leadership in schools and significantly winnows the vast quantity of leadership qualities to focus on the few that teachers deem critical for principals to possess and cultivate.

District and building level administrators can use the results of this study to plan appropriate professional development and hiring practices for their school faculties. Increasing awareness of teachers’ expectations of a new principal’s leadership can positively impact staff morale, school culture, and areas of principals’ professional practice.
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Appendix A: Leadership Traits Survey
LEADERSHIP TRAITS QUESTIONNAIRE OF AN IDEAL PRINCIPAL

Please circle the appropriately numbered response. Circle a response that indicates how well you agree or disagree with each statement.

1 = Strongly Agree
2 = Agree
3 = Disagree
4 = Strongly Disagree

I would describe the IDEAL PRINCIPAL to prompt each statement in the following:

1. Would accept responsibility for his/her actions while working
2. Would use proper time management techniques
3. Would effectively plan and present programs (special project & others)
4. Would be well organized
5. Would perform tasks competently and effectively
6. Would display an awareness of people's feelings and behaviors
7. Would work with agency personnel to determine resources and programs
8. Would accept and utilize suggestions to improve performance
9. Would act with integrity in all areas of human relationships
10. Would demonstrate good communication skills
11. Would demonstrate good interpersonal skills
12. Would demonstrate positive leadership qualities
13. Would work within agency philosophies, frameworks and goals
14. Would demonstrate flexibility by adapt to different situations
15. Would develop practical and realistic programs for school improvement
16. Would solve problems practically and realistically
17. Would analyze problems and arrive at appropriate solutions
18. Would maintain an appropriate appearance and behavior
19. Would be enthusiastic and motivated in performing duties
20. Would perform, model and support the duties of teachers
Appendix B: IRB Proposal
IRB REQUEST
Proposal for Research
Submitted to the Baker University Institutional Review Board

I. Research Investigator(s) (Students must list faculty sponsor first)

Department(s) School of Education Graduate Department

Name Signature

1. Dr. Harold Frye ____________________ , Major Advisor
2. Dr. Phil Messner ____________________ , Research Analyst
3. University Committee Member
4. External Committee Member

Principal Investigator: Precious Kurth ____________________
Phone: 816-262-9676
Email: pkurth@k12.mo.us
Mailing address: [Redacted]

Faculty sponsor: Dr. Harold Frye
Phone: 913-344-1220
Email: hfrye@bakeru.edu
Expected Category of Review: ____Exempt ____X_ Expedited ____Full

II: Protocol Title

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Summary
The following summary must accompany the proposal. Be specific about exactly what participants will experience, and about the protections that are included to safeguard
participants from harm. Careful attention to the following may help facilitate the review process:

**In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.**
This is a quantitative non-experimental study using a descriptive survey about leadership traits. Data results from the study will enable the researcher to make inferences about teachers’ preferences of leadership traits in an ideal principal. The study will be conducted in the Liberty School District, specifically at Liberty High School and Liberty North High School.

**Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.**
The survey consists of 20 statements. Respondent will circle which statement they most favor by using a scale of 1) strongly agree, 2) agree, 3) disagree, 4) strongly disagree. Other than responding to a survey there are no other conditions or manipulation in the survey. Participants respond voluntarily and anonymously.

**What measures or observations will be taken in the study? If any questionnaire or other instruments are used, provide a brief description and attach a copy.** The survey consists of 20 statements. Respondent will circle which statement they most favor by using a scale of 1) strongly agree, 2) agree, 3) disagree, 4) strongly disagree.

**Will the subjects encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical, or legal risk? If so, please describe the nature of the risk and any measures designed to mitigate that risk.**
The survey respondents will not encounter the risk of psychological, social, physical or legal risk. Survey responses are voluntary and anonymous.

**Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.**
There will not be stress involved to any survey respondents. Survey responses are voluntarily and anonymous.

**Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.**
The survey respondents will not be deceived or mislead in any way.

**Will there be a request for information that subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.**
This research request does not a request of personal information from respondents.

**Will the subjects be presented with materials that might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.**
This research request will not be presented with offensive, threatening or degrading materials. Survey results are confidential and anonymous.
Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?
It is estimated the approximate amount of time per respondent would not exceed ten minutes.

Who will be the subjects in this study? How will they be solicited or contacted?
Provide an outline or script of the information which will be provided to subjects prior to their volunteering to participate. Include a copy of any written solicitation as well as an outline of any oral solicitation.

High school teachers in a mid-western school district will be provided an electronic cover and permission letter indicating the purpose of the survey and their role. All survey responses will be confidential, anonymous and reviewed only by the researcher.

What steps will be taken to ensure that each subject’s participation is voluntary?
What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?
Participants will receive an electronic copy of a cover letter and permission form indicating their participation is voluntary, anonymous and confidential.

How will you ensure that the subjects give their consent prior to participating? Will a written consent form be used? If so, include the form. If not, explain why not.
Participants will receive an electronic copy of a cover letter and permission form indicating their participation is voluntary, anonymous and confidential.

Will any aspect of the data be made a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subject? If so, please explain the necessity.
Data from the survey will not be archived in the district or with the researcher. Results will be destroyed after completion of the data collection and analysis.

Will the fact that a subject did or did not participate in a specific experiment or study be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher or employer? If so, explain. Participation in the survey is voluntary, anonymous and confidential. At no time will teachers be asked their names.

What steps will be taken to ensure the confidentiality of the data?
Participants will receive an electronic copy of a cover letter and permission form indicating their participation is voluntary, anonymous and confidential. Results will be destroyed after completion of the data collection and analysis.

If there are any risks involved in the study, are there any offsetting benefits that might accrue to either the subjects or society?
There are not any risks involved in the study. There are not any offsetting benefits to participants or society.

Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.
Results will be destroyed after completion of the data collection and analysis.
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Appendix D: Survey Item Analysis
A survey was given to gauge and group teacher expectations of principals with regard to preference and importance. The following is an itemized analysis of each survey question.

As shown in Table D1, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported (p=.652) given that 92.1% of respondents agreed accepting responsibility for his/her actions was an expectation for principals.

**Table D1**

*Summary Results for Item 1. Would accept responsibility for his/her actions while working*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the range of your teaching experience?</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.632</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table D2, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported (p=.445) given that 73.5% of respondents agreed the use of proper time management techniques was an expectation for principals.

**Table D2**

*Summary Results for Item 2. Would use proper time management techniques*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the range of your teaching experience?</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 \quad df \quad p
\]

\[
2.672 \quad 3 \quad 0.445
\]

As shown in Table D3, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported (p=.279) given that 68.2% of respondents agreed being well organized was an expectation for principals.
Table D3

**Summary Results for Item 4. Would be well organized**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16 +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.478</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table D4, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported ($p=0.951$). Approximately 82% of respondents agreed performing tasks competently and effectively was an expectation for principals.
Table D4

Summary Results for Item 5. Would perform tasks competently and effectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16 +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 0.347, \quad df = 3, \quad p = 0.951
\]

As shown in Table D5, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported (p=0.951) given that 77.5% of respondents agreed displaying an awareness of people’s feelings and behaviors was an expectation for principals.
Table D5

Summary Results for Item 6. Would display an awareness of people’s feelings and behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.009</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table D6, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported ($p=.882$) given that 75% of respondents agreed working with agency personnel to determine resources and programs was an expectation for principals.
**Table D6**

*Summary Results for Item 7. Would work with agency personnel to determine resources and programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.379</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table D7, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported ($p=0.852$) given that 67.5% of respondents agreed accepting and utilizing suggestions to improve performance was an expectation for principals.
Table D7

*Summary Results for Item 8. Would accept and utilize suggestions to improve performance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16 +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 \quad df \quad p \]

|                  | 0.791 | 3      | 0.852  |

As shown in Table D8, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported \( (p=.842) \) given that 91.3% of respondents agreed acting with integrity in all areas of human relationships was an expectation for principals.
Table D8

Summary Results for Item 9. Would act with integrity in all areas of human relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 \quad df \quad p
\]

|              | 0.829 | 3      | 0.842 |

As shown in Table D9, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported (p=.255) given that 85.2% of respondents agreed demonstrating good communication skills was an expectation for principals.
Table D9

Summary Results for Item 10. Would demonstrate good communication skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16 +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table D10, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported ($p=.255$) given that 85.9% of respondents agreed demonstrating good interpersonal skills was an expectation for principals.
Table D10

*Summary Results for Item 11. Would demonstrate good interpersonal skills*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16 +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>89.3%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table D11, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported (p=.796) given that 85.3% of respondents agreed demonstrating positive leadership qualities was an expectation for principals.
Table D11

Summary Results for Item 12. Would demonstrate positive leadership qualities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 \quad df \quad p
\]

|                | 1.021 | 3     | 0.796 |

As shown in Table D12, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported (p=.594) given that 52% of respondents agreed accepting responsibility for his/her actions is expectation teachers hold for principals.
Table D12

Summary Results for Item 13. Would work within agency philosophies frameworks and goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>What is the range of your teaching experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 \quad df \quad p
\]

\[
4.619 \quad 6 \quad 0.594
\]

As shown in Table D13, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported (p=.007) given that 72.8% of respondents agreed demonstrating flexibility by adapting to different situations was an expectation for principals.
Table D13

Summary Results for Item 14. Would demonstrate flexibility by adapting to different situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total n

|        | 32 | 23 | 28 | 68 | 151 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table D14, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported ($p=.881$) given that 69.1% of respondents agreed developing practical and realistic programs for school improvement was an expectation for principals.
**Table D14**

*Summary Results for Item 15. Would develop practical and realistic programs for school improvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>What is the range of your teaching experience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 | df | p \\
--- | --- | ---
0.669 | 3   | 0.881
\]

As shown in Table D15, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported (p=.466) given that 76.8% of respondents agreed solving problems practically and realistically was an expectation for principals.
Table D15

*Summary Results for Item 16. Would solve problems practically and realistically*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.632</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table D16, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported ($p=.023$) given that 76% of respondents agreed analyzing problems and arriving at appropriate solutions was an expectation for principals.
Table D16

*Summary Results for Item 17. Would analyze problems and arrive at appropriate solutions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.505</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table D17, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported ($p=.153$) given that 60.7% of respondents agreed maintaining appropriate appearance and behavior was an expectation for principals.
### Table D17

**Summary Results for Item 18. Would maintain appropriate appearance and behavior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16 +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.276</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table D18, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported ($p=.153$) given that 67% of respondents agreed being enthusiastic and motivated when performing duties was an expectation for principals.
Table D18

Summary Results for Item 19. Would be enthusiastic and motivated when performing duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 \quad df \quad p
\]

\[
2.788 \quad 3 \quad 0.425
\]

As shown in Table D19, because there was no significant difference in agreement between the four career length categories, H1 was not supported (p=.153).

Approximately 82% of respondents agreed performing, modeling and supporting the duties of teachers was an expectation for principals.
Table D19

Summary Results for Item 20. Would perform, model and support the duties of teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the range of your teaching experience?</th>
<th>0 to 5</th>
<th>6 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 15</th>
<th>16 +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 \quad df \quad p
\]

| 0.956 | 3 | 0.812 |