Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Their Perceptions of Principals' Transformational Leadership Practices

Jennifer J. Short, Ed. S.
B.A., Western Governors University
M.S., Western Governors University
Ed. S., Webster University

Submitted to the Graduate Department and Faculty of the School of Education of
Baker University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

_____
Susan K. Rogers, Ph.D.
Major Advisor

_____
Sharon Zoellner, Ph.D.

_____
Randal Bagby, Ed.D.

Date Defended: May 4, 2016

Abstract

The relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and the extent to which teachers perceived their principals as engaging in transformational leadership practices could lead to increased educational successes for students and teachers. The setting of the study was the Keystone Learning Services eight school districts. Teachers from elementary schools in the eight districts were invited to participate in the study. Overall, there were 50 surveys completed. The first purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between elementary teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational. The second purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational. The final purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational. A quantitative research design was used to measure the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and the eight specific practices of transformational leadership. Correlations were calculated to index the strength and the direction of the relationship between the variables. One-sample *t* tests were conducted to test for the statistical significance of each correlation. The results revealed for the variables of self-efficacy in student engagement and classroom management, there was not a statistically significant relationship with any of the transformational leadership practices. The results also indicated with regard to self-efficacy in instructional strategies, some statistically

significant relationships with teachers' perception of their principals' shared vision, principals' building consensus, principals' support of individuals, and principals' collaborative structure building. The results of this study have implications for district, building leaders, and teachers in regards to building self-efficacy and engaging in transformational leadership practices. When a District's administrators and principals are concerned with professional needs, reward performance, elicit feedback, share in decision-making, and model professional behavior, teachers respond positively. Some recommendations for future research were to add a qualitative research component and to extend the research to survey all teachers within a district, not just at the elementary level. By gathering specific insight from all teachers, a better understanding of what transformational practices are desired by teachers for support could be obtained.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. First, my daughters, Danielle, Hannah, Allison, and Heather Short, for understanding the amount of effort this endeavor required, supporting my demanding schedule, and encouraging me to pursue my educational dreams. As your mother, I am in awe of how amazing you are and proud of you for valuing educational success in your own lives. To my sister Krista Keiser Gaza, who is always more excited about my progress and successes than I am. To my parents, Duke and Tina Keiser, who created in me a love of lifelong learning, a desire to succeed, and a belief that I could do anything that I wanted to do. And to Jay Harris, thank you for being my soundboard and cheering for me. I love you all.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank Dr. Susan Rogers for her guidance, wisdom, and encouragement. I have a great deal of admiration and respect for Dr. Rogers. Without her, I would not be finishing my dissertation or graduating. Early in the program, I dropped out from the coursework, and Dr. Rogers found a way to help me begin again and mentored me the whole way. She will be a special friend for life! Second, I would like to thank the brilliant statistician, Ms. Peg Waterman. Peg is the smartest person in the world! I enjoyed her as an instructor and as my research analyst. Peg always encouraged me, was very timely with feedback, strengthened my dissertation, taught me how to sound like I knew what I was talking about, and is such a positive and kind person. Third, I want to thank Dr. Randal Bagby for serving on my committee, providing guidance during my coursework, mentoring me through the field experience, giving valuable feedback that strengthened my study, and being a friend. Next, I want to thank Dr. Sharon Zoellner for the valuable instruction, providing helpful feedback for my study, and serving on my committee. Finally, I want to thank my amazing cohort including my accountability buddy, Keith Jones, BOOM! Thank you for challenging me, supporting my goals, and truly being the most amazing group of professionals I have had the privilege to know.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter One

Introduction

In our modern, academic, and complex schooling systems, concentrating on ways to improve student achievement is still the focal point. High standards are placed on students as well as teachers. Teacher self-efficacy is a motivational construct that directly influences outcomes in the classroom. It has been related to student achievement (Moore & Esselman, 1992; Ross, 1992), increased job satisfaction (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Borgogni, & Steca, 2003), commitment to teaching (Coladarci, 1992), and greater levels of planning and organization (Allinder, 1994).

Self-efficacy, according to Bandura (1997) describes a person's ability to believe in capabilities and implementation of actions to be successful. A teacher's self-efficacy influences the teacher's thought patterns. Efficacy evokes emotions that drive actions into meeting goals, perseverance through challenges or adversity, recovery from an obstacle, and addresses steadfastness over events that affect the mission (Bandura, 1997).

Efficacy is normally instituted during new teacher education programs and the first years of teaching. The results of research have indicated teacher self-efficacy increases during teacher education experiences (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Wenner, 2001) but declines for a period beginning after graduation through the end of the first year of teaching (Moseley, Reinke & Bookour, 2003). The concept of self- efficacy is critically important (Ying, 2012) yet absent from most training, ongoing support programs, and daily work environments (Walker & Barton, 1987).

Teachers have varying levels of self-efficacy. School administrators can directly influence the building of efficacy with their staff. Principals can build and foster efficacy

in the areas of student engagement, effective instructional practices, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Individuals who feel comfortable in their working environment, feel supported by the leadership, and acknowledge their leader's influence with others for gain or assistance, tend to have much higher efficacy convictions (Bandura, 1977).

Leadership, in particular, transformational leadership, has been linked to positive student outcomes, teacher beliefs, and collaborative practices (Demir, 2008). School leaders who value transformational leadership qualities empower teachers to rise above their personal limitations and strive for common goals. Common goals can be achieved when a transformational leader supports intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence (Bass, 1985).

Burns (1978) promoted the idea of transformation leadership as a relationship with one or more individuals connecting in a profound way that leads them to rise to higher levels of motivation and morality in tandem. Educational leaders who hold beliefs in their abilities are able to change the culture of a building by influencing behaviors, building selfless attitudes, inspiring greatness, and valuing high levels of morality and virtues (Burns, 1978). It is expected that by nurturing the relationship between self-efficacy and exposing the effects of principals' transformational leadership actions, the impact will dramatically improve school success while building capacity and increasing the performance of students (Briner & Steiner, 2007).

Building a relationship between teacher self-efficacy and principal transformational leadership qualities is an important task. The challenge is to isolate the characteristics necessary to achieve this connection. Jerald (2007) summarized the

characteristics associated with strong efficacy in teachers. These teachers display effective planning and organization, a willingness to try new methods, openness to new ideas, dedication and patience when things are not going as planned, actions that prove to be more supportive of students who are not mastering skills, and are more likely to continue to help a lower achieving student rather than referring them for special education services. Building on these characteristics could affect positive change in schools through quality professional development (Cooper, 2009); the results may be utilized to develop professional learning ventures and expectations, training models, and further research into how to best foster efficacy in teachers.

Background

Teaching and learning are dependent on the abilities and effectiveness of teachers. Understanding teachers' beliefs about their confidence in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management, student engagement, and instructional strategies could address strengths and areas for improvement. To develop a cohesive culture in a school, productivity, collective commitments, focus, and motivational influences must be present (Peterson & Deal, 2002). These influences may come from transformational leaders as they try to grow their staff and establish a foundation for learning.

Researchers seem to agree that principals have a direct or indirect influence on teachers' overall effectiveness. Job performance and satisfaction, motivation, and collaboration can also be contributed to quality culture and transformational leadership qualities (Anderman, Belzer, & Smith, 1991; Campo, 1993; Hallinger, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Jones, 1998; Nnadozie, 1993; Reames, 1997). An efficient principal must

take the temperature of the building and carefully assess the strengths of the culture and areas for improvement to ensure the school system operates effectively and fluidly (Deal & Peterson, 1999).

Keystone Learning Services (Keystone) supports the administration, staff, students, and families within their coop by providing services, professional learning, and resources. More specifically, Keystone supports eight different districts. Keystone provides special education services, student intervention team training, Kansas Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) structures and training, and offers a multitude of professional development events and resources for teachers. The districts supported by Keystone include Valley Falls USD 338, Jefferson County North USD 339, Jefferson County West USD 340, Oskaloosa USD 341, McLouth USD 342, Perry LeCompton USD 343, Easton USD 449, and Atchison County School District USD 377. The districts are comprised of one elementary school except for Perry Lecompton, which has two schools. Table 1 includes the demographic data for Keystone elementary schools. The schools are listed by their Unified School District number.

Table 1

2014-2015 Demographic Data for the Keystone Learning Services Elementary Schools

	Enrollment	% Males	% Females	% Low SES	% White	% Other
USD 338	269	47	53	30	97	3
USD 339	338	52	48	23	92	8
USD 340	249	53	47	24	95	5
USD 341	321	56	44	50	92	8
USD 342	243	56	44	30	96	4
USD 343	294	45	55	50	90	10
USD 377	304	54	46	64	97	3

Note. Adapted from District K-12 Report Card 2014-2015 by Kansas State Department of Education.

Retrieved from http://online.ksde.org/k12/k12.aspx

As Keystone district administrators continue to work together, the leadership they can provide must include the continuous support of principals. Principals of these schools must mix care with service. Their goals must be to set high standards and expectations while providing necessary resources and emotional support, while building a transformational culture (Lee & Li, 2015).

Statement of the Problem

A study conducted by Goddard and Skrla (2006) revealed some common factors outlined by 1,981 teachers and associated them with the teachers' thoughts of efficacy. The results of this study indicated less than half of the difference in teachers' efficacy was attributed to students' socioeconomic status levels, students' achievement levels, and faculty experience. Goddard and Skrla (2006) stated the importance of the factors related to or associated with self-efficacy were professional training, collaboration among

colleagues, and guidance and support. There is an opportunity for principals, through professional training, to foster teacher efficacy by providing efficacy-building experiences and employing specific behaviors, which include modeling professionalism and offering intellectual stimulation, and providing prescriptive individualized training, collaboration, and inspirational motivation (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) insisted that employees who regard themselves as highly efficacious will sustain efforts to render successful results, and employees who hold low self-efficacy are much less likely to execute tasks fully to reach desired outcomes. The relationship that exists between teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and their perceptions of a principal's transformational leadership contributes to school improvement measures and student achievement gains (Demir, 2008). Transformational leadership contributes to a collective, collaborative culture and individual efficacy in teachers (Demir, 2008). Leaders may identify where employees are on an efficacy scale and create experiences to construct and sustain levels that relate to student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management by exhibiting a plethora of transformational leadership practices.

Purpose of the Study

The first purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between elementary teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational. The second purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational. The final purpose of this study was to determine the relationship

between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational.

Significance of the Study

Understanding how the relationship between transformational leadership qualities and the contribution these qualities have made to teachers' developed sense of efficacy, may affect the way the Keystone districts plan for their professional development ventures, administrator development, and collaborative interactions between teachers and principals. Principals may need to incorporate more direct contributions as a transformational principal in the areas of sharing a vision, building consensus, holding high expectations, modeling behavior, providing individualized support, providing intellectual stimulation, strengthening school culture, and building collaborative structures to increase teacher self-efficacy. The impact the study has on teachers could lead to teacher retainment, improvement of student achievement, and trials of better practices and innovative strategies. The relationship that exists between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management, and the teacher'perception of their principal leading with transformational qualities must be analyzed (Portin, DeArmond, Gundlach, & Schneider, 2003).

Delimitations

Roberts (2004) defined delimitations as the boundaries of the study that are controlled by the researcher. The delimitations of this study are as follows:

1. The study was confined to the elementary teachers employed by the districts in the Keystone Learning Service consortium during the 2015-2016 school year.

2. The study was limited to data collected from one survey, which was created by combining the Teacher's Self-Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001) and the Nature of School Leadership (Leithwood, 1997) surveys.

3. The study was restricted to the surveying of teachers during the month of January 2016.

Assumptions

Assumptions are described as factors presumed in a study (Roberts, 2004). The study was based on the assumptions primarily surrounding the participants' candid and honest responses to the surveys. Additionally, it was surmised that the participants understood their role and expectations. This study was also based on the dependency of the accuracy of the surveys to measure what they purport to measure. The data was properly gathered and analyzed.

Research Questions

Creswell (2009) explained research questions (RQs) "shape and specifically focus the purpose of the study" (Creswell, 2009, pp. 151-152). The following research questions address the essential focus of this study and provide parameters for research compiled in the literature review (Roberts, 2004).

RQ1. To what extent is there a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational?

RQ2. To what extent is there a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational?

RQ3. To what extent is there a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their principals' leadership is transformational?

Definition of Terms

According to Lunenburg and Irby (2008), key terms need to be clarified if they are paramount to the study and referenced or used continuously throughout the dissertation. The following definitions are understood in this study:

Classroom management. "Classroom management is the process by which teachers and schools create and maintain appropriate behavior of students in classroom settings" (Emmer & Sabornie, 2015, para.1).

Efficacy. Efficacy is the ability to produce a desired or intended result (Farlex Partnership Medical Dictionary, 2012).

Instructional strategies. "Instructional strategies are techniques teachers use to help students become independent, strategic learners. These strategies become learning strategies when students independently select the appropriate ones and use them effectively to accomplish tasks or meet goals" (Alberta Learning, 2002, p. 67).

Student engagement. "Student engagement refers to the degree of attention, curiosity, interest, optimism, and passion that students show when they are learning or being taught" ("Hidden Curriculum," 2015).

Transformational leadership. "Transformational leadership is a process of building commitment to organizational objectives and empowering followers to accomplish those objectives" (Demir, 2008, p. 95).

Overview of the Methodology

This study involved a quantitative research design using survey methods to examine to what extent there was a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and teachers' perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership. Elementary school teachers in the eight districts of the Keystone Learning Services were the participants. Two surveys were combined into Survey Monkey to elicit responses related to teacher self-efficacy and principal's transformational leadership practices. Hypothesis tests were conducted to address each of the research questions. A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient was calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instruction strategies, and classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal has transformational leadership qualities. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance for each correlation coefficient.

Organization of the Study

This research study consists of five chapters. Chapter one included the background of the study, statement of the problem, purpose statement, significance of the study, delimitations, assumptions, research questions, definition of terms, and overview of the methodology of the study. A review of the literature is included in chapter two, which includes definitions and aspects of self-efficacy with regard to teacher self-efficacy

relating to student engagement, instructional strategies, classroom management, and transformational leadership characteristics and the relationship between teacher self-efficacy and principal leadership. Included in chapter three is a description of the research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, hypothesis testing, and limitations.

Presented in chapter four are the study's findings including descriptive statistics and results of the hypothesis testing for the three research questions. Provided in chapter five is a summary of the entire study including an overview of the problem, purpose statement, and research questions; review of the methodology; findings related to the literature; and major findings, implications for action, recommendations for future research, and conclusions.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

The purpose of chapter two is to provide insight into the value of self-efficacy, the characteristics and research associated with transformational leadership, and any relationship that may exist between them. Specifically, chapter two will provide previous research and information based on the effects that teachers' self-efficacy has on student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. These distinct areas are critical to understanding the impact teacher self-efficacy and principal's leadership has on student achievement.

Additionally, this chapter includes an overview of the research on the qualities, characteristics, and behaviors of transformational leaders. With the attempt to understand quality leadership, the connection between specific leadership behaviors and development of teachers, and the link between teachers' levels of efficacy will assist the schooling community to understand the impact of transformational leadership. This impact may affect teachers' confidence in their capabilities to engage and manage students and deliver strong instructional strategies.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

There are many facets of teachers' self-efficacy. Efficacy beliefs empower teachers to influence others through their actions. Teachers with stronger levels of efficacy can influence both students and colleagues. When teachers believe in themselves, they control the success of the learning and collaborative environments (Webb, 1985). Teachers with high self-efficacy explore using different instructional

strategies while striving to improve their practice by evaluating teaching materials (Allinder, 1994; Guskey, 1988; Stein & Wang, 1988).

In today's school environment, teachers need to be reflective, collaborative, and highly trained instructional experts. They are responsible for ensuring significant learning progress is made by all students. Teachers have substantially different levels of self-efficacy to apply in educating their students. Teachers' self-efficacy has been linked to their actions in the classroom and instructional adjustments. Bandura (1977) theorized that teachers' self-efficacy affects how they invest in their pedagogy. Self-efficacy also affects how teachers set professional goals and the resiliencies they apply when things do not go as planned or when hitting an obstacle.

Ashton and Webb (1986) provided research-based habits of strong efficacy. They promote studying and analyzing teacher self-efficacy. With seven distinct habits of strong efficacy, Ashton and Webb revealed why teacher self-efficacy should be a staple in teachers' professional growth. These include goal setting for themselves and their students, a sense of how important their role is in educating students, hold themselves personally responsible for student learning, continuously improves their practices and performance, displays confidence to affect student learning, invests greater efforts to reach all students, and uses collaborative measures with students and colleagues.

Coladarci (1992) contended there are three aspects of understanding the impact of teacher self-efficacy. He further stated that with greater self-efficacy beliefs, teachers will have students who show improvement, be more successful when a supervisor suggests that a curriculum change be made, and more capable of providing proper interventions when students are not adequately given opportunities to access the

curriculum. Coladarci (1992) contributed to the importance of teacher efficacy understanding by stating that a teacher's general and personal efficacy is without argument related to the commitment to teaching and retention factors of the teacher. Efficacy is even more of a determining factor to the commitment of teaching than are factors of income disparities or a school's culture (Coladarci, 1992).

Increasing efficacy could lie within in-service experiences. The research findings propose some ways of developing these experiences are more effective than are others. For instance, during in-service events, teachers generally receive information or new resources (Garet et al., 1999). However, missing from these events is an opportunity to practice their newly learned skills. To concentrate on the development of teacher self-efficacy, the skill practice element must be reinforced significantly (Schmidt & Bjork, 1992).

Looking more into the existence of self-efficacy, some factors are relevant to explore. Higher levels of self-efficacy tend to exist in teachers who are confident in their grade level curriculum or in the skills needed to help students be successful in a particular grade level (Petrie, Hartranft & Lutz, 1995). The increasing age of the teacher is a factor (Campbell, 1996) along with the classroom characteristics and the behavior of students in promoting job satisfaction, which in turn elevates efficacy. Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, and Hoy (1998) described other habits and behaviors of teachers with a high sense of efficacy tended to be less likely to ostracize students for wrong answers or responses, organized students into smaller learning groups as opposed to whole group settings for instruction, and viewed special education students as their own, whether the student has behavior or academic struggles.

Self-efficacy is the perception of competence and confidence compared to actual levels. Individuals consistently misjudge their actual abilities (Poulou, 2007). Consequently, this can affect teachers' decisions on courses of action and effort levels. People tend to avoid situations when they presume their skill set is not adequate. In contrast, people will engage with confidence in activities they feel well adjusted for handling (Bandura, 1977).

Teachers' self-efficacy is regarded as an important aspect of effective teaching practices. Henson (2001) stated teachers' self-efficacy is consistently related to positive and productive pedagogy and student outcomes. A problem in education exists when teachers question their effectiveness. Teachers should have the mindset to trust themselves, their management of students, and their classroom instruction. Ng, Nicholas, and Alan (2010) felt that if teachers were confused or worried about their practice, they often questioned why they are teachers and could be notably stressed at work. Ng et al. (2010) offered self-perception as essential to efficacy in teaching. Educators with strong self-efficacy allow their ideas to control their teaching convictions (Ng et al., 2010).

In describing his insights, Ross (2007) stated, "More effective teaching should increase the likelihood of teachers obtaining mastery experiences, the strongest predictor of self-efficacy" (p. 52). Predicting self-efficacy could lead to increased awareness of factors that assist teachers in reaching higher levels of self-efficacy in their teaching practices. One important aspect of self-efficacy is it can be increased. With proper support and direction, even a teacher that reports less confidence in their instructional methods, classroom management techniques, or ability to engage students can increase their level of self-efficacy (Ross, 2007).

Definitions of self-efficacy. Teacher self-efficacy according to Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) was defined and believed to be the "judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated" (p. 783). Teacher efficacy studies began several decades ago with the researchers at the RAND Corporation. The first studies involved an assessment of teachers' beliefs about their control over the reinforcement of their actions (Armor et al., 1976).

Several studies were based on the work of Rotter's (1996) locus of control theory. From Rotter's work, it was assumed that teachers took action based on student learning and motivation. Historically, both Rotter's (1966) and Bandura's (1977) beliefs and traditions have influenced the study of self-efficacy and accepted beliefs of self-efficacy. Unfortunately, these theories have not been interpreted with validity and reliability, which has led to a decrease in approval by researchers with regard to theoretical formulation and attempts to measure the constructs (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

Origins of self-efficacy. The assumed basis of self-efficacy is secured in social cognitive theory (Bandura 1977, 1997). Bandura described self-efficacy, as confidence in one's potential to organize and accomplish the tasks that are required to yield a given attainment. Bandura (1997) described four origins of self-efficacy: mastery experience, vicarious experience, social persuasions, and physiological and affective states.

Bandura, Adams, and Beyer (1977) reported mastery experience depicts one's perceptions of previous performance. For example, a teacher who successfully has assisted students in making adequate learning progress may be more likely to increase the

belief in their ability, whereas teachers who were not successful may have a decreased belief in their abilities. Failures in past performance directly affect one's outlook on being able to obtain a different outcome when those tasks are tried again (Bandura, Adams, & Beyer, 1977).

Vicarious experience indicates the understanding the individual gains from learning from others (Bandura, 1997). Specifically, when a teacher watches another teacher succeed or fail they are able to conceptualize the behaviors and compare it to their own. Teachers watching and working with each other, especially during induction years, have greater success in managing their job, dealing with more difficult students, and feeling successful with instruction than those working in isolation (Billingsley, Carlson, & Klein, 2004).

Bandura's (2004) third origin of efficacy is social persuasions, which directly relates to the support, feedback, messages, and criticism that teachers receive from others. Administrators, colleagues, parents, community, and students can all affect a teacher's psychological state and self-efficacy. Teachers who receive or perceive continued support from their administrators express reduced stress, more dedication, and overall job gratification than those who receive less attention from administrators (Billingsley & Cross, 1992).

Lastly, the final origin as defined by Bandura (2004) is the physiological and emotional states. Stress and anxiety in heavy doses can diminish a teacher's reliance on personal skills or their potential to fulfill necessary assignments for their job. On the contrary, teachers with decreased stress levels can work with greater confidence.

Measuring teacher self-efficacy. Several measurements of efficacy have been used to determine the levels of teachers' self-efficacy. The RAND Corporation derived theories of self-efficacy with two evaluations of quality, innovative educational programs funded in part by the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Armor et. al., 1976). With these evaluations, teachers' self-efficacy was calculated with the utilization of a 5-point Likert scale to collect data on two responses. The responses related to teachers' beliefs about their control of student's general successes and the extent that teachers felt they could influence student achievement.

Gibson and Dembo (1984) improved on the RAND two-response survey with the construction of a ten-item survey in hopes of strengthening reliability and validity of the data collected. Gibson and Dembo (1984) wanted to capture both personal efficacy and teaching efficacy. They coined their research General Teaching Efficacy (GTE). The analysis of the data collected from surveys showed some distinctions between personal and teaching efficacy and caused some confusion and concern about the limitation of items and responses to the measure (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998).

Bandura (1997) attempted to improve on collecting evidence of teacher self-efficacy. Derived from his early work, the survey was constructed to measure how motivation is calibrated using one's judgment of their perceived capability to accomplish specific tasks and one's beliefs about the likely advantages or consequences of those actions (Bandura, 1977). Bandura's Self -Efficacy Scale (Bandura, 1997) was a self-assessment that showed efficacy with regard to how it influenced decision-making, available resources, effective instruction, managing behavior, and creating positive

school climates. This scale was comprised of 30 items and provided a general picture of a variety of self-efficacy constructs without being too specific.

In 2001, the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) or the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale was created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001). This scale specifically measured teachers' perceptions of their confidence with student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) were motivated to create a new survey partially because they felt there was some ambiguity with the survey or scales that were previously used to measure self, teacher, and general efficacy. These researchers were dissatisfied with the lack of "assessments of teaching in support of student thinking, effectiveness with capable students, creativity in teaching, and the flexible application of alternative assessment and teaching strategies" (p. 801).

Effects of Self-Efficacy. In a study conducted by the RAND Corporation, Armor et al. (1976) identified teacher efficacy as a trait that is directly related to student achievement. Over a four-year span, the RAND Corporation analyzed planned change. This "change agent study" focused on the change processes and teacher's professional growth. Findings were supportive of teacher efficacy being the prevailing teacher characteristic to ensure growth and positive change (Armor et al., 1976).

Hipp (1996) related self-efficacy beliefs to pedagogy by addressing the degree to which a teacher assumes an effect on the performance of students. Strong self-efficacy is acquired when educators embrace their skills in a way to organize and deliver courses of action that are necessary to achieve a particular skill in a specific context area. Personal beliefs, perceptions of confidence in skills, and beliefs of aptitude are determinants of

successful teaching (Hipp, 1996). The attainment of self-efficacy is enhanced when a teacher is led by a skillful principal (Hipp, 1996; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). Hipp (1997) also found that transformational leadership had a significant impact on teacher efficacy. He proclaimed that principals had a great impact in the areas of teacher capacity, managing student behavior, promoting a sense of community, empowering teachers, and recognizing the accomplishments of teachers. Results of Hipp's research showed there was a statistically significant relationship between teacher satisfaction, a teacher's willingness to employ effort, and a teacher's perception of their effectiveness (Hipp, 1997).

Tschannen- Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, and Hoy (1998) have contributed extensive research and measurement tools to the study of the effects of efficacy. Initially, they explored the meaning of efficacy. Secondly, they explained how teachers' self-efficacy beliefs collected by a survey could be used to improve pedagogy practices (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). Instructional events are successful when teachers are successful in affecting outcomes (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) developed a survey to measure efficacy in different categories. These included efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) stated, teachers with a high level of efficacy "believe that they can control, or at least strongly influence, student achievement and motivation" (p. 202).

In early findings about teacher efficacy, Woolfolk Hoy (2000) defined attributes involving student motivation, innovative teaching trials, teachers' competence, classroom management techniques, time spent teaching necessary subjects, and teachers' referrals of

students to support services. Also noted was evidence that novice teachers completing their first year in the classroom and holding a high level of teacher efficacy exhibited increased satisfaction, favorable reactions and less anxiety in teaching (Woolfolk Hoy, 2000). Although a teacher's self-efficacy does increase the teacher's retention and job satisfaction, it does not automatically produce a successful teacher (Darling-Hammond, 2003).

According to related research involving studies on teacher self-efficacy, there is some favorable research showing positive effects on student outcomes; however, there are limits to the advantages. The value of a teacher's sense of efficacy has been determined in the studies, but the basis of building or deepening teachers' efficacy confidence has not been confirmed (Anderson & Betz, 2001; Poulou, 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2007). For instance, Anderson and Betz (2001) have noted that limited research has been conducted relating to the sources of self-efficacy and the ways to effectively build and foster beliefs in teachers that lead to better practices and increased student achievement.

In a mixed-method study, Lewandowski (2005) examined teachers' perceptions of their confidence and the influence of leadership and professional learning on that efficacy using the Teachers Efficacy Scale. She concluded that teachers who have lower efficacy beliefs asserted that their leader displayed the high expectations, intellectual stimulation, support of individuals, and developing expertise attributes measured by the Nature of School Leadership survey more than did the teachers having higher efficacy beliefs. The high efficacy teachers scored their principals similarly, about average on the transformational leadership survey, whereas the low efficacy teachers chose more often

the strongly agree category to depict the importance of transformational leadership practices. Lewandowski (2005) also found self-efficacy increases as a result of the principal's ability to inspire efficacy beliefs to improve teaching.

Reeves (2011) explained that to maximize the influence that teachers have on student engagement and classroom management teachers will need support from the school system leaders. Principals need to provide professional development, time to plan and collaborate, professional learning opportunities, and the respect that is paramount for successful teaching (Reeves, 2011). These factors would indicate that shared and supportive (transformational) leadership are vitally important for teacher efficacy and increased student achievement.

Bandura (1986, 1997) indicated the success of student engagement and ability to achieve desired outcomes is established by the teacher's self-efficacy beliefs. In measuring teachers' self-efficacy, looking at their skillfulness to engage students in the learning environment and maintaining classroom order is a central component (Handelsman, Briggs, Sullivan, & Towler, 2005). Teachers are instrumental in engaging learners in academic events or learning materials (Gurung, Daniel, & Landrum, 2012).

Porter (2014) researched the correlation between the implementation of professional learning communities and teacher self-efficacy. This study was conducted in a medium-sized Oregon school district. All staff members were asked to complete the 24-question Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk, Hoy, A., 2001). Porter's analysis of the data showed a strong relationship existed between shared and supportive leadership with student engagement and classroom management. Findings from Porter's study indicated teachers believed they have an

influence on student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management.

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Student Engagement

Researchers agree that favorable academic results are attributed to student engagement and academic self-efficacy (Bresó, Schaufeli, & Salanova, 2011; Choi, 2005; Galyon, Blondin, Yaw, Nalls, & William, 2012). Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) examined correlative effects of transformational leadership behaviors on certain organizational circumstances and student engagement. The sample consisted of 9,941 students and 1,762 teachers in one large Canadian School district. The data collected from the students and teachers showed high efficacy levels in both students and teachers and support of transformational leadership qualities to enhance individualized support for teachers. Leithwood and Jantzi (2000) also concluded from this study, that principals with transformational qualities of leadership had limited contributions to student engagement (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). These findings may support that high levels of student engagement reduces teachers' perceived need for leadership support (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000).

A nationwide study was conducted by Tucker et al. (2002) to determine the influence of teacher behaviors on student engagement variables. Using the Rochester Assessment Package for Schools (RAPS-S), Tucker et al. collected student demographic data directly from the demographic data form. Student feedback from the survey results showed a significant connection between student engagement and teacher participation with instruction. The most relevant outcome was the realization that when teachers were interested in students' lives, students were more likely to engage in deeper learning levels (Tucker et al., 2002). The findings from this study serve as a reminder of the importance

of teacher-to-student relationships in shaping academic success in conjunction with stewards of knowledge. Hence, it is essential that teachers show students that they care about them in order to engage them.

Linnenbrink and Pintrich (2003) describe student engagement in three specific categories, which are influenced by self-efficacy. The three distinct forms are motivational, behavioral, and cognitive engagement (Linnenbrink & Pintrich, 2003). Motivational engagement refers to personal interest in content, benefits from content, and legitimacy of content to personal goals. Behavioral engagement refers to the effort in tasks, relationships with other individuals regarding the content, and willingness to ask for assistance when clarity is needed. Cognitive engagement is complex. Linnenbrink and Pintrich (2003) detail cognitive engagement as minds on not just hands on. They further explain that when individuals believe they can successfully complete a given task, their engagement is stronger and so is the self-efficacy belief.

A study concentrating on teachers' perceptions of student engagement and teacher self-efficacy beliefs was conducted by Pappa (2014). All educators in 14 schools in rural and urban areas of Kardista, Greece were surveyed in this study. According to the results of this study, Pappa found the level of efficacy teachers held both professionally and personally was relevant to the students' cognitive and affective engagement, teacher to student relationships, goal setting and achievement, and observation and modification of courses of action to ensure student development. Pappa's work also supported the theory that strong and trusting teacher-student relationship leads to increased student engagement. The quality of social or peer relationships was also notable for increased student engagement.

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Classroom Management

Several researchers recognize the importance of teachers' efficacy beliefs and their capabilities to manage their students. Emmer and Hickman (1991) reported that classroom management competency is independent of other kinds of teacher efficacy. Meaning, one's total beliefs of their level of efficacy is most likely not a comprehensive reflection of a teacher's classroom management efficacy. Efficacy levels can forecast how a teacher will respond to certain problems and what strategies they will deploy (Emmer & Hickman, 1991). Emmer and Hickman (1991) also warned that when student teachers have too high of a sense of efficacy with regard to managing behaviors in their classrooms, it can decrease their ability to improve their practice.

Researchers are frequently in agreement with the relationship between high efficacy and effective classroom management. Successful classroom management has been linked to high levels of self-efficacy (Gordon, 2001; Henson, 2003). Reportedly, teachers holding high self-efficacy perceptions are particularly confident in using effective classroom management skills (Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk, 2004). Highly efficacious teachers are well planned, student-centered, organized, and humanistic in their class management approaches (Anthony & Kritsonis, 2007).

The relationship between teachers' classroom management and self-efficacy beliefs lies within each teacher's expectations and opportunities for learning (Henson, 2001). Efficacy in classroom management relates to a teacher's reliance on their knowledge and skills to affect academic performance (Berman, McLaughlin, Bass, Pauly, & Zellman, 1977). Teachers with clear expectations that students will learn will work continuously to help struggling students. They will spend more time on academic tasks.

When teachers value greater learning opportunities, they offer more guidance and support

and praise accomplishments (Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

Gordon (2001) researched the behavioral factors, cognitive abilities, and attitudes

of 93 low efficacious teachers and 96 highly efficacious teachers. Her work led to the

assumption that a teacher's efficacy is a predictor of classroom management success.

Specifically, Gordon argued high efficacy teachers are more inclined to accept

challenging student behaviors and tend to feel less personal about them. Highly

efficacious teachers are prone to liking students with high needs or behavior challenges

and reportedly still have above average students in their classrooms (Gordon, 2001).

Gordon (2001) reported that low efficacious teachers, in distinct contrast, report chronic

behavior concerns with students, feel upset and disappointment with behaviors, and

sometimes develop a sense of guilt. The low efficacious teachers tended to have more

behavior struggles with students and use more punitive and negative consequences when

attempting to manage the behaviors. These teachers produced students with lower

achievement levels.

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Instructional Strategies

Parkay, Greenwood, Olejnik, and Proller (1988) purported that efficacy is

determined by the extent that teachers regard their actions as the starter for successful

learning events. A strong efficacy belief in instructional strategies minimizes the stress

associated with planning for desired outcomes (Parkay et al., 1988). In a study looking at

middle school teachers and English Language Learners, Parkay et al. (1988) reported that

teacher stress directly affected student achievement. Furthermore, Parkay et al. reported

that teachers with lower efficacy beliefs tend to burn out faster and leave the profession prematurely.

Unique instructional techniques are used by teachers that hold high levels of self-efficacy. Langer (2000) believes that when teachers lead effective professional lives, students will make gains. She studied ways to improve students' literacy abilities. Langer conducted her research in 44 middle and high school classrooms across four states and 25 different schools and districts over a five-year span. Her conclusions were that high efficacious teachers were able to maintain students staying on task; construct direct, academic instruction; create hands-on learning opportunities; inquiry learning events, and incorporate high order thinking and processing skills. These experiences led to increased student achievement and caring student-teacher relationships (Langer, 2000).

Zahorik, Halbach, Ehrle, and Molnar (2003) assert that teachers with higher self-efficacy engaged in using multiple pedagogy styles and instructional methods within one learning event to provide the most effective opportunities for all students to learn. A teacher's influence over students is measured by the way instruction is delivered and the amount of attention a teacher gives to individual students (Zahorik et al., 2003). Effective teachers focus on learning. Effective and efficacious teachers stress with students both personal and academic learning goals (Zahorik et al., 2003). Teachers with higher efficacy primarily focus their instruction on providing learning opportunities for students with foundational and critical thinking skills to be successful (Zahorik et al., 2003).

Using a variety of instructional techniques leads to increased student engagement, which consistently leads to improved learning (National Academy of Science, 2004).

Exceptional instruction leads students into interactive learning experiences. Teachers must be facilitators of students' own learning opportunities through questioning, meaningful discussions, and higher-level thinking events that lead to increased learning. In this form of instruction, learning facilitators are viewed to be instructionally effective when teachers can offer constructive and prescriptive feedback on student's work, which in turn informs them of their advancement into learning (Tournaki, Lyublinskaya, & Carolan, 2009). Greenberg (2005) named this instructional environment a learning laboratory. His laboratory becomes an environment full of learning processes and experiences. Students may not solidify learning without the support of an effective teacher who believes in their skills and knowledge to transfer information with clarity to students (Ashman & Conway, 1997). Teacher self-efficacy plays a major role in overcoming the disconnect between teaching and actual learning.

Swars and McMunn-Dooley (2010) contended that teachers with lower self-efficacy were not as effective in successfully using a variety of instructional strategies compared to teachers with high self-efficacy. Swars and McMunn-Dooley (2010) studied a professional development model at Georgia State University that analyzed 21 pre-service teachers' experiences in learning to teach mathematics and sciences. They found that the learning prompted improved self-efficacy. The professional development was based on training, support, and application of best practices. These researchers have suggested looking into approaches to teacher preparation that connect university programs and schools so pre-service teachers can connect theory and practice and build efficacy through the transition of a college student to classroom practitioner (Swars & McMunn-Dooley, 2010).

Teachers with a strong sense of efficacy provide adequate instruction for all students in the class. These educators maximize instructional time with students and continue to find ways to connect with students and learning. Instructional strength is critical to any learning situation.

Impact on Student Achievement

Teacher efficacy is easily explained by a teacher's "judgment of his or her capabilities to bring about desired outcomes of student engagement and learning, even among those students who may be difficult or unmotivated" (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, p. 783). Dembo and Gibson (1985) contended that there was a connection between teachers who committed more time working with students with learning disabilities or challenges and heightened levels of teacher self-efficacy. The rationale for improving efficacy beliefs includes the benefits of greater teacher productiveness, improved academic attitudes, and collective commitments to increasing student achievement.

Berman et al. (1977) explained perceptions of outcomes are the direct result of personal behavior, internal attempts, or the external forces or events. Teachers' self-efficacy not only contributes to their influences on students but also to their educational system as a whole. Teachers must understand how important their belief is in how they can affect and influence student achievement to bring about desired outcomes. A teacher's belief in how they can influence a student's outcome is the greatest factor in student achievement (Berman et al., 1977). Students are influenced by their teacher's enthusiasm and engagement. Zepke and Leach (2010) synthesized 93 research studies

from ten different countries and concluded students were found to be able to engage deeper in learning when they were able to experience an academic challenge.

Guo, McDonald-Connor, Yang, Roehrig, and Morrison (2013) from the Univesity of Chicago looked at longitudinal data from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Study of Early Child Care and Youth Development. This data consisted of reading outcomes of 1,043 fifth grade students and discovered that self-efficacy had a greater impact on achievement than did teacher's education or experience. The researchers also examined classroom practices by conducting a survey to determine to what extent teachers believe they can make a difference in their students' achievement. The results yielded highly efficacious teachers show increased support for student's learning and can create a more positive learning environment (Guo et al., 2013). These findings also indicate student achievement is based on the emotional and responsive support and evaluative feedback they received from teachers. A positive note is that the relationship associated with a teacher's self-efficacy and student achievement can be fostered through improved classroom practices (Guo et al., 2013).

Most school systems still work under isolation practices with little effort placed on the critical effects of collaboration and teamwork among teachers, administrators, parents, and community members (Epstein & Sanders, 2006). Teacher self-efficacy in student engagement and instructional strategies was significantly associated with the fostering of self-efficacy practices that are developed in a collaborative school system (Krizman, 2013). A study that focused on the relationship between parental involvement and teachers' self-efficacy was conducted by Krizman (2013). She surveyed 49 middle school teachers from two different school districts along Mississippi's Gulf Coast using

the TSES and interview questions. The findings of her research indicated that a moderately strong relationship existed between teachers' self-efficacy and the use of parental involvement practices to ensure student achievement. Higher levels of teacher's self-efficacy were associated with more frequent use of modeling, consistent prescriptive feedback, and individualized support that teachers receive from their school leaders and teammates (Krizman, 2013).

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership was first coined and defined by Burns (1978). This early definition of leadership was based on individuals obtaining high levels of morality and motivation when leaders and followers support each other. Bass (1985) further defined the concept with his research and marketing of the style. He declared transformational leadership involved modeling of integrity and fairness, goal setting through building consensus, encouraging and supporting others, recognizing others successes, and stirring the emotions of people (Bass, 1985).

A transformational leader will pay careful attention to the needs of subordinates by attempting to share and understand individual concerns or their developmental desires or needs (Bass, Waldman, Avolio & Bebb, 1987). According to Bass (2000), transformational leadership defines a leader's ability to advance the beliefs of current self-interests through intellectual stimulation, inspirational influences, or individualized consideration. Leithwood (1992) proclaimed leaders are continually attempting to meet three primary goals: assisting staff in the development and sustainment of a professional and collaborative team culture, cultivating teacher development, and helping them problem solve together more beneficially. School leaders whose actions resemble

transformational leadership behaviors tend to enable teachers to rise above their personal limitations and help foster beliefs in themselves, eventually, creating commitments to collective goals. The ability to alter teachers' intentions from self-interest seeking to the common interest of the organization is a successful mind shift that transformational leaders may obtain (Leithwood, 1992).

According to the work of the Wallace Foundation (2013) over the last decade in educational leadership, researchers have provided evidence about what creates an effective leader. This evidence leads to the nature of the principal's role and the influence they may have on student achievement. The Wallace Foundation (2013) has published over 70 studies reporting on public schools in at least 28 states and a multitude of districts within them. These studies covered topics involving school leadership behavior, responsibilities, training, and evaluations. The culminating message from the Wallace Foundation (2013) describes five principles or key standards of practice to lead a school community successfully. These standards include shaping a vision for all to pursue, creating a climate conducive to learning, cultivating leadership qualities in others, improving instruction, and managing staff, data-decisions, and processes to encourage school improvement.

Educational leadership is a complex responsibility. Specifically, principals must lead different groups of people or stakeholders, which involves rallying them around a mission and vision and ensuring all students meet educational goals. Styles and qualities of leadership are diverse and individualized. In schoolhouses across the country, several leadership styles are prevalent. Among the most effective is transformational leadership (Collins, 2014).

Transformational leadership is found in many working sectors, not just education; however, the fundamentals of transformational leadership are found in best practices. According to Stone, Russell, and Patterson (2003), leaders of various organizations share the ability to articulate a clear, concise vision while attaining buy-in for the vision. These individuals act confidently and with optimism. They find ways to express confidence and build confidence in others. All transformational leaders tend to model actions, lead by example, and empower others to achieve collective goals (Stone et al., 2003). Within educational settings, transformational leaders find common ground, build cultures for change, support collective requirements, and support classroom visits (ERIC, 1992).

Transformational leaders act in deliberate ways. Hoyt and Blascovich (2003) attempted to define leadership by claiming it is "a method of influencing groups or individuals to support and meet group goals" (p. 679). Specifically, concerning transformational leadership, trust has been associated with a group or with an individual as an important aspect of influence (Hoyt & Blascovich, 2003).

Transformational Leadership Characteristics

Several characteristics are associated with transformational leaders, but four major characteristics encompass the behavior or actions of transformational style leaders. These include idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Sullivan and Decker (2001) described transformational leadership as "a leadership style focused on effecting revolutionary change in organizations through a commitment to the organization's vision" (p. 57). Transformational leadership embarks on the development of a vision and mission,

development of individual and collective commitments, and development and accomplishment of goals (Sullivan & Decker, 2001).

Similar to Sullivan and Decker, Leithwood (1993) described specific behaviors displayed by transformational leaders. Transformational leadership encompasses sharing a vision, modeling professional practice, holding high expectations, intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, and developing expertise in teachers (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000). Developing interdependency as well as individualized support are equally important dimensions of a transformational leader's challenges (Leithwood, 1993).

Of the identified transformational practices involving vision, modeling, high expectations, intellectual stimulation, support of individuals, and developing expertise, Leithwood (1994) associated some with being teacher effects and others relating more to a group. Modeling desired behavior and providing intellectual stimulation and individualized support are found to be more effective when used in conjunction with the fostering of group goals (Leithwood, 1994). Creating a vision, holding high expectations, and the development of expertise are practices that tend to assist leaders in ensuring teachers reach goals (Leithwood, 1994).

Similar to Leithwood's findings, Sergiovanni (1995) suggests transformational leaders motivate their employees to obtain higher levels of efficiency and collected commitments. Transformational leadership encourages opportunity by increasing expectations. Through the cultural, human, symbolic, technical, and educational leadership forces identified by Sergiovanni (1995), principals will be powerful adaptive

leaders. Principals must also be knowledgeable in learning theory and curriculum and assist teachers with utilizing different instructional strategies (Sergiovanni, 1995).

In support of Sullivan and Decker and Hoyt and Blascovich's beliefs, Bass and Riggio (2006) contend transformational leaders are concerned with building trust within their organizations. They work to inspire people to be aware of the established shared vision. Engraining inspirational motivation is essential to a transformational leader. With intrinsic motivation, great work is done (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Transformational leaders campaign to build collective commitments. As teachers are working collaboratively, a transformational leader is encouraging their efforts and promoting how their contributions are critical to the organization's goals. Patterson, Grenny, Maxfield, McMillan, and Switzler (2007) are in support of some transformational leadership qualities. Patterson et al. (2007) contended that the most influential strategies practiced by transformational leaders were their ability to impact thinking and behavior of others. Among the most productive strategies they recount are positive peer pressure and definitive data that cause them to act in new ways (Patterson et al., 2007).

Relationship Between Transformational Leadership and Teacher Self-Efficacy

The leadership of the principal has had a positive impact on teachers' self-efficacy (King & Kerchner, 1991). In school settings where behavior disruptions were kept to a minimum and teachers felt a sense of common purpose, there was a greater sense of efficacy. Principals, who furnish proper resources and support and protect teachers from damaging factors yet still allow teachers autonomy in their classrooms, can lay the foundation for stronger efficacy beliefs to develop (Hipp & Bredeson, 1995).

Furthermore, when the principal modeled appropriate behavior and rewarded

performance, results yielded greater self-efficacy among teachers (Hipp & Bredeson,

1995).

The results of a study conducted by Coladarci (1992) in which 364 K-8 Maine

educators participated determined that principal support in conjunction with teacher

collaboration, advanced levels of teachers' self-efficacy. When teachers felt support and

acquired efficacy, they tended to hold confidence in their capabilities to achieve

excellence and were able to increase the levels of student achievement (Coladarci, 1992).

Coladarci studied the relationship between teachers' sense of efficacy and teachers'

responses to the question "Suppose you had to do it all over again: In view of your

present knowledge, would you become a teacher?" (Coladarci, 1992). Teachers with a

higher a sense of efficacy had a greater sense of commitment, taught with greater

enthusiasm, and were far more likely to stay in the teaching profession longer (Coladarci,

1992).

Teachers' perceptions of their leader are conditional on their feelings about the

expectations established, past conduct or reputation of the organization, performance of

the previous leaders, and affective or cognitive processes of individuals (Foti, Knee, &

Backert, 2008). The visionary and transformational leadership practices are considered

more recent leadership delivery theories. These unique theories are centered on

perceptual processes and employ the perceptions of subordinates to determine the level of

influence a leader is able to bestow on staff (Awamleh & Gardner, 1999).

Balkundi, Harrison, and Kilduff (2011) formulated two models: centrality to

charisma and charisma to centrality. The first model, centrality to charisma establishes

leaders occupy a central location or physical space to be seen as having extraordinary qualities. The second model, charisma to centrality, focuses on charisma as a central trait needed to influence subordinates. Balkundi, et al. (2011), further explained the public appearance and visible qualities of a leader were less important than the personal interactions shared when deducing effectiveness. Focused personal interactions are made possible by trusting relationships. To gain respect and trust, a transformational leader is skilled in soliciting advice from followers and paying attention to personalized needs (Balkundi et al., 2011).

Having a trusting relationship is critical when change is necessary in an organization; a transformational leader is able to improve school conditions and foster collective commitments necessary to make changes to better the learning environment (Fullan, 2002). Transformational leaders are concerned with culture and capacity building. When principals focus on the development of teachers' knowledge and skills to develop experts, work on professional learning communities, incorporate logical and consistent programs that hold high expectations, and ensure necessary resources and supports are easily accessible, the culture of the schooling community is cohesive and sustainable (Fullan, 2002).

Leadership plays an instrumental role in increasing efficacy in teachers. Teachers who are content in the school environment, are encouraged by the leadership, and distinguish that principals exert influence over others for teachers' gain or assistance, are prone to hold much higher efficacy opinions (Leithwood, 1997). A study was conducted by Lewandowski (2005) in which she sought to analyze the association between teachers' self-efficacy and the influence of leadership and professional growth. Teachers

completed the Nature of School Leadership Survey (Leithwood, 1997). Results of the study supported teachers holding low efficacy beliefs claimed with more conviction that their leaders displayed the practices measured by the Nature of School Leadership (1997) survey than did those holding high efficacy beliefs.

The results of the study conducted by McCoy (2014) involving administrators and faculty of 20 colleges in the Alabama Community College System (ACCS) determined transformational leadership included a compelling correlation with beliefs of a collective culture. Using a multifactor leadership questionnaire and a collective efficacy scale, the researcher found a positive correlation between the degree of transformational leadership and the degree of collective teacher efficacy dimensions. The areas on the leadership continuum with the most positive correlation were influence, motivation, stimulation, and consideration (McCoy, 2014).

The impact of transformational leadership actions on a teacher's efficacy was captured in a study conducted by Dale (2012) in an East Tennessee School District involving middle school teachers. The participants were surveyed about their beliefs of principal leadership traits, job satisfaction, and efficacy. Efficacy levels were closely dependent on the teachers' perceptions of their principal's leadership style. Furthermore, the researcher was able to validate teachers' perceptions that principals need to engage in transformational leadership behaviors to assist teachers in becoming more relevant in the classroom. The teachers indicated during this study that the most concerning categories of transformational leadership that affected them were support, availability, training and resources, respect, and assertiveness (Dale, 2012).

As teacher efficacy reportedly influences various behaviors of teaching and

attitudes of educators, understanding the impact that supervision has on a teacher's belief in their capabilities is critical. Studies by Blasé and Blasé (2001), Bulach, Michael and Booth (1999), and Ross and Gray (2004) have deduced a compelling relationship linking leadership responses of principals and teachers' sense of self-efficacy and collective efficacy exists.

In a national study of 809 educators from public high schools, middle schools, and elementary schools throughout the United States, Blasé and Blasé (2001) determined influential principal characteristics on classroom instruction.
Blasé & Blasé (2001) noted six characteristics of effective leaders.

> 1) avoids restrictive and intimidating approaches to teachers; (2) believes in teacher choice and discretion; (3) integrates collaboration, inquiry, and reflective discussions; (4) embraces growth and change; (5) respects teachers' knowledge and abilities; (6) and are committed to enacting school improvement and reform. (p. 22)

Blasé and Blasé (2001) contended that principals who were effective leaders enabled the elevation of teacher consideration on learning and their professional practices. Consequently, teachers utilized more of a variety of instructional strategies, included more reflection into their practices, and became confident risk-takers and planners who are more productive. Results also suggested principals encouraged organizational collaboration, the creation of more professional learning opportunities, promoted teacher's reflective behavior, and supply necessary literacy resources (Blasé & Blasé, 2001).

A study developed by Demir (2008) involved 218 elementary school teachers from 66 different schools. The objective of the study was to test the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors of principals and the positive impact it had on teachers' self-efficacy. A teacher efficacy survey was used to look at the four factors of collective efficacy, self-efficacy, transformational leadership, and collaborative culture. Demir (2008) found transformational leadership had a significant influence on collective teacher efficacy. She also reported transformational leadership behaviors of principals had a significant relationship with collaborative school culture. Teachers' self-efficacy leads to personal beliefs in their capabilities, which renders more confidence in collective tasks and culture (Demir, 2008).

Teacher self-efficacy is a major contributing factor to the success of students and the schooling community (Portin et al., 2003). The behavior of a building leader may directly contribute to the amount of confidence and competence teachers exude. The relationship that exists between a teacher'self-efficacy in classroom instruction, classroom management, or student engagement and the teacher's perception of their principal leading with transformational qualities must be analyzed (Portin et al. 2003). Transformational leaders are those who create working and learning environments that promote a sense of purpose, focus on student achievement, and build capacity for collective commitments through well-orchestrated guidance and support. Studies show positive correlations among the relationship between transformational leaders and promoting and growing efficacy in teachers (Portin et al. 2003).

In 2009, Horn-Turpin surveyed 121 special education teachers across region seven in Virginia. The purpose of Horn-Turpin's study was to determine if special

education teachers perceived transformational leadership behaviors as being significantly related to teacher efficacy, job satisfaction, or organizational commitment. Horn-Turpin used the *Teacher Efficacy Survey Short Form* developed by Hoy and Woolfolk (2001). Horn-Turpin's (2009) factor analysis supported that transformational leadership was significantly related to the factors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. His findings did not indicate that administrative support was significantly linked to teacher self-efficacy (Horn-Turpin, 2009).

A study was conducted in Northern and Southern regions of Greece by Gkolia and Belias (2014) to discover the impact of principals' transformational leadership on teachers' efficacy and job satisfaction. Gkolia and Belias randomly sampled 640 teachers from 77 elementary and secondary schools with a Teacher Satisfaction Inventory. Their findings revealed transformational leadership had a significant positive effect on teacher satisfaction, individualized support, and overall relationships between principal and teacher and teacher and student. Gkolia and Belias (2014) contend principals must model behaviors and expectations for teachers, help teachers to collaborate and work toward common goals, and respect and concern themselves with teacher's personal feelings.

Chen (2014) examined whether a relationship existed between self-perceived transformational leadership practices of principals and student academic achievement. In his study, 154 principals from California middle schools and high schools were surveyed with a leadership practices inventory. According to Chen (2014), transformational leadership had no significant effect on student achievement or student performance on the California State Assessment known as CAHSEE. However, multiple regressions were conducted to determine how much of the self-perceived transformational leadership and

what factors contributed to scores. The first set controlled a single variable, transformational leadership, and how it was practiced by the principals. The results contended principals were concerned with students in free or reduced lunch programs, the utilization of instructional coaches, professional learning communities, and number of students per computer (Chen, 2014).

A study with 165 teachers from rural districts in southwest Virginia was conducted by Sallee (2014). The purpose of the research was to determine whether a relationship existed between teacher efficacy and the relationship between principals and teachers. Sallee (2014) reported a significant relationship between principals and teachers. Several themes and characteristics emerged from this study including eeffective communication, proper support and encouragement, visible involvement, professionalism and respect, and promoting teachers as professionals to promote high-quality relationships and boost efficacy (Sallee, 2014).

Summary

Chapter two presented studies and findings related to self-efficacy and transformational leadership. The definition, origin, and effects of efficacy were given. The impact that self-efficacy has on student achievement was reported. To foster self-efficacy in teachers, looking into the values and benefits is essential. Levels of efficacy vary among teachers. Beliefs in their abilities to provide effective instruction, engage students properly, and manage their students in a way that provides an environment that is conducive to learning all fluctuate. The definition and practices of transformational leadership were given. The relationship between self-efficacy and transformational leadership was established. With the influence of a transformational leader's behaviors,

self-efficacy and collective commitments can develop. Specific practices were identified. When a leader is concerned with individuals' needs, rewards performance, elicits feedback, shares in decision-making, and models professional behavior, teachers will respond positively. In chapter three, the methods used to study the extent of the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom instruction, classroom management, and student engagement and their principal's transformational leadership practices are described. Research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation, measurement, validity and reliability, data selection procedures, data analysis, hypotheses testing, and limitations are all components of chapter three.

Chapter Three

Methods

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent that there is a relationship between a teachers' self-efficacy (in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management) and their perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership qualities. The methodology used in this study is described in this chapter. Included are the research design, population and sample, sampling procedures, instrumentation (including measurement, validity, and reliability), data collection procedures, data analysis and hypothesis testing, and limitations.

Research Design

A quantitative correlational survey research design was utilized to examine teachers' self-efficacy in relationship to their perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership. The dependent variables were the teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. The independent variables were the teacher's perceptions of the extent to which the principals have a shared vision, build consensus, hold high-performance expectations, model behavior, provide individualized support, provide intellectual stimulation, strengthen school culture, and build collaborative structures.

Population and Sample

The population for this study was comprised of all elementary educators in the state of Kansas. The sample for this research study included elementary educators in the following districts: Valley Falls, Jefferson County North, Jefferson County West, Oskaloosa, McLouth, Perry LeCompton, Easton, and Atchison County School Districts.

General classroom, special education, physical education, music, and library/media teachers from all elementary schools in these districts were included in the sample.

Sampling Procedures

Nonrandom purposive sampling was used for the current research study. Specific criteria were used to locate the survey participants. The first adopted criterion for participation in the study was to be an elementary school teacher from Valley Falls USD 338, Jefferson County North USD 339, Jefferson County West USD 340, Oskaloosa USD 341, McLouth USD 342, Perry LeCompton USD 343, Easton USD 449, and Atchison County School District USD 377 during the 2015-2016 school year. The second established criterion was the participant must have been a certified general educator, special educator, or a special area educator in music, physical education, or library media from the elementary schools.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument used in this research study was derived from two distinct tools. The two surveys were combined into one survey; however, both were used in their entirety without altering the item content or sequence. The first part of the instrument, the Teacher's Sense of Teacher Efficacy Scale (TSTES), was used to measure a teacher's efficacy. The developers were Tschannen-Moran from College of William & Mary and Woolfolk Hoy from the Ohio State University (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The TSTES (see Appendix A) is available in a 12-item short form or the 24-item long form. The long form survey was used in this study. The TSTES was developed from Bandura's (1977) theory that motivation comes from people's judgments of their abilities to perform specific tasks and their expectations about the consequences of those

performances. The TSTES items were designed to obtain data regarding three areas that

create difficulties for teachers in their activities or environments (Bandura, 1977). The

TSTES includes 24 items scored using a 9-point Likert-type scale ranging from *Nothing*

(1), *Very Little* (3), *Some Influence* (5), *Quite a Bit* (7), to *A Great Deal* (9). The TSTES

is structured with eight items for each of the three self-efficacy categories including items

measuring efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom

management (Tschannen-Moran, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001.)

The second part of the survey utilized in this study was the Nature of School

Leadership Survey (NSLS) (see Appendix B), developed by Leithwood and Jantzi from

the University of Toronto in 1994. The NSLS was used to measure the extent to which

teachers felt their administrators' behaviors and actions were transformational based on

six distinct categories (Leithwood, 1997). These categories are building shared vision,

building consensus, demonstrating high expectations, modeling professional behavior,

provides individualized support, provides intellectual stimulation, strengthens school

culture, and builds collaborative structures. The NSLS includes 50 items scored using a

6-point Likert scale of (1) *Strongly Agree,* (2) *Moderately Agree*, (3) *Agree Slightly More*

Than Disagree, (4) *Disagree Slightly More Than Agree*, (5) *Moderately Disagree*, (6)

Strongly Disagree.

Measurement. For the dependent variable of perceived self-efficacy in student

engagement, items on the TSTES were 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 12, 14, and 22. These eight items

were averaged to produce a mean score for teacher self-efficacy in student engagement.

The range of possible values for the score was between 1 and 9. For the dependent

variable of perceived self-efficacy in instructional strategies, items on the TSTES were 7,

10, 11, 17, 18, 20, 23, and 24. These eight items were averaged to produce a mean score for self-efficacy in instructional strategies. The range of possible values was between 1 and 9. For the dependent variable of perceived self-efficacy in classroom management, items on the TSTES survey were 3, 5, 8, 13, 15, 16, 19, and 21. Responses to the eight items were averaged to produce a mean score for teacher self-efficacy in classroom management. The range of possible values was between 1 and 9.

The independent variables in research questions 1, 2, and 3 were measured using the NSLS containing eight transformational leadership practices: builds school vision, builds consensus, demonstrates high expectations, models professional practice, individualizes support, intellectual stimulation, strengthens school culture, and develops structures to build collaborative structures. The survey consisted of 50 items.

For purposes of this study, the following items from the NSLS were reverse coded due to the wording of the items: 3, 28, 33, 36, 39, 41, and 48 before averages were calculated. Specific wording used was not perceived as transformational when the teacher *Strongly Agreed*. For example, item 28 states: lacks awareness of my unique needs and expertise. To show this to be transformational, *Strongly Disagree* would need to be selected. The recoding scheme is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Reverse Coding Indicators

Original Coding	Revised Reverse Coding
(1) Strongly Agree	(6) Strongly Agree
(2) Moderately Agree	(5) Moderately Agree
(3) Agree Slightly More than Disagree	(4) Agree Slightly More than Disagree
(4) Disagree Slightly More than Agree	(3) Disagree Slightly More than Agree
(5) Moderately Disagree	(2) Moderately Disagree
(6) Strongly Disagree	(1) Strongly Disagree

Building school vision was measured by the average of the responses to items 1, 14, 24, 37, and 44. The potential range of scores was between 1 and 6. Building consensus was measured by the average of the responses to items 2, 11, 25, 33, and 49. The potential range of scores was between 1 and 6. Demonstrating high expectations was measured by the average of the responses to items were 9, 13, 26, and 30. The potential range of scores was between 1 and 6. Modeling professional practice was measured by the average of the responses to items 4, 10, 21, 27, 31, 45, 47, and 50. The potential range of scores was between 1 and 6. Individualized support was measured by the average of the responses to items were 5, 15, 28, 32, 39, and 43. The potential range of scores was between 1 and 6. Intellectual stimulation was measured by the average of the responses to items 6, 12, 17, 22, 29, 34, and 40. The potential range of scores was between 1 and 6. School culture was measured by the average of responses to items 7, 16, 20, 23, 35, 38, 41, and 46. The potential range of scores was between 1 and 6. Developing structures to build collaborative structures was measured by the average of

the responses to items 3, 8, 18, 19, 36, 42, and 48. The potential range of scores was between 1 and 6. The independent variables were the teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal's transformational leadership has a shared vision, builds consensus, holds high- performance expectations, models behavior, provides individualized support, provides intellectual stimulation, strengthens school culture, and builds collaborative structures.

Reliability and validity. Reliability and validity are important to survey construction. No instrument can claim 100% reliability or validity and for that reason, analyzing the reliability and validity is critical for a quality study. "Reliability is the degree to which an instrument is a consistent measure" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 181). "Validity is the degree to which an instrument measures what it purports to measure" (Lunenburg & Irby, 2008, p. 181).

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy constructed three instruments to measure teachers' self-efficacy. They used the data produced from three instruments to construct a final instrument, the TSTES (Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). To assess the reliability of the TSTES, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated. The coefficient alpha reliabilities from the TSTES were .91 for instructional strategies, .90 for classroom management, and .87 for student engagement, and the overall reliability was .94 (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The construct validity of the TSTES was based on correlations with other measures including the RAND 1 and 2 items and the Gibson and Dembo's personal teaching efficacy (PTE) and general teaching efficacy (GTE). All instruments were positively related. The strongest correlation was between the TSTES and Gibson and Dembo's PTE. The weakest correlation was between TSTES

and Gibson and Dembo's GTE. All of the correlations were statistically significant, p

<.01. These results indicate that the TSTES is reliable and valid. The following table

provides validity correlations.

Table 3

Validity Correlations

Instrument	Validity Correlations with TSTES
RAND 1	.18
RAND 2	.52
Personal Teacher Efficacy	.61
Gibson and Dembo's PTE	.16

Note. Obtained from research results provided by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy, 2001

The construct validity of the NSLS was derived from the framework established

by Leithwood in collaboration with Jantzi (1994). This survey measured eight different

dimensions of transformational leadership. Several surveys have been constructed and

adapted since 1994. These surveys were developed with varying dimensions of

transformational leadership and number of survey items. The number of dimensions has

varied. Survey dimensions varied among four, six, and eight dimensions of

transformational leadership (Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996). The surveys were constructed

from 24-items up to 87-items (Jantzi & Leithwood, 1996).

The NSLS (1995) has a high overall Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of

.967 for measuring the various aspects of transformational leadership (J. Freeland,

personal communication, December 5, 2015). These coefficients provide strong evidence

for the validity and reliability of the measurement that was provided by teachers using these surveys.

Table 4

Cronbach's Alpha Reliabilities for Eight Subscales of Transformational Leadership

Subscale	Cronbach's Alpha Reliabilities
A Shared Vision for School	.894
Builds Consensus	.894
Holds High Expectations	.755
Models Behavior	.899
Provides Individualized Support	.844
Provides Intellectual Stimulation	.917
Strengthens School Culture	.904
Builds Collaborative Structures	.855

Note. Obtained from personal communication with J. Freeland, December 5, 2015

Data Collection Procedures

Preceding the data collection, permission to conduct the research was obtained. The eight school district superintendents in the Keystone Learning Services Cooperative orally granted permission for their principals to encourage teacher participation. The purpose of the study and the research questions were shared with the eight superintendents during the October 2014 Keystone superintendent and board of directors meeting.

Permission from Baker University to conduct research was requested on November 4, 2015. An Institutional Review Board (IRB) form was submitted to the Baker University IRB committee (see Appendix C). Included with the IRB form were

letters constructed to provide insight into surveys and requirements for participation in the study. One letter addressed Elementary principals and solicited their help and support in encouraging their staff to participate (see Appendix E). The second letter was for the teachers (see Appendix F). The IRB committee approved the request on November 13, 2015 (see Appendix D).

After the research study had been approved by the selected Kansas school districts, the IRB was submitted to Baker University. After permission had been granted, the principals in the districts received letters that contained survey links to be sent to teachers. Teacher participation was completely voluntary, and their answers were confidential and combined with the responses of other participants in summary form. Information reported did not include any individuals, schools, or school districts. The completion of the survey indicated consent to participate and permission to use the information provided in the study. Participants entered their responses in Survey Monkey.

Teachers in every building received the same link to the survey. Four participation reminders were sent to principals via email to forward to staff about the completion of the survey. The initial email was sent on January 7, 2016 (see Appendix G). The first reminder was sent via email on Jan. 28, 2016 (see Appendix G). The second reminder was sent via email on February 4, 2016 (see Appendix G). A third reminder was sent via email on February 11, 2016 (see Appendix G). The fourth and final reminder to participate in the survey was sent via email on February 18, 2016 (see Appendix G). The survey was closed, and the data collection process concluded on February 25, 2016.

Data Analysis and Hypothesis Testing

Data from Survey Monkey was downloaded and imported into Microsoft Excel. For each research question below, eight hypotheses are listed. A paragraph describing the hypothesis tests follows the list of eight hypotheses.

RQ1. To what extent is there a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational?

H1. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal has a shared vision.

H2. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal builds consensus.

H3. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal holds high-performance expectations.

H4. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal models professional behavior.

H5. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal provides individualized support.

H6. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal provides intellectual stimulation.

H7. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal strengthens school culture.

H8. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal builds collaborative structures.

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their principals' leadership is transformational as measured by the following characteristics: the principal has a shared vision, builds consensus, holds high-performance expectations, models professional behavior, provides individualized support, provides intellectual stimulation, strengthens school culture, and builds collaborative structures. A one-sample *t* test was

conducted to test for the statistical significance of each of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance for each hypothesis test was set at .05.

RQ2. To what extent is there a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational?

H9. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal has a shared vision.

H10. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal builds consensus.

H11. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal holds high-performance expectations.

H12. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal models behavior.

H13. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal provides individualized support.

H14. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal provides intellectual stimulation.

H15. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal strengthens school culture.

H16. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal builds collaborative structures.

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their principals' leadership is transformational as measured by the following characteristics: the principal has a shared vision, builds consensus, holds high-performance expectations, models professional behavior, provides individualized support, provides intellectual stimulation, strengthens school culture, and builds collaborative structures. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance of each of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance for each hypothesis test was set at .05.

RQ3. To what extent is there a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their principals' leadership is transformational?

H17. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal has a shared vision.

H18. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal builds consensus.

H19. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal holds high-performance expectations.

H20. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal models behavior.

H21. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal provides individualized support.

H22. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal provides intellectual stimulation.

H23. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal strengthens school culture.

H24. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal builds collaborative structures.

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teachers' self-efficacy in student

engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their principals' leadership is transformational as measured by the following characteristics: the principal has a shared vision, builds consensus, holds high-performance expectations, models professional behavior, provides individualized support, provides intellectual stimulation, strengthens school culture, and builds collaborative structures. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance of each of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance for each hypothesis test was set at .05.

Limitations

To avoid misinterpretation of the findings, Lunenburg and Irby (2008) suggested that limitations should be shared. In this study, to gain the full sample of participants, the researcher was dependent upon the support of the principals in soliciting the participation of their teachers. The researcher did not have control over how much support the principal provided in ensuring that the teachers were notified about the study or the encouragement the principal provided to teachers to complete the survey. The study had the following limitations:

1. Participants who did not respond to the survey may have responded to questions differently than the participants who did respond, hence threatening the external validity of the study.

2. The survey was restricted to a rating scale and did not allow for explanations or elaboration of thoughts of participants. No additional information was collected or used in the study other than the surveys.

Summary

      Chapter three components involve quantitative study and the survey used for data collection. Demographics of the Keystone Learning Services Cooperative districts and specific elementary participants were described. Research questions and hypothesis statements focused on the distinct perceptions of teachers about efficacy beliefs and transformational qualities of their principals. Instrumentation including validity and reliability of the surveys was included. Limitations associated with the study were noted. The results of the data collected were organized with descriptive statistics and outcomes of hypotheses testing.

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between elementary teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, classroom management, instructional strategies, and classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational. In this study, eight specifics practices of transformational leadership were measured. This chapter presents the findings of the study including the descriptive statistics and results of the hypothesis testing.

Descriptive Statistics

The population for this study was elementary teachers in eight districts of the Keystone Learning Cooperative. A letter was sent to the eight principals who forwarded the letter and a survey link to 126 teachers. After the data from 50 surveys was downloaded, seven surveys were incomplete and were not used in the analyses. The incomplete surveys included the Teacher Self-Efficacy Survey portion items 1 through 24 or surveys where several items were left blank by participants. Forty-three completed surveys were included in the analysis.

Hypothesis Testing

This section includes the research questions followed by the analysis. The research questions are followed by eight hypotheses concluding with the results of the analysis. The summary included in this section revealed findings of teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and any link there is to the eight transformational .leadership practices of the principals. These practices include the ability to share a vision, build consensus, hold high-

performance expectations, model professional behavior, provide individualized support, provide intellectual stimulation, strengthen school culture, and build collaborative structures. Due to the nature of the Likert-type scales on the two surveys, a negative correlation between the teacher's self-efficacy and the teacher's perception of the principal's transformational leadership practices indicates that teachers who perceived the principals as highly transformational also held high self-efficacy beliefs, and in contrast teachers who did not perceive the principals to be highly transformational saw themselves as not having high self-efficacy beliefs.

RQ1. To what extent is there a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational?

Eight Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their principals' leadership is transformational as measured by the following practices: the principal has a shared vision, builds consensus, holds high-performance expectations, models professional behavior, provides individualized support, provides intellectual stimulation, strengthens school culture, and builds collaborative structures. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance of each of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance for each hypothesis test was set at .05.

H1. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals'

leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal has a shared vision.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.118$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and the teachers' perceptions that the principal has a shared vision, $t = -.776$, $df = 43$, $p = .442$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with higher self-efficacy in student engagement also rated their principal as transformational in sharing the vision, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H2. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal builds consensus.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.130$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and a principal's ability to build consensus, $t = -.858$, $df = 43$, $p = .396$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in student engagement also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the consensus built by the principal, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H3. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals'

leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal holds high-performance expectations.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.043$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and a principal's high performance expectations, $t = .282$, $df = 43$, $p = .779$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in student engagement also rated the principal as more transformational as indicated by the high performance expectations principals hold, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H4. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal models professional behavior.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.075$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and a principal modeling professional behavior, $t = -.493$, $df = 43$, $p = .624$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in student engagement also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by modeling professional behavior, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H5. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals'

leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal provides individualized support.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.107$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and a principal providing individualized support, $t = -.709$, $df = 43$, $p = .482$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in student engagement also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the individualized support provided by the principal, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H6. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal provides intellectual stimulation.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.069$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and a principal providing intellectual stimulation, $t = -.452$, $df = 43$, $p = .654$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in student engagement also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the intellectual stimulation provided by the principal, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H7. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals'

leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal strengthens school culture.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.070$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and a principal strengthening school culture, $t = -.461$, $df = 43$, $p = .647$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in student engagement also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the principal strengthening school culture, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H8. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principals' leadership is transformational, as measured by the degree to which the principal builds collaborative structures.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.108$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between student engagement and a principal building collaborative structures, $t = -.715$, $df = 43$, $p = .478$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in student engagement also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the principal building collaborative structures, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

RQ2. To what extent is there a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational?

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their principals' leadership is transformational as measured by the following practices: the principal has a shared vision, builds consensus, holds high-performance expectations, models professional behavior, provides individualized support, provides intellectual stimulation, strengthens school culture, and builds collaborative structures. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance of each of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance for each hypothesis test was set at .05.

H9. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal has a shared vision.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.294$) provided evidence for a moderately strong negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated there was a statistically significant relationship between instructional strategies and the teachers' perceptions that the principal has a shared vision, $t = -2.017$, $df = 43$, $p = .049$. Teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in instructional strategies also rated their principal as transformational in sharing the vision.

H10. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal builds consensus.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.322$) provided evidence for a moderately strong negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test

indicated there was a statistically significant relationship between instructional strategies and built consensus, $t = -2.230$, $df = 43$, $p = .031$. Teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in instructional strategies also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the consensus built by the principal.

H11. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal holds high-performance expectations.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.113$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between instructional strategies and principals high performance expectations, $t = -.748$, $df = 43$, $p = .459$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in instructional strategies also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the high performance expectations principals hold, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H12. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal models behavior.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.286$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between instructional strategies and principal modeling behavior, $t = -1.957$, $df = 43$, $p = .057$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in student instructional strategies also rated

their principal as more transformational as indicated by modeling professional behavior, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H13. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal provides individualized support.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.325$) provided evidence for a moderately strong negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was a statistically significant relationship between instructional strategies and individualized support, $t = -2.251$, $df = 43$, $p = .030$. Teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in instructional strategies also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the individualized support provided by the principal.

H14. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal provides intellectual stimulation.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.247$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between instructional strategies and principal providing intellectual stimulation, $t = -1.670$, $df = 43$, $p = .102$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in instructional strategies also rated their principal as more transformational when providing intellectual stimulation, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H15. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal strengthens school culture.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.287$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between instructional strategies and principal strengthening school culture, $t = -1.965$, $df = 43$, $p = .056$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in instructional strategies also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the principal strengthening school culture, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H16. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal builds collaborative structures.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.325$) provided evidence for a moderately strong negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was a statistically significant relationship between instructional strategies and building collaborative structures, $t = -.328$, $df = 43$, $p = .028$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in instructional strategies also rated their principal as more transformational when building collaborative structures.

RQ3. To what extent is there a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their principals' leadership is transformational?

Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationships between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their principals' leadership is transformational as measured by the following practices: the principal has a shared vision, builds consensus, holds high-performance expectations, models professional behavior, provides individualized support, provides intellectual stimulation, strengthens school culture, and builds collaborative structures. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test for the statistical significance of each of the correlation coefficients. The level of significance for each hypothesis test was set at .05.

H17. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal has a shared vision.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.138$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between classroom management and vision, $t = -.911$, $df = 43$, $p = .368$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in classroom management also rated their principal as transformational in sharing the vision, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H18. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal builds consensus.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.119$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample *t* test indicated

there was not a statistically significant relationship between classroom management and building consensus, $t = -.787$, $df = 43$, $p = .436$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in classroom management also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the consensus built by the principal, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H19. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal holds high-performance expectations.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.125$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between classroom management and high-performance expectations, $t = -.824$, $df = 43$, $p = .415$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in classroom management also rated the principal as more transformational as indicated by the high performance expectations principals hold, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H20. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal models behavior.

The correlation coefficient ($r = -.094$) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between classroom management and modeling behavior, $t = -.616$, $df = 43$, $p = .541$. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in classroom management also rated the principal as

more transformational as indicated by modeling professional behavior, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H21. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal provides individualized support.

The correlation coefficient (r = -.148) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between classroom management and individualized support, t = -.979, df = 43, p = .333. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in classroom management also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the individualized support provided by the principal, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H22. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal provides intellectual stimulation.

The correlation coefficient (r = -.099) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between classroom management and intellectual stimulation, t = -.651, df = 43, p = .518. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy on classroom management also rated the principal as more transformational when providing intellectual stimulation, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H23. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal strengthens school culture.

The correlation coefficient (r = -.108) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between classroom management and strengthening school culture, t = -.709, df = 43, p = .482. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in classroom management also rated their principal as more transformational as indicated by the principal strengthening school culture, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

H24. There is a statistically significant relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal builds collaborative structures.

The correlation coefficient (r = -.102) provided evidence for a weak negative relationship between the two variables. The results of the one-sample t test indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship between classroom management and collaborative structures, t = -.671, df = 43, p = .506. Although teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy in classroom management also rated their principal as more transformational when building collaborative structures, the relationship was not statistically meaningful.

Summary

Included in chapter four were the results of the data analysis for each hypothesis to determine if there is a correlation between teachers' ratings of their self-efficacy with

regard to student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and their principals' transformational leadership practices as defined as sharing a vision, building consensus, modeling high-expectations, supporting individuals, stimulating intellect, building culture, and building collaborative structures. The findings indicated for the variables of self-efficacy in student engagement and classroom management there was not a statistically significant relationship with any of the transformational leadership practices. However, with regard to self-efficacy in instructional strategies, findings showed statistically significant relationships with teachers' perceptions of their principals' shared vision, building consensus, support of individuals, and collaborative structure building. In Chapter five, the following sections are included: the study summary, overview of the problem, purpose statement and research questions, review of methodology, major findings, and findings related to literature. Lastly, the conclusions section, the implications for action, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks close this chapter.

Chapter Five

Interpretation and Recommendations

The previous chapter presented results of the data analysis for this study. Chapter five concludes the study by revisiting the overview of the problem, the purpose of statement and research questions, the methodology, and the major findings of this research. An examination of the related literature follows these initial sections. Chapter five contains implications for action and recommendations for future research, which led to suggestions for extensions of the study. The chapter finishes with concluding remarks.

Study Summary

Recognizing teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management could help support best practices and student achievement. Leadership plays a vital role in the success of any organization, but specifically, this study investigates if there was a relationship that exists between teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and their perceptions of principals' transformational leadership practices. The next section states the purpose of the study and the research questions. The summary concludes with a review of the methodology and the study's major findings.

Overview of the Problem. Self-efficacy refers to the belief is one's capacity to engage in behaviors necessary to attain something or perform (Bandura, 1977). Teachers hold different levels of belief in efficacy with regard to their abilities in student engagement, instructional strategies, and Leadership plays an instrumental role in increasing efficacy in teachers. Teachers who are content in the school environment, are encouraged by the leadership, and distinguish that principals exert influence with others

for teachers' gain or assistance, are prone to hold much higher efficacy opinions (Leithwood, 1997). Therefore, the current research was conducted to discover to what extent there was a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which their principals' leadership is transformational.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions. The first purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between elementary teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational. The second purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational. The final purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which principals' leadership is transformational. Three research questions were created to capture the purposes of the study.

Review of the Methodology. This study involved a quantitative research design involving survey research method. Elementary teachers were surveyed with an instrument that combined two surveys involving elementary teachers in eight specific districts to examine to what extent there was a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and teachers' perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership. Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated to index the strength and direction of the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instruction strategies,

and classroom management and teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal has transformational leadership qualities. A one-sample *t* test was conducted to test the statistical significance of each correlation coefficient.

Major findings. The findings were derived from three research questions. The results related to research question one revealed that for teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and the eight transformational leadership practices, the relationships were not statistically meaningful. The principal's transformational practices included shared vision, building consensus, modeling professional behavior, providing individualized support, intellectual stimulation, building culture, and building collaborative structures.

From the results related to research question two, teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies, and the eight transformational leadership practices there were four areas that had a negative statistically significant relationship. Those were a principal's ability to share the vision, build consensus, offer individualized support, and build collaborative structures. Teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and the extent to which a principal has indicators of transformational leadership had four relationships that were not statistically meaningful, which included holding high expectations, modeling behavior, intellectual stimulations, and building culture.

Major findings related to research question three, teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management, and the eight transformational leadership practices, there were weak negative statistically insignificant relationships for all eight correlations. Those principal transformational leadership practices included shared vision, building consensus, modeling professional behavior, providing individualized support, intellectual

stimulation, holding high expectations, building culture, and building collaborative structures.

Findings Related to the Literature

The findings section evaluates this study's results in relationship to previous studies. Past studies provided evidence similar to the current study. Specifically, the current research explored the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and the extent to which teachers found their principals to engage in transformational practices. Several previous studies examined in the literature review directly support the current findings as well as some studies that are in contrast with findings.

Previous studies examining the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and to what extent teachers' perceptions of their principals as transformational leaders included in the current research range from 1991 to 2014. Teachers who tended to rate themselves with more self-efficacy on instructional strategies also rated their principal as transformational in sharing the vision, building consensus, and providing individualized support, which supports the research conducted by King and Kerchner (1991) and Hipp and Bredeson (1995). According to King and Kerchner (1991), principals had a positive impact on teachers' self-efficacy when a vision was shared, and a common purpose was communicated. These practices included sharing a vision, building consensus, offering individualized support, and building collaborative structures. The current study supports the research of Hipp and Bredeson's (1995) findings that when principals support individual teachers in their classrooms and still allow for some autonomy and model expected behaviors, a stronger foundation of efficacy is established.

The current research findings support a link between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and the extent to which a principal engages in transformational practices are consistent with those of Blasé and Blasé (2001) showing that principals who elevated teachers' self-efficacy enabled them to focus on learning and professional practices. In particular, teachers were engaging in varying instructional strategies and becoming confident risk takers and planners. Furthermore, both studies support that effective principals encourage structured collaboration.

Additionally, the findings associated with the current study, which found a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and the principal's transformational practice of sharing a vision was consistent with Sullivan and Decker (2001), Hoyt and Blascovich (2003), and Bass and Riggio (2006), who found that transformational leaders establish a shared vision. Principals inspire staff through inspirational motivation and individualized support. Specifically, Bass and Riggio (2006) contended when intrinsic motivation was present that great work was done.

Horn-Turpin's (2009) research supported transformational leadership was specifically related to the factors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment through building collaborative structures. The current study's data supports teachers with higher efficacy beliefs also found their principals to practice transformational practices especially in building collaborative structures. In contrast, Horn-Turpin conveyed that administrative support was not significantly linked to teacher self-efficacy (Turpin, 2009).

The current study is consistent with findings from a previous study conducted by Krizman (2013). Krizman (2003) found teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement

and instructional strategies was significantly associated with the fostering of self-efficacy practices that are developed in a collaborative school system (Krizman, 2013). Higher levels of teachers' self-efficacy were associated with more frequent use of modeling, consistent prescriptive feedback, and individualized support that teachers received from their school leaders and teammates (Krizman, 2013). The current study supports these findings with data suggesting when teachers' self-efficacy beliefs increase, so does their belief that principals' practices are more transformational.

Likewise, the findings from the current study are consistent with those of Gkolia and Belias's (2014) research on the impact of principals' transformation leadership on teachers' efficacy and job satisfaction. The current study supports their findings that transformational leadership had a significant positive effect on individual support of teachers and overall relationships between the principal, teacher, and students. Specifically, the current study supports that teachers view themselves as having higher efficacy beliefs when their principals offer individualized support and build collaborative structures. When principals model behaviors, offer individualized support for teachers, allow them to collaborate and work toward common goals, and concern themselves with teachers' personal feelings, relationships improve, and efficacy is higher (Gkolia & Belias, 2014).

The current study is consistent with Sallee's relationship findings between principals and teachers' self-efficacy. Sallee (2014) reported a significant relationship between principals and teachers. Several themes and characteristics emerged from this study including effective communication, proper support and encouragement, visible involvement, professionalism and respect, and promoting teachers as professionals to

promote high-quality relationships and boost efficacy (Sallee, 2014). Similarly, the current study's findings indicate that teachers' self-efficacy can be boosted in instructional strategies when principals offer individualized support.

The current study is in contrast with the findings from Chen (2014) who examined whether a relationship existed between transformational leadership practices of principals and teachers' self-efficacy and student academic achievement. According to Chen (2014), transformational leadership had no significant effect on teachers' self-efficacy. The results principals are concerned with are students in free or reduced programs, the utilization of instructional coaches, professional learning communities, and the number of students per computer (Chen, 2014). In contrast, the current study's findings show that transformational leadership practices did have a significant effect on teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies in the practices of sharing a vision, building consensus, offering individualized support, and building collaborative structures.

Conclusions

This section provides conclusions drawn from the current study on the self-efficacy of teachers in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and to what extent they find their principals to use transformational practices in their leadership. Data from the current study is significant to school leaders, as the findings could be used to build stronger efficacy in teachers in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management techniques. This section includes implications for action, recommendations for future research, and concluding remarks complete the study.

Implications for action. With the influence of a transformational leader's practices, teacher's self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management can develop. When a principal is specifically concerned with individual's needs, shares in decision-making, and models professional behavior, teachers will respond positively. A particular area for action would be to increase teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies, where the influence of a principal's transformational practices in sharing a vision, building consensus, offering individualized support, and building collaborative structures can raise teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. This study has practical and purposeful implications for the Keystone superintendents, building principals, and teachers.

Keystone Learning Services' eight superintendents could offer this survey to all teachers in all PK-12buildings. If all teachers completed the survey, this would give administrators an indication of the strength of efficacy and the extent to how they view their principals as being transformational leaders. With the current study, district superintendents could plan professional development with all district principals. The professional learning would include training in instructional strategies and how to effectively communicate the vision, consensus building into school improvement measures, provide individualized support to teachers based on individual needs, and train all staff in the collaborative building structures and processes of professional learning communities.

Principals can use this current study to develop their transformational leadership practices. The NSLS could be used in isolation to obtain a baseline for growth. The survey could be facilitated at the beginning of the year and then administered again at the

end to measure growth. The evidence obtained from the study has shown that when teachers rate themselves as holding high self-efficacy beliefs, they also find their principals to utilize transformational practices. Teachers with proper support and direction that report less confidence in their instructional methods, classroom management techniques, or ability to engage students can increase their level of efficacy (Ross, 2007).

Increasing efficacy could lie within in-service experiences offered by the districts. Building teacher self-efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management can be conducted during professional development events that offer active experiences combined with cognitive processing, modeling of significant behaviors, simulations, and discussions based on previous experiences (Garet et al., 1999). To concentrate on building efficacy, teachers need to be given ample opportunity to practice or reflect on their newly learned skills (Schmidt & Bjork, 1992).

Recommendations for future research. The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent there was a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and the extent to which they perceived their principals were transformational. This study was limited in demographics to small rural schools in a specific region. Changing variables such as demographics or sampling size could strengthen study's implications.

The first recommendation would be to add a qualitative research component. By gathering specific insight from teachers, a better understanding of what transformational practices are desired by teachers for support could be obtained. Qualitative measures could also ensure the validity of the quantitative results.

Another suggestion to extend the research would be to survey all teachers within a district, not just at the elementary level. By collecting data from all teachers, trends could also be analyzed based on variables of grade level, years of experience, and socio-economic status of students in their classrooms. Principals could use the data to determine transformational practices that are strong and those that need work based on the feedback from their teachers.

A third suggestion would be to administer the surveys separately. Self-efficacy needs to be strengthened in teachers. By administering the TSTES, principals could determine the current beliefs and provide professional development to strengthen lower scoring items. A future study could examine what specific professional development measures could be put in place to assist teachers in gaining self-efficacy beliefs. Separately the NSLS could be used to determine practices that are strong and those that require improvement. The identified transformational leadership practices of the survey could be discussed with staff and goals could be set to make improvements in weaker areas. Principals could then engage in professional development ventures that would strengthen their weaker skills.

Surveying elementary teachers in a large, urban school district could extend the current study. The results of the current study could then be compared to analyze the difference between small, rural and large, urban schools. With this comparison, district administrators could learn what relationships exist between self-efficacy and transformational leadership practices and how the extreme demographics may influence outcomes.

Concluding remarks. The results of this study supported research previously conducted in studies devoted to the relationship between teachers' self-efficacy and transformational leadership practices. This current study determined if there was a correlation between teachers' self-efficacy with regard to student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management and transformational leadership practices as defined as sharing a vision, building consensus, modeling high-expectations, supporting individuals, stimulating intellect, building culture, and building collaborative structures. The findings indicated there was not a statistically significant relationship with any of the transformational leadership practices with the variables in self-efficacy in student engagement and classroom management. However, with regard to self-efficacy in instructional strategies, findings showed statistically significant relationships among teachers' perception of their principals' shared vision, principals' building consensus, principals' support of individuals, and principals' collaborative structure building. Results of the current study yielded that when teachers have a higher sense of efficacy, they also view their principals as engaging in transformational leadership practices.

References

Alberta Learning. (2002). *Health and Life Guide Skills to Implementation (K-9).*

Retrieved from https://education.alberta.ca/media/1477143/healthgi.pdf

Anderman, E. M., Belzer, S., & Smith, J. (1991, April 3-7). *Teacher commitment and job*

satisfaction: The role of school culture and principal leadership. Paper presented

at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Chicago, IL: AERA.

Anderson, S., & Betz, N. (2001). Sources of social self-efficacy expectations: Their

measurement and relation to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior,*

58, 98-117.

Anthony, T., & Kritsonis, W. (2007). A mixed methods assessment of the effectiveness

of strategic e-mentoring in improving the self-efficacy and persistence (or

retention) of alternatively certified novice teachers within an inner city school.

District Doctoral Forum National Journal for Publishing and Monitoring

Doctoral Student Research, 4(1), 1–8.

Armor, D., Conroy-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A. Pauly, E.,

& Zellman, G. (1976). *Analysis of the school preferred reading programs in*

selected Los Angeles minority schools (Report No. R-2007-LAUSD). Santa

Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Ashman, F., & Conway, R. (1997). *An introduction to cognitive education.* London,

England: Routledge.

Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). Teachers' sense of self-efficacy, classroom

    behavior, and student achievement. In P. T. Ashton and R. B. Webb (Eds.),

    Teachers sense of self-efficacy and student achievement (pp. 125–144). New

    York, NY: Longman.

Awamleh, R., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Perceptions of leader charisma and

    effectiveness: The effects of vision content, delivery, and organizational

    performance. *The Leadership Quarterly, 10*(3), 345-373.

Balkundi, P., Harrison, D. A., & Kilduff, M. (2011). Centrality and charisma: Comparing

    how leaders' network and attributions affect team performance. *Journal of*

    Applied Psychology, 96(6), 1209-1222.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change.

    Psychological Review, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*.

    Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W.H.

    Freeman

Bandura, A. (2004). Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health Education*

    Behavior. 31(2):143–164. doi: 10.1177/1090198104263660

Bandura, A., Adams N. E., & Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral

    change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(3), 125-139.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectation.* New York, NY:

    Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (2000). The future of leadership in learning organizations. *The Journal of Leadership Studies, 7,* 18-40.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

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

Bass, B. M., Waldman, D. A., Avolio, B. J., & Bebb, M. (1987). Transformational Leadership and the falling dominoes effect. *Group and Organization Studies 12*(1), 73-87. doi: 10.1177/105960118701200106

Berman, P., McLaughlin, M., Bass, G., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G. (1977). *Federal programs supporting educational change: Factors affecting implementation and continuation*. Santa Monica, CA: The RAND Corporation.

Billingsley, B., Carlson, E., & Klein, S. (2004). The working conditions and induction support of early career special educators. *Exceptional Children, 70,* 333–347.

Billingsley, B., & Cross, L. (1992). Predictors of commitment, job satisfaction, and intent to stay in teaching: A comparison of general and special educators. *The Journal of Special Education, 25*, 53–471.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. R. (2001). The teacher's principal: Collegiality instead of control is one thing teachers appreciate in a leader. *Journal of Staff Development, 22*(1), 22-25.

Bresó, E., Schaufeli, W. B., & Salanova, M. (2011). Can a self-efficacy-based intervention decrease burnout, increase engagement, and enhance performance? A quasi-experimental study. *Higher Education, 61*, 339-355. doi:10.1007/s10734-010-9334-6

Bulach, C. R., Michael, P., & Booth, D. (1999, December). *Analyzing the leadership behavior of school principals.* Paper presented at the Association for the Advancement of Educational Research conference, Pointe Vedra, FL.

Campo, C. (1993). Collaborative school cultures: How principals make a difference. *School Organization, 13*(2), 119–127.

Coladarci, T. (1992). Teachers' sense of efficacy and commitment to teaching. *Journal of Experimental Education, 60*, 323-337

Chen, S. (2014). *The effects of transformational leadership of principals on student academic achievement*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3119769)

Choi, N. (2005). Self-efficacy and self-concept as predictors of college students' academic performance. *Psychology in the Schools, 42*, 197-205. doi: 10.1002/pits.20048

Collins, J. (2014). *Transformational leadership: The most effect leadership style.* Retrieved from http://www.wattsnext.com.au/Transformational-Leadership-The-most-effective-leadership-style

Dale, J .C., Jr. (2012). *The Correlation of the perceived leadership style of middle school principals to teacher job satisfaction and efficacy.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from www.digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi? 1655&context=doctoral

Darling-Hammond, L. (2003, May). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do. *Educational Leadership, 60*(8), 6-13.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1999). *Shaping school culture: The school leader's role.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Dembo, M. H., & Gibson, S. (1985). Teachers' sense of efficacy: An important factor in school improvement. *The Elementary School Journal, 86*, 173-184.

Demir, K. (2008). Transformational leadership and collective efficacy: The moderating roles of collaborative culture and teachers' self-efficacy. *Egitim Arastirmalari Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 33*, 93-112.

Efficacious. (n.d.) *Farlex Partner Medical Dictionary Online* (2012). Retrieved December 23, 2015 from http://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary. com/efficacious.

Emmer, E. T., & Hickman, J. (1991). Teacher efficacy in classroom management and discipline. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51,* 755-765.

Emmer, E. T., & Sabornie, E. J. (2015). *Handbook of classroom management* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Epstein, J. L., & Sanders, M. G. (2006). Prospects for change: Preparing educators for school, family, and community partnerships. *Peabody Journal of Education, 81*(2), 81-120.

Foti, R. J., Knee, Jr., R. E., & Backert, R. S. G. (2008). Multi-level implications of framing leadership perceptions as a dynamic process. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 178-194.

Fullan, M. (2002). Principals as leaders in a culture of change. *Educational Leadership, Special Issue, 59*(8), 16-21. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education University of Toronto.

Garet, M. S., Birman, B. F., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Herman, R., & Yoon, K. S. (1999). *Designing effective professional development: Lessons from the Eisenhower program.* Jessup, MD: U.S. Department of Education.

Galyon, C. E., Blondin, C. A., Yaw, J. S., Nalls, M. L., & William, R. L. (2012). The relationship of academic self-efficacy to class participation and exam performance. *Social Psychology of Education, 15*, 233-249. doi:10.1007/s11218-011-9175-x

Gibson, S., & Dembo, H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(4), 569–82.

Gkolia, A., & Belias, D. (2014). The impact of principals' transformational leadership on teachers' satisfaction: Evidence from Greece. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, 3*(6) 69-80.

Goddard, R. D., & Skrla, L. (2006). The influence of school social composition on teachers' collective efficacy beliefs. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 42*(2), 216-235

Goddard, R., Hoy, W., & Woolfolk, A. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. *Researcher, 3*(33), 3–13.

Gordon, L. M. (2001). *High teacher efficacy as a marker of teacher effectiveness in the domain of classroom management*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Council on Teacher Education, San Diego, CA.

Greenberg, K. H. (2005). *The cognitive enrichment advantage: Teacher handbook*. Knoxville, TN: Harris & Associates.

Guo, Y., McDonald-Connor, C., Yang, Y., Roehrig, A., & Morrison, F. (2013). The effects of teacher qualification, teacher self-efficacy, and classroom practices on fifth graders' literacy outcomes. *Elementary School Journal, 113*(1), 3-24.

Gurung, R. A. R., Daniel, D. B., & Landrum, R. E. (2012). A multisite study of learning in introductory psychology courses. *Teaching of Psychology, 39*, 170-175. doi:10.1177/0098628312450248

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

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

Handelsman, M. M., Briggs, W. L., Sullivan, N., & Towler, A. (2005). A measure of college student course engagement. *The Journal of Educational Research, 98*, 184-192. doi:10.3200/JOER.98.3

Henson, R. K. (2001). *Relationships between pre-service teachers' self-efficacy, task analysis, and classroom management beliefs.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Henson, R. K. (2003). Relationships among preservice teachers' self-efficacy, task analysis, and classroom management beliefs. *Research in the Schools, 10*(1), 53-62.

Hidden curriculum. (2015, July). In S. Abbott (Ed.), *The glossary of education reform*. Retrieved from http://edglossary.org/hidden-curriculum

Hipp, K. A. (1996). *Teacher efficacy: Influence of principal leadership behavior.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational research Association, New York, NY.

Hipp, K. A. (1997, March). *Documenting the effects of transformational leadership behavior on teacher efficacy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Hipp, K. A., & Bredeson, P. V. (1995). Exploring connections between teacher efficacy. *Journal of School Leadership, 5*, 136–150.

Horn-Turpin, F. (2009). *A study examining the effects of transformational leadership behaviors on the factors of teaching efficacy, job satisfaction and organizational commitment as perceived by special education teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://theses.lib.vt.edu/theses/available/etd-02152009-080918/unrestricted/FDHornTurpinETD09.pdf

Hoy, A. W. (2000). *Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Hoy, W. K. & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *Elementary School Journal, 93*(4), 355-372.

Hoyt, C. L., & Blascovich, J. (2003). Transformational and transactional leadership in

virtual and physical environments. *Small Group Research, 34,* 678-715.

Jantzi, D., & Leithwood, K. (1996) Toward an explanation of variation in teachers'

perceptions of transformational school leadership. *Educational Administration*

Quarterly, 32(4), 512-538.

Jones, M. T. (1998). *The relationship of organizational commitment to the organizational*

culture of high schools. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest

Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9829441)

Kansas State Department of Education. (2015). *District K-12 Report Cards*. Retrieved

from http://online.ksde.org/k12/k12.aspx

King, B., & Kerchner, T. (1991). *Defining principal leadership in an era of teacher*

empowerment. Paper presented at the American Educational Research

Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL.

Krizman, C. (2013). *The relationship between teachers' self-efficacy beliefs and parental*

involvement (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://repositories.tdl.org/

ttuir/bitstream/handle/2346/50638/Krizman_Charlotte_Diss1.pdf?sequence=1

Langer, J. (2000). Excellence in English in middle and high school: How teachers'

professional lives support student achievement. *American Educational Research*

Journal, 37(2), 397-439.

Lee, H., & Li, F. M. O. (2015). Principal leadership and its link to the development of a

school's teacher culture and teaching. *International Journal of Education Policy*

& Leadership, 10(4). Retrieved from http://journals.sfu.ca/ijepl/index.php/ijepl/

article/view/555/150

Leithwood, K. (1992). The move towards transformational leadership. *Educational Leadership, 49*(5), 8-12.

Leithwood, K. (1993). *Contributions of transformational leadership to school restructuring.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston, TX.

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

Leithwood, K. (1997). The nature of leadership survey. Unpublished manuscript, The Ontario Institute Studies in Education: University of Toronto at Toronto, Canada.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration, 38*(2*),* 112-126.

Lewandowski, K. (2005). *A Study of the relationship of teachers' self- efficacy and the impact of leadership and professional development* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://dspace.iup.edu/bitstream/handle/2069/17/ Karen%20Heidi%20Lewandowski.pdf?sequence=1

Linnenbrink, E., & Pintrich, P. (2003). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in student engagement and learning in the classroom. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 19*, 119-137.

McCoy, J. H. (2014). *Transformational leadership and a culture of efficacy: A search for correlation in the Alabama two-year college system.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd.

Ng, W., Nicholas, H., &, Alan W. (2010). School experience influences on pre-service
teachers evolving beliefs about effective teaching. *Teaching and Teacher
Education, 26,* 278-289.

Nnadozie, C. A. (1993). *A study of the relation between participation in decision-making
and school culture and perception of job satisfaction among teacher.* (Doctoral
dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest dissertations and Theses database. (UMI
No. 9329523)

Pappa, S., (2014). *Teachers' perceptions of student engagement and teacher self-efficacy
beliefs* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://jyx.jyu.fi/dspace/bitstream/
handle/123456789/44989/URN:NBN:fi:jyu-201412223572.pdf?sequence=1

Parkay, F. W., Greenwood G., Olejnik, S., & Proller, N. (1988). A study of the
relationship among teacher efficacy, locus of control, and stress. *Journal of
Research and Development in Education, 21*(4), 13-22.

Patterson, K., Grenny, J., Maxfield, D., McMillan, R., & Switzler, A. (2007). *Influence:
The power to change anything*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Peterson, K. D., & Deal, T. E. (2002). *Shaping school culture fieldbook*. San Francisco,
CA: Jossey-Bass

Petrie, T. A., Hartranft, F., & Lutz, K. (1995) The relationship between teacher efficacy
and administrative perception of effectiveness. *The High School Journal, 782*, 73-
77.

Portin, B. S., DeArmond, M., Gundlach, L., & Schneider, P. (2003). *Making sense of
leading schools: A national study of the principalship*. Seattle, WA: Center on
Reinventing Public Education, University of Washington.

Poulou, M. (2007). Personal teaching efficacy and its sources: Student teachers' perceptions. *Educational Psychology, 27*, 191-218.

Reames, E. H. (1997). *A study of the relationships between school work culture and teacher beliefs of efficacy and commitment in middle schools.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Auburn, AL: Auburn University.

Reeves, D. (2011). *Transforming professional learning into student results.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effect of coaching on student achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education, 17*(1), 51-65.

Ross, J. A. (2007). Professional development effects on teacher efficacy: Results of randomizes field trial. *The Journal of Educational Research, 10*(1), 50-60.

Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2004, April). *Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Schmidt, R. A., & Bjork, R. A. (1992). New conceptualizations of practice: Common principles in three paradigms suggest new concepts for training. *Psychological Science, 3,* 207-217.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1995). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Stone, A. G., Russell, R. F., & Patterson, K. (2003). Transformational versus servant leadership: A difference in leader focus. *Servant Leadership Roundtable- August 2003.* Retrieved July 9, 2015 from https://www.regent.edu/acad/global/ publications/sl_proceedings/2003/stone_transformation_versus.pdf

Sullivan, E, & Decker, P. (2001). *Effective leadership and management in nursing*. Ann Arbor, MI: Prentice Hall.

Swars, S. L., & McMunn-Dooley, C. M. (2010). Changes in teaching efficacy during a professional development school-based science methods course. *School Science and Mathematics, 110*(4), 193-202.

Tournaki, N., Lyublinskaya, T., & Carolan, B. V. (2009). Pathways to teacher certification: Does it really matter when it comes to efficacy and effectives? *Action in Teacher Education, 30*(4), 96-109.

Transformational Leadership [Def.1]. n.d. *In Business Dictionary Online.* Retrieved September 9, 2015 from http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/ transformational-leadership.html

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 783-805. doi:10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00036-1

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202-248.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 944-956.

Tucker, C. M., Zayco, R. A., Herman, K. C., Reinke, W. R., Trujillo, M., & Carraway, K. (2002). Teacher and child variables as predictors of academic engagement among African American children. *Psychology in the Schools, 39*(4), 477-488.

Webb, N. (1985). Student interaction and learning in small groups: A research summary. *Learning to Cooperate, Cooperating to Learn*, (pp. 148-172.) New York, NY: Springer

Zahorik, J., Halbach, A., Ehrle, K., & Molnar, A. (2003). Teaching practices for smaller classes. *Educational Leadership, 61*(1), 75-77.

Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010). Improving student engagement: Ten proposals for action. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 11*(3), 167–177.

Appendices

Appendix A: Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale

Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale[1] (long form)

Teacher Beliefs	How much can you do?								
Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.	Nothing	Very Little		Some Influence		Quite A Bit		A Great Deal	
1. How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
2. How much can you do to help your students think critically?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
3. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
4. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
5. To what extent can you make your expectations clear about student behavior?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
6. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
7. How well can you respond to difficult questions from your students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
8. How well can you establish routines to keep activities running smoothly?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
9. How much can you do to help your students value learning?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
10. How much can you gauge student comprehension of what you have taught?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
11. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
12. How much can you do to foster student creativity?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
13. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
14. How much can you do to improve the understanding of a student who is failing?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
15. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
16. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
17. How much can you do to adjust your lessons to the proper level for individual students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
18. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
19. How well can you keep a few problem students form ruining an entire lesson?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
20. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
21. How well can you respond to defiant students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
22. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
23. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
24. How well can you provide appropriate challenges for very capable students?	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)

Appendix B: Nature of Leadership Survey

NATURE OF LEADERSHIP

The following statements are descriptions of leadership that may or may not reflect leadership practices in your school. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree (1 = strongly agree, 2 = moderately agree, 3 = agree slightly more than disagree, 4 = disagree slightly more than agree, 5 = moderately disagree, and 6 = strongly disagree) that the statement describes leadership practices in your school. Record your response by circling the appropriate number beside the statement.

To what extent do you agree that the person(s) providing leadership in your school:

	Strongly Agree					Strongly Disagree
1. Excites us with visions of what we may be able to accomplish if we work together to change our practices/programs.............................	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Regularly encourages us to evaluate our progress toward achieving school goals...	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Rarely takes our opinion into account when making decisions.............	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Leads by 'doing' rather than simply by 'telling'.................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Provides resources to support my professional development.............	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Encourages me to reexamine some basic assumptions I have about my work..	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Gives high priority to developing within the school a shared set of values, beliefs and attitudes related to teaching and learning.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Distributes leadership broadly among the staff, representing various viewpoints in leadership positions..	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Has high expectations for us as professionals......................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Maintains a very low profile...	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Provides staff with a process through which we generate school goals...	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Is a source of new ideas for my professional learning.........................	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Holds high expectations for students..	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Gives us a sense of overall purpose...	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Takes my opinion into consideration when initiating actions that affect my work..	1	2	3	4	5	6

Nature of Leadership (Cont'd)

To what extent do you agree that the person(s) providing leadership in your school:

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	

16. Shows respect for staff by treating us as professionals........................ 1 2 3 4 5 6
17. Stimulates me to think about what I am doing for my students............. 1 2 3 4 5 6
18. Ensures that we have adequate involvement in decision making
    related to programs and instruction.. 1 2 3 4 5 6

19. Supports an effective committee structure for decision making.......... 1 2 3 4 5 6
20. Makes an effort to know students (e.g., visits classrooms,
    acknowledges their efforts)... 1 2 3 4 5 6
21. Sets a respectful tone for interaction with students............................. 1 2 3 4 5 6

22. Encourages me to pursue my own goals for professional learning....... 1 2 3 4 5 6
23. Encourages ongoing teacher collaboration for implementing
    new programs and practices.. 1 2 3 4 5 6
24. Helps clarify the specific meaning of the school's vision in terms
    of its practical implications for programs and instruction.................. 1 2 3 4 5 6

25. Encourages us to develop/review individual professional growth
    goals consistent with school goals and priorities................................. 1 2 3 4 5 6
26. Expects us to engage in ongoing professional growth............................ 1 2 3 4 5 6
27. Displays energy and enthusiasm for own work...................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6

28. Lacks awareness of my unique needs and expertise.............................. 1 2 3 4 5 6
29. Encourages us to evaluate our practices and refine them as needed...... 1 2 3 4 5 6
30. Expects us to be effective innovators.. ... 1 2 3 4 5 6

31. Demonstrates a willingness to change own practices
    in light of new understandings.. 1 2 3 4 5 6
32. Encourages me to try new practices consistent
    with my own interests.. 1 2 3 4 5 6
33. Rarely refers to school goals when we are making decisions
    related to changes in programs or practices... 1 2 3 4 5 6

Nature of Leadership (Cont'd)

To what extent do you agree that the person(s) providing leadership in your school:

	Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree	
34. Stimulates discussion of new ideas relevant to school directions.........	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. Facilitates effective communication among staff................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. Establishes working conditions that inhibit staff collaboration for professional growth and planning................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. Communicates school vision to staff and students....................	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. Encourages the development of school norms supporting openness to change................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. Shows favoritism toward individuals or groups....................	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. Facilitates opportunities for staff to learn from each other................	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. Reinforces isolation of teachers who have special expertise................	1	2	3	4	5	6
42. Provides an appropriate level of autonomy for us in our own decision making................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
43. Provides moral support by making me feel appreciated for my contribution to the school................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
44. Helps us understand the relationship between our school's vision and board or Ministry initiatives................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
45. Models problem-solving techniques that I can readily adapt for work with colleagues and students................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
46. Promotes an atmosphere of caring and trust among staff....................	1	2	3	4	5	6
47. Symbolizes success and accomplishment within our profession..........	1	2	3	4	5	6
48. Supports the *status quo* at the expense of being at the cutting edge of educational change................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
49. Works toward whole staff consensus in establishing priorities for school goals................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
50. Is open and genuine in dealings with staff and students....................	1	2	3	4	5	6

Thank you very much for completing this questionnaire. If you want to elaborate on issues related to leadership, write your comments in the margins or on the blank page. Please seal the questionnaire in the envelope provided and return it to your school secretary.

Appendix C: IRB Application

BAKER UNIVERSITY

School of education
Graduate department

Date:

IRB PROTOCOL NUMBER _____
(irb USE ONLY)

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. Susan Rogers	*Susan Rogers*	Major Advisor
2.	Margaret Waterman	*Margaret Waterman*	Research Analyst
3.	Dr. Sharon Zoellner	_____	University Committee Member
4.	Dr. Randal Bagby	_____	External Committee Member

Principal Investigator: Jennifer Short
Phone: 913-683-9826
Email: jenn.short6@gmail.com
Mailing address: 2109 Cedar Ridge Dr. Leavenworth, KS 66048

Faculty sponsor: Dr. Susan Rogers
Phone: 913-344-1226 cell 785-230-2805
Email: srogers@bakeru.edu

Expected Category of Review: ___Exempt _X_ Expedited ___Full

II: Protocol: (Type the title of your study)

Teachers' Self-Efficacy in Relationship to Principal's Transformational Leadership

Summary

In a sentence or two, please describe the background and purpose of the research.

This study will take place in the School Districts belonging to the e Cooperative. The eight districts are Valley Falls USD 338, Jefferson County North USD 339, Jefferson County West USD 340, Oskaloosa USD 341, McLouth USD 342, Perry LeCompton USD 343, Easton USD 449, and Atchison County School District USD 377. The districts' elementary buildings will be included. Classroom teachers, including gym teachers, music teachers, art teachers, media teachers, reading and math interventionists, and special education teachers working with students from Kindergarten through the 5th grade will be included.

This study will have multiple purposes. The first purpose of this study will be to determine whether there is a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management and teachers' perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership. The second purpose of this study will be to determine whether there is a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in instructional strategies and teachers' perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership. The final purpose of this study will be to determine whether there is a relationship between teachers' self-efficacy in student engagement and teachers' perceptions of their principals' transformational leadership.

Briefly describe each condition or manipulation to be included within the study.

There will not be any conditions or manipulation in this study.

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.
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.

This study will utilize a quantitative correlational survey research design to examine teacher's efficacy in relationship with the level of their perceptions of their principal's transformational leadership. The variables are the teachers' self-efficacy in regards to student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management. The independent variables are the teachers' perceptions of the extent to which the principal transformational leadership has a shared vision, builds consensus, holds high performance expectations, models behavior, provides individualized support, provides intellectual stimulation, strengths school culture, and builds collaborative structures.

The attached survey instruments will be combined into one survey. The first instrument will be used to measure teacher's self-efficacy. The developers of the survey are Tschannen-Moran from College of William & Mary and Woolfolk Hoy from the Ohio State University (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). This survey is

comprised of items relating to teacher self- efficacy in student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management.

The second instrument is the Nature of School Leadership Survey. Leithwood from the University of Toronto developed this instrument in 1994. It will be used to measure the extent teachers feel their principals behaviors and actions are transformational based on six distinct areas. These areas are building school vision, intellectual stimulation, individualize support, modeling professional practice, demonstrating high-expectations, and developing structures to foster participation in schooling decisions.

Subjects will not encounter psychological, social, physical, or legal risk.

Will any stress to subjects be involved? If so, please describe.

There will be no stress to subjects involved.

Will the subjects be deceived or misled in any way? If so, include an outline or script of the debriefing.

The subjects will not be deceived or misled in any way.

Will there be a request for information, which subjects might consider to be personal or sensitive? If so, please include a description.

There will be no request for personal information, which might be considered personal or sensitive.

Will the subjects be presented with materials, which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading? If so, please describe.

The subjects will not be presented with materials, which might be considered to be offensive, threatening, or degrading.

Approximately how much time will be demanded of each subject?

The subjects will be asked to complete a survey that will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

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.

The subjects in this study are elementary teachers in Valley Falls USD 338, Jefferson County North USD 339, Jefferson County West USD 340, Oskaloosa USD 341, McLouth USD 342, Perry LeCompton USD 343, Easton USD 449, and Atchison County School District USD 377. Subjects will be solicited by building principals emailing the survey out to each subject. The letters that will be sent to principals and teachers are attached.

What steps will be taken to insure that each subject's participation is voluntary? What if any inducements will be offered to the subjects for their participation?

No inducements will be offered to subjects for their participation.

How will you insure 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.

The subject's voluntary completion of the survey will be the indicator of the consent.

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.

No data will be a part of any permanent record that can be identified with the subjects.

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.

The fact that a subject did or did not participate in this specific study will not be made part of any permanent record available to a supervisor, teacher, or employer.

What steps will be taken to insure the confidentiality of the data? Where will it be stored? How long will it be stored? What will be done with it after the study is completed?

I will be using an online survey and no identifiable data will be collected. Data will be stored in a password-protected spreadsheet on my personal computer. The data will be stored for three years before it will be deleted and destroyed.

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 no risks involved in this study.

Will any data from files or archival data be used? If so, please describe.

No data from files or archival data will be used.

Appendix D: IRB Approval Letter

BAKER UNIVERSITY *Own Confidence*

Baker University Institutional Review Board

11/13/2015

Dear Jennifer Short and Dr. Rogers,

The Baker University IRB has reviewed your research project application and approved this project under Expedited Status Review. As described, the project complies with all the requirements and policies established by the University for protection of human subjects in research. Unless renewed, approval lapses one year after approval date.

Please be aware of the following:

1. Any significant change in the research protocol as described should be reviewed by this Committee prior to altering the project.
2. Notify the IRB about any new investigators not named in original application.
3. When signed consent documents are required, the primary investigator must retain the signed consent documents of the research activity.
4. If this is a funded project, keep a copy of this approval letter with your proposal/grant file.
5. If the results of the research are used to prepare papers for publication or oral presentation at professional conferences, manuscripts or abstracts are requested for IRB as part of the project record.

Please inform this Committee or myself when this project is terminated or completed. As noted above, you must also provide IRB with an annual status report and receive approval for maintaining your status. If you have any questions, please contact me at CTodden@BakerU.edu or 785.594.8440.

Sincerely,

Chris Todden EdD
Chair, Baker University IRB

Baker University IRB Committee
    Verneda Edwards EdD
    Sara Crump PhD
    Erin Morris PhD
    Scott Crenshaw

Appendix E: Letter to Principals

Dear Principal,

My name is Jennifer Short. I am a doctoral candidate at Baker University. Last fall, I spoke with your superintendent about this survey and gained permission to ask you to assist me. I would appreciate your assistance with research I am conducting on teachers' perceptions of the extent of the relationship that exists between teachers' self-efficacy and their principal's transformational leadership qualities. I would like to send you a survey to forward to your teachers for completion. I am administering the survey during the month of December 2015 to elementary teachers in the Keystone Coop. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Their participation is completely voluntary and responses will be anonymous. The teachers' names will not appear anywhere on the survey. A teacher's participation in this study is extremely important for the completion of my dissertation. The results will provide useful information into the value of certain leadership qualities to foster teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management, instructional strategies, and student engagement.

If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact me at jenn.short6@gmail.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Educationally,
Jennifer Short
Ed. D. Candidate
Baker University, Graduate School of Education
Email: jenn.short6@gmail.com

Appendix F: Letter to Teachers

Teachers,

My name is Jennifer Short. I am a doctoral candidate at Baker University. I would appreciate your assistance with research I am conducting on teachers' perceptions of self-efficacy in regards to classroom management, instructional strategies, and student engagement and to what extent is there a relationship to transformational leadership traits. The research is being conducted through the Ed. D program at Baker University. I am administering a survey during the month of December 2015. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Your participation is completely voluntary and your answers will be confidential and combined with the response of other participants in summary form. Information reported will not include any individuals, schools, or school districts. The completion of the survey will indicate your consent to participate and permission to use the information provided by you in the study. The Survey Monkey link is https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/TSE_transformationalleadership.

Teacher participation in this survey is extremely important for the completion of my dissertation. The results will provide useful information into the value of certain leadership qualities to foster teachers' self-efficacy in classroom management, instructional strategies, and student engagement. You also have the option to not answer any question that may make you feel uncomfortable or discontinue participation at any time. If you have any questions regarding this research, please contact me at jenn.short6@gmail.com.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Educationally,

Jennifer Short
Ed. D. Candidate
Baker University, Graduate School of Education
Email: jenn.short6@gmail.com

Appendix G: Reminder Email to Principals

Greetings,

Thank you again for your assistance with my survey. Here is the teacher link to participate in my dissertation survey. As a reminder, this is completely anonymous and very important to my study. Thank you for encouraging your staff to participate.

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/TSE_transformationalleadership.

Educationally,
Jennifer Short