

Perceptions of Leadership: Visions of Integration

by

Linda T. Lorei

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

May, 2015

Perceptions of Leadership: Visions of Integration

Linda T. Lorei

I hereby release this **dissertation** to the public. I understand that this **dissertation** will be made available from the OhioLINK ETD Center and the Maag Library Circulation Desk for public access. I also authorize the University or other individuals to make copies of this thesis as needed for scholarly research.

Signature:

Linda T. Lorei, Student

Date

Approvals:

Karen H. Larwin, Thesis Advisor

Date

Robert Beebe, Committee Member

Date

Kenneth Miller, Committee Member

Date

Andrew Pushchak, Committee Member

Date

Dr. Salvatore A. Sanders, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies

Date

©

Linda T. Lorei

2015

ABSTRACT

Principal actions and reflection for educator effectiveness continues to be a prevailing topic of interest in educational research. The existing literature has explored influences on a school's projected success stemming from a principal's actions (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). However, the majority of school administrator research lacks inquiry specific to gender differences (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011). The increasing number of women in school leadership roles points toward an area worthy of exploration (Shakeshaft, Brown, Irby, Grogan, & Ballenger, 2007). The purpose of this study was to explore teacher and principal perceptions of principals' leadership actions while examining whether gender differences in perceptions exist. This quantitative study employed two validated surveys for data collection, the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) for teachers and the PIMRS for principals (Hallinger, 2008). The surveys both contain 50 questions that were assigned to 10 subscales of principal instructional management for comparative analysis (Hallinger). Three open-ended questions were added to the principal's form of the survey. Data was collected from 505 teachers and principals. In addition to gender, years of experience, principal tenure, district size, school type, and school level were examined as moderators. Results indicate a significant relationship between the teachers' and principals' perceptions of instructional leadership in 4 PIMRS sub-factors: maintaining high visibility, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating curriculum, and promoting professional development. Findings specify noteworthy differences among perceptions of female principals and teachers for the PIMRS sub-factor of promoting professional development.

DEDICATION

For my husband, Mark:

My sine qua non. How can I ever thank you for everything you do for me? You are the most fantastic soulmate, partner, and best friend. Your amazing personality brings out the best in me for sure! Thank you for your enduring love and incredible support on this crazy journey, always at my side! Your loving sense of humor has buoyed me countless times and always makes me smile. Our sails are pointed towards the most pleasant and beautiful of winds! I love you and can't wait to see where our journey takes us next!

For my daughters, Anne, Jane, and Kate:

My beautiful girlies, how I love thee! I have always felt that my first purpose in life was to be your Marmie! I am so proud of each of you and your amazing accomplishments! Our adventures are just beginning, and I hope to have paved a path for you that was unimaginable to my own mom and her mother before her, even if it means sitting beside your best friend with your 'matching laptops' every night. Follow your soul, listen to your heart, and walk lightly on this earth. "Choose to shine!"

For Liz, Maddie, Ben, & Tom:

My wonderful stepchildren –it's hard to believe it has been 10 years since our families joined forces! I love our family that we have become and the crazy fun we have together. So many memories of silly OBX vacations with tie-dye t-shirts and Lorei-athons, Easter basket hunts-where are they? Crazy Secret Santa events-including ornaments?! Thanks for understanding when it was another 'crock pot' night and the cookie jar was empty. It's been a fun ride so far!

For my parents, Gloria and Albert Kosiba, and family, Karen & Rob, and Chris:

I am so blessed to have a loving family of lifelong learners, educators, and artists. As Pablo Picasso said, "Learn the rules like a pro so you can break them like an artist." Your love and support has helped me to pioneer new territories! (If Dad can navigate an iPad and text at 94, I can complete my doctorate at 49!)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am so grateful to so many people in my life who have in some way shared this journey. The doctoral program is like an 'Ironman' of academics and I could not have done it without the support of an incredible coach. Thank you with all of my heart to my chair, Dr. Karen Larwin. Your gentle persistence continually encourages in the darkest of hours. I could not have done this without you! I have been blessed to have a fantastic committee of mentors in Dr. Bob Beebe, Dr. Kenneth Miller, and Dr. Andy Pushchak. I greatly appreciate your wisdom, guidance, careful attention, and encouragement on this unbelievable journey. Thank you to my YSU Cohort 2012 family! I really enjoyed our time together and wish you well! Thank you to my fellow mentor female administrators, Audrey and Nancy. Working with you ladies inspired me to pursue this path! Thank you to all of my colleagues at IU5 and to the schools we serve. I am grateful to know you and to share your on-going enthusiasm for learning. Thank you to Leslie Reedy, who so carefully edited my words. Finally, I acknowledge Dr. Philip Hallinger for granting permission to use the two survey instruments for this research and to assist students in their quest to contribute to the field of research. We all must help each other to learn and grow.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I	1
Problem Statement	3
Purpose of the Study	3
Research Questions.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Need for the Study.....	6
Methodology	7
Study Limitations and Delimitations.....	8
CHAPTER II	10
Literature Review.....	10
History.....	13
Historical and evolving role of the principal.....	13
History of women in educational leadership.....	20
Barriers.....	22
Innovative approaches to Leadership.....	25
Gender	28
Women Leaders	28
Gender differences in leadership	31
Actions/Perceptions of Actions.....	35
Leadership actions.....	37
Teacher perceptions of a leader’s actions.....	39
Perceptual significance.....	41
Summary.....	42
CHAPTER III	45
Methodology.....	45
Research Questions.....	45
Research Design.....	46
Sample	47
Instrumentation	48
Analysis.....	51
Limitations.....	52
CHAPTER IV	54
Introduction.....	54
Descriptive Statistics.....	55
Reliability Analysis.....	61
Test of Basic Statistical Assumptions.....	66
Analysis of Research Questions.....	69
Open-Ended Responses.....	79
Summary	80
Chapter V	84
Introduction.....	84

Research Question #1.....	85
Research Question #2.....	86
Research Question #3.....	88
Research Question #4	89
Open-Ended Responses.....	90
Role of the Building Administrator.....	91
Fulfilling Today's Role.....	93
Characteristics of an Exemplary Leader.....	94
Implications	95
Recommendations for Future Research.....	99
Conclusion.....	100
REFERENCES	102
APPENDICES.....	116

Chapter I

Identifying school leadership actions of principals that impact student achievement has been a frequent topic in educational research in recent years. As educational policy seeks to increase curriculum rigor, teacher effectiveness, and student learning at the national level, school leaders bear the responsibility to envision, initiate, enact, and sustain strategies for ever-increasing achievement outcomes. Research documents the actions and role of the school leader as an influence on a school's anticipated success (Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Marzano, Waters, and McNulty's (2005) examination of 35 years of research seeks to identify specific principal leadership actions. Although the number of women holding school administrative roles continues to grow, there is much to learn and discover in regard to women's impact upon student achievement (Shakeshaft, Brown, Irby, Grogan, & Ballenger, 2007).

The last few decades have seen the evolution of principal job duties. Historically, the principal has been a manager, generally responsible for operational oversight in a school. However, with legislation enacting accountability measures through No Child Left Behind (2001), awareness of the importance and effectiveness of principal leadership has become an important focus (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013). Researchers seeking leadership actions with potential to increase student achievement are incorporating external factors such as student motivation, home environments of students, and community involvement (Branch et al., 2013). For example, Blasé & Blasé (1999) examined the encouragements and guidance a school administrator provides to teachers

through meaningful instructional feedback and resulting effects upon student achievement.

Investigation of principal leadership occurs through multiple study methods. For example, Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe (2008) called attention to worldwide curiosity regarding potential influences of school leaders in supporting student achievement results. A first meta-analysis of 22 leadership studies comparing instructional and transformational leader actions led Robison et al to identify the importance of a leader's attention to instructional practices teachers employ for greater impacts on student learning. Establishing goals and expectations, resourcing strategically, planning, coordinating, and evaluating teaching and the curriculum, promoting and participating in teacher learning and development, and ensuring an orderly and supportive environment are leadership practices identified as imperative in managing schools (Robinson et al.).

Leadership theories in education are similarly evolving, with additional attention towards the potential influence of transformational and shared management styles school leaders employ. A second meta-analysis of twelve research studies of student outcomes and leadership led Robinson, Lloyd and Rowe (2008) to identify conclusions regarding differences in leadership among similar schools that hold differing student achievement results. Those schools reporting superior student outcomes reveal attention to student learning and teaching; however, Robinson et al. expressed caution in discrediting transformational leadership study outcomes entirely due to research focusing on social, as opposed to academic effects. Determining leadership actions that link to successful student outcomes requires additional inquiry for leader actions that support instructional practices (Robinson et al.).

Problem Statement

The limited research literature regarding women in school administrative roles reviews the influences of gender upon various leadership actions; however, concern regarding the lack of women holding educational supervisory positions bears mention (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011). The authors conceded that the majority of school administrator research, occurring primarily through dissertations, omits inclusion of gender differences (Grogan & Shakeshaft). Grogan & Shakeshaft identify a consequence as the deficiency of available literature regarding gender differences in leadership, including differentiation of the specific school administrative role.

Grupton (2009) provided personal reflections regarding changes in women's roles as leaders in education, sharing insights and advice for prospective female leaders. Grupton discussed that the advancement of females within the general workforce in recent years reveals a shortage of held managerial positions. The author reported the greatest gender equity in principal positions held by those at the elementary level, with fewer females working as middle school and secondary principals (Grupton). Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) contended that new insights emerge as analysis of gender leadership differences occur.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore possible connections between the perceptions of principal leadership actions among teachers and principals, considering principal gender. Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Walhstrom (2004) identified 9 variables influencing student learning; state leadership, policies, and practices, district leadership, policies, and practices, student family background, school leadership, other

stakeholders, school conditions, teachers, classroom conditions, and leaders' professional learning experiences. Consideration of variables including leadership actions in establishing school visions, leading instruction, supporting teachers, and interaction with students similar to Branch, Hanushek, and Rivkin's (2013) examination, will provide the framework for this study.

As Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson (2010) outlined, actions that school leaders take in relation to distributing leadership and instructional leadership with teacher interactions, as well as context variables, such as student poverty, building size, and location, all exert influence upon outcomes of learning. Marzano et al. (2005) identified 21 responsibilities of the school principal with correlations to student achievement through meta-analysis of 69 studies, indicating positive effects between all responsibilities and first-order change when principals perceive the change as an extension of past work, consistent with organizational norms and values, and easily learned by staff. Building upon the current level of research, this study poses the possibility of additional definition and insight for specific leadership activities that hold potential for increasing student achievement effects.

Examining impacts of school leadership by leader gender raises the possibility for additional understandings of leadership influence. As Shakeshaft, Brown, Irby, Grogan, and Ballenger (2007, p. 105) discussed, the educational research focus since the 1970s has shifted from simple gender comparisons to "understanding the world of women" separately from men. The quality of an administrator is paramount to the overall effect of the school (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013). Uncovering gender based understandings that examine effective leadership actions connecting to student

achievement can provide essential pathways to support struggling leaders, enhance strong leaders, and assist leaders new to the position.

A leader's influence originates through sharing leadership responsibilities and decision-making, while supporting teachers' motivation and working conditions (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010). Equitable implementation of policies that address diverse cultural and socioeconomic concerns and build relationships with all stakeholders in the school community extend leader influence (Louis et al). Yet, there is a need for a clear definition of instructional leadership and identification of behaviors specific to influencing academic achievement gains (Louis et al).

The Rand Report (2004) analyzing policy implications regarding school administration examined the increase in female administrators nationwide while noting the lack of gender studies of differences in leadership behaviors. Shakeshaft, Brown, Irby, Grogan & Ballenger (2007) discussed the numerous barriers women entering administrative leadership roles encounter. A gap in the research concerning teachers' and principals' perceptions of principal application of leadership actions is an opportunity to recommend school improvement and professional development areas. Differences in leadership behaviors of male and female administrators deserve exploration for addition to the literature in an era of principal effectiveness.

Research Questions

1. Given the important leadership actions of a principal, do the perceptions of principal application of these actions differ among teachers and principals?

2. Are there differences in these perceptions of leadership actions among male and female teachers and principals?
3. Do demographic variables, including principal experience and tenure in the building, moderate the differences in perceptions between teachers and principals?
4. What environmental or demographic variables moderate any differences in perception between teachers and principals, including public, private, or charter, district size or school level?

Definition of Terms

Accountability – Leader responsibility for the performance of students and adherence to government regulations (Sodoma & Else, 2009).

Leadership behaviors – General approaches administrators employ in leading a school (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2009).

Perception – Reported feelings of job satisfaction represented through survey answers aligned with leadership theories (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003).

Need for the Study

In a discussion of leadership research prior to 2009, Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011, p. 39) indicated a need for future investigation of effective leadership actions in stating, “These studies add to the literature on the many approaches to effective leadership and now provide a starting point for examining leadership through a number of additional perspectives.” An investigation of perceptions of principal actions and gender can offer insights connecting to perceived strengths in leading a school. Survey

themes may provide areas to recommend professional developments for leaders lacking perceived success.

Improving student achievement and helping all children to learn are goals in the forefront for principals as leadership effectiveness for evaluation purposes is a current education policy initiative (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013). Today's principal endures increasing demands on his/her time, pressure for instructional leadership, and answers to community and social concerns facing the children and families they serve (Sodoma & Else, 2009). Identification of positive leadership actions a principal applies on a daily basis to improve students' outcomes is timely and relevant in the era of educator evaluation reform.

As an educator working in the field, the researcher's career experiences as a teacher, principal, and curriculum administrator add meaning to this study and the resulting implications. Study outcomes will offer recommendations for prospective areas of professional development for principals and teachers to support school reforms and positively affect student achievement. Documentation of particular actions school leaders may potentially employ to encourage student academic success offers benefit to principals striving to meet demands for exemplary school and district ratings.

Methodology

The study methodology utilizes quantitative research methods to study the effects of teacher and principal perceptions of leadership actions on achievement. The study includes teachers and principals from Erie, Crawford, and Warren counties in Northwest Pennsylvania. The PIMRS (Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale) survey, originated in 1982 by Philip Hallinger, Professor and Executive Director of the

College of Management, Mahidol University, Thailand, and evolved through multiple revisions to the current edition (Hallinger, 2008). The objective of the PIMRS Instrument is to measure the actions of a school leader in shaping effects upon student learning (Hallinger). Survey questions address creating school vision, managing instruction, and developing school learning environments (Hallinger). This vetted survey will provide collection of perceptions of leader actions for this study. Both Teacher and Principal versions of the PIMRS surveys will be sent to teachers and principals to attain an adequate sample of responses for comparison of effects. The intent of this quantitative study is to uncover the routine application of leadership actions providing perceptions of both teachers and principals with attention to any gender differences. Hardman (2011) examined relationships between teachers' perceptions of principal leadership styles and student achievement results on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), indicating the need for additional research linking leadership decisions on teachers and student achievement.

Study Limitations and Delimitations

Cook and Campbell (1979) advised evaluation of internal and external validity issues when conducting statistical analysis. Study limitations include consideration of the demographics of the students and school settings of survey participants, self-scoring by the survey participants in completing the PIMRS instrument and any ensuing misrepresentation that may occur. Additionally, attention will be given to the influential effects of the observer upon the actions of study subjects, tenure and career experiences of the principal participants, and the effects of time over the course of the study. The study delimitations include the sole use of the PIMRS survey to measure perceptions of

leadership actions, not collecting perceptions of leadership actions from principal supervisors, board members, parents, or students, omission of school leader research literature prior to 1999, and exclusion of any qualitative methods for data collection. Finally, any generalization of findings beyond the area of Northwest Pennsylvania is prohibitive due to the demographics of the survey population.

Chapter II

Literature Review

Attaining positive student achievement stands in the foreground of many outcomes effective school principals desire to accomplish in the current era of educator accountability. Effective leadership practices a principal demonstrates with staff, students, and the community can impact educational outcomes. The research literature continues to examine school leader actions that promote student achievement as principal evaluation currently receives political reform nationwide. Clifford, Behrstock-Sherratt, and Fetters (2012) considered the implications of recent principal evaluation reform, emphasizing the need for research inclusion in policy implementation. The authors assessed evaluation procedures in various states and distinguished two components of leadership incorporated within principal evaluation policies; principal practice and principal impact (Clifford et al., 2012). Acknowledging the complexity and importance of the principal role, differences among principals' daily actions are worth investigation. Although specific leadership actions have been identified to promote school success, many questions remain regarding their long-term efficacy and usage (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010).

Extension of previous research concerning educational leadership encompasses viewpoints of all stakeholders including students, parents, and other members of the local community and led Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson (2010) to identify three constructs for investigation; namely collective leadership, shared leadership, and distributive leadership. Mediating factors influence teacher efficacy, such as characteristics, motivation, and capacity of the work environment for improvements in

student learning, and may support collective leadership influences of the school leader (Louis et al.).

Parents, and their subsequent involvement in the school setting, are one area concerning student learning outcomes that lacks clear definition in the research literature (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010). A common responsibility of the principal, gathering parental support varies greatly across the educational setting and surrounding community through district policies that include supplementary parental representatives on local school committees (Louis et al.). However, Louis et al. identified the potential benefits for increased student achievement when school leaders pursue the expansion of collective leadership to broaden the incorporation of parental involvement in the overall school process.

Discussions of shared leadership are common themes in recent research literature (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; & Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). Examinations of the actions school leaders take to build strong, positive professional relationships among teachers includes considerations of actions within collaborative learning communities, leader awareness of instructional practices for teacher support, and perceptions of trust among teachers and principals (Louis et al.). The multi-faceted complexities of leadership school settings require allow various configurations of leadership to emerge in research data: for example, one model indicates the school leader's addition of outside experts for school reforms to incorporate teacher collaboration; a second limits teacher leadership and excludes external practitioner supports; and a third example further reduces teachers'

influence on reforms due to principals utilizing traditional authoritative styles of leadership (Louis et al.).

The ever-evolving responsibilities of today's school leader demands the need to understand perceptions of success in leading others forward, and the research literature examines the concept of leader efficacy in detail (Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; & Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). Mentoring and professional development for school leaders in alignment to specific school needs and goals for increasing student outcomes facilitates school leader success (Louis et al.).

The following review of the literature includes examination of the historical and evolving role of the school principal and theories of leadership. The review includes consideration of literature regarding experiences of female principals and examination of teacher and principal perceptions of leadership actions. The review of the literature excludes research prior to the year 1999 in an effort to highlight more recent discussion and data in the current climate of political reform regarding principal evaluation occurring since the year 2000. Themes the literature emphasizes in the review are the historical role of principals, women leaders, leadership actions, teacher perceptions of leadership, and principal supports. While the daily actions of a school leader continue to receive considerable attention in educational research, new insights regarding perceptions of their usage by teachers and principals, with attention to the teachers' and school leader's respective gender, support a timely and necessary addition to leadership empirical research literature and for practitioners considering school improvements.

History

Historical and evolving role of the principal

A school principal's job duties have continued to evolve as evidenced over the past number of decades. Societal changes from the expansion of technology, random acts of school violence, and economic disparity create ever increasing challenges for today's school leader. Harvey (2011, p.4) stated, "Traditionally, the principal resembled the middle manager suggested in William Whyte's 1950's classic *The Organization Man* – an overseer of buses, boilers, and books." Principals serving primarily as a building manager maintaining order is an image of the past (Harvey). With increasing accountability measures through No Child Left Behind, principals endeavor to maintain student achievement growth and lead instructional practices.

The changing role of the principal has led to unforeseen consequences. For example, in a study concerning professional development of principals, Corcoran, Casserly, Price-Baugh, Walston, Hall, and Simon (2013) relayed the implications of expecting principals to lead instruction and assessment when they may not have robust knowledge of exemplary instructional practices. Additionally, Corcoran et al. discussed evolving responsibilities of a principal to now include district planning and operations, and leadership in instruction and school safety: "These competing demands lead to a clear gap between the aspirational and the actual uses of time for those serving in this position" (p. 28).

No Child Left Behind accountability emphasizes educator accountability and a recent, persistent mandate for principals to lead instruction and student achievement. However, the perceptions of the principal role in leading learning are deep-rooted in the

research literature. As Blasé and Blasé (1999) maintained, values a principal establishes that transfers emphasis upon teacher professional growth and reflection impacts instructional outcomes.

The literature discusses the role of the principal and examines varying theories of leadership for potential effectiveness. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) discussed the scrutiny educational leadership receives when educators seek viable methods to generate academic success. Marzano et al. highlight the surprising lack of empirical research of the last 35 years examining school leaders, also acknowledging the number of available leadership books endorsing actions for leaders to pursue. Marzano, Frontier, and Livingston (2011) provided an overview of the history of educational evaluation dating from the 1700s, indicating that supervisors of teaching were initially clergy, due to the common perception of teacher as public servant. As time progressed to the mid-1800s, perceptions of ways to instruct students began changing to include complexities of learning and consideration of teaching expertise (Marzano et al.).

With the advent of learning theories, conflicting views of school oversight management for optimal learning began to arise from scientific theorists including John Dewey and Frederick Taylor (Marzano, Frontier, & Livingston, 2011). These theories ultimately led to a more systematic approach to public schooling including the use of standardized testing to measure student learning (Marzano et al.). Discussion of changes in education after World War II led Marzano et al. to review a supervisor's role during this time period and include a long, comprehensive list of supervisory duties comprising management of classroom climate, resources, teachers, and school attendance. Also, principals were to lead faculty meetings, observe teaching, lead as a teaching resource,

and communicate with the public (Marzano et al.). Marzano et al. claimed that the rapid advancement of the clinical supervision model by the late 1960s led to changes in teacher lesson evaluations, including a pre-observation conference between a supervisor and a teacher, a classroom observation of teaching, and a final analysis between the supervisor and teacher.

Rousmaniere (2013) examined the evolving principal role towards a more complex middle manager position, comparing the changes to a similar evolution in middle managerial business leaders from the late 19th century to today. Highlighting the dual role in supporting teachers and reporting to district superintendent authorities, Rousmaniere pondered the growth of the school principal role and our current governmental educational system, the initial manager role of the principal changing to become a teaching coach position responsible for connecting with the community and teachers. Usdan, McCloud, and Podmostko (2000) reviewed a task force report that examined the role of the school principal, observing the increasing responsibilities the job requires, and a lack of preparation in prior coursework and professional support once in the role. A call to action to reinvent the role of principal concludes the review (Usdan et al.).

Trail (2000) examined various roles a principal must assume in creating school reform, such as psychologist, teacher, facilities manager, philosopher, police officer, diplomat, social worker, mentor, public relations director, coach, and cheerleader. Trail detailed the evolution of the role of a principal and the requirement of multi-tasking between various roles at a moment's notice. Emphasizing standards for school leaders and collaboration within the community connects to a discussion of leading sustainable

school reform initiatives and distributing leadership (Trail). Levine (2005) indicated the evolving role of a principal to be of paramount importance in the current era of social change regarding education and accountability, and stressed the importance of teacher preparation.

Levine (2005) further reflected on the critical evaluation of schools aiming to increase achievement without acknowledging the social problems students bring to the school system in public education today. Discussing the current global economy, Levine stated the need for education to provide students opportunities for advanced skills and knowledge leading to career readiness in today's marketplace. Levine also highlighted the changing demographics of students in school and the need for diversity representation and training among school teachers and principals. Preparation and development of today's principal requires alignment to meet these emerging needs.

Richards, Brown, & Forde (2007) stressed the importance of creating school environments where all students receive equal opportunities to learn by addressing diversity of students in today's classrooms. Customizing student accommodations requires school leaders to provide tangible instructional resources as well as responses to teachers' needs (Richards et al.). Elias, Zins, Graczyk, & Weissberg (2003) discussed the social-emotional needs of present day students in classrooms where schools are implementing reforms to increase achievement, emphasizing the impact of economic poverty and single parent homes upon today's school environment. Addressing student diversity, students' social-emotional needs, and including the local community in planning sustainable school improvements is a necessity for today's school principals (Richards et al.; Elias et al).

Corcoran, Casserly, Price-Baugh, Walston, Hall, and Simon (2013) compared practices of six districts in examining principal supervision systems, professional development, and evaluation of principals. Corcoran et al. discussed the principals' need for support, access to resources, and communication and collaboration with central office administrators. Often, principals transition to the role from teaching positions with varying levels of instructional expertise, and ultimately, unpredictable confidence levels as an instructional leader (Corcoran et al.). Pierce (2000) compared responsibilities from the principal of the past to the principal of today, highlighting the extension of work hours, increasing school budgetary controls, responsibility for student discipline and interaction, the management of faculty members and instruction.

Meeting the social needs of the community by creating present day before and after school programs lengthens the school day, and ultimately extends the school principal's day (Pierce, 2000). Increasing leadership turnover often occurs by reassignment of principals to improve school outcomes and compounds the effect upon schools (Pierce). Additionally, employment packages of today's principal rarely provide collective bargaining supports or tenure for employment security (Pierce). Redefining the job of principal by dividing managerial and instructional leadership tasks into separate roles could lead to leadership success (Pierce; Harvey, 2011).

Addressing the numerous challenges faced by today's principal requires a specific plan of support to sustain leadership success (Bouchard, Cervone, Hayden, Riggins-Newby, & Zarlengo, 2002). Acknowledging the barriers to pursuing leadership roles, the authors suggested recommendations from the field to improve principal preparation programs (Bouchard et al.). In defining the principal's role in guiding instruction, the

authors stated, “An **instructional leader** must understand what is important and valuable to the school in terms of learning theory, effective instruction, and the curriculum and furthermore must be able to communicate and represent these interests to students, teachers, and parents” (Bouchard et al., p.3). Conceding the difficulty for many principals to separate the administrative role in leading the school building and leading instruction, Bouchard et al. highlighted multiple additional issues principals face including limited resources, teacher contract issues, staff development needs, lack of respect for the role of principal, and students’ social issues. Providing principals with mentors and professional development are potential ways to address barriers (Bouchard et al.).

While the changing duties associated with the principal’s role is a popular topic of discussion, reinvention of the role to address current needs is also a common theme. Usdan, McCloud, and Podmostko (2000) discussed the shortage of capable principals to fill open positions, identifying early retirements as a cause. Principal responsibilities and low pay levels are barriers for potential new applicants (Usdan et al). Recommendations to address these concerns include improving principal preparation programs, and increasing pay to accommodate additional responsibilities (Usdan et al.). Defining the role of the principal by three categories: instructional leadership, community leadership, and visionary leadership, Usdan et al., further declared student learning as the most significant and necessary leadership role.

Principal evaluation is increasingly a topic of reform in education policy discussions. Evaluation areas include supervisor discussions regarding principal and teacher performance, assessing principal knowledge of student data, conducting instructional walkthroughs with principals, and observing principal efforts to resolve

parental concerns (Corcoran, Casserly, Price-Baugh, Walston, Hall, and Simon, 2013). Principal evaluation recommendations include providing a clear definition of the role and obligatory skills to include a narrowing of responsibilities and spans of control (Corcoran et al.). Strategically assigning principals to schools where skill sets align, providing professional developments to principals in need, maintaining open lines of communication between principals and central office, assigning mentor coaches to new principals, evaluating school progress, and using community resources to develop new leaders complete the list of reform suggestions (Corcoran et al.).

Branch, Hanushek, and Rivkin (2013) discussed evaluation of principal quality through the current use of value-added models to determine the extent of advancing student achievement among similar groups of student populations. Utilizing principal observation data from a six year time frame, Branch et al. addressed data variances, including concerns regarding principal turnover in low performing schools. The authors attributed the data variances to movement of principals with poor evaluations to different schools instead of termination through the evaluation process (Branch et al.).

Pathways to the principal role and preparation programs are similarly evolving over time. Turnbull, Riley, and MacFarlane (2013) considered three possible paths to the principal position. Preparation through universities, non-profit leadership apprenticeship residencies, or multi-stage programs with a district final-stage all incorporate work as an assistant principal as a precursor to the principal role (Turnbull et al.). Gregg (2007) detailed the history of the assistant principal role primarily from the 1940s, when providing additional support for school principals led to this new position with candidates often chosen from current teachers on staff. The assistant principal position involves a

valuable preparatory phase that serves as a preliminary, experience building career move for those intending to pursue principal roles in time.

Opportunities with authentic, inquiry-based experiences allow improvement of problem-solving skills sets for new principals (Turnbull, Riley, and MacFarlane, 2013). Discussion of six school districts including Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Denver Public, Gwinnett County Public, Hillsborough County Public, Prince George County, and the New York City Department of Education contains variations among program requirements for common requirements for mentoring by experienced principals to those learning the role's expectations and required abilities (Turnbull et al.). Examples of the application process for prospective principals includes realistic job duty simulations of teacher observations and feedback, data analysis, teacher meeting facilitation, community and parent communication role plays, simulated school walkthroughs, and self-reflections (Turnbull, et al.).

In conclusion, principal evolution and reinvention includes increasingly complex responsibilities to prepare today's students for work in a global economy (Usdan, McCloud, and Podmostko, 2000). For example, new technologies are entering schools for instructional use, often without adequate professional development supports for teachers (Usdan et al.). This is just one challenge today's principals may encounter. Providing support for principals to meet paradigm shifts in role expectations is a recurring point in the research literature valuable of further contemplation.

History of women in educational leadership.

The literature represents women leaders in education less than men when discussing the evolving role of the principal, yet, as the role currently continues to

progress into new dimensions, a discussion of women's history in educational leadership roles adds another perspective. Rousmaniere (2013) examined the history of the school principal and participation of the female leader. Discussion of the principal role in early America recounting to post-colonial times contains mention of female principals working as preceptors responsible for supervision and instruction of female students with males in oversight roles (Rousmaniere). However, some historical accounts detail female principal leaders solely responsible for schools with only female student enrollments (Rousmaniere). Female leaders were able to expand education of girls beyond primary levels by gaining the support of the community through displays of determination and commitment to students (Rousmaniere).

Rousmaniere (2013) depicts the principal role in early America as a lonely position, requiring considerable support and assurance from the surrounding community without clear job descriptions and lacking overall representation by females (Rousmaniere). Relaying the experiences of a young male administrator from the 1920s, Rousmaniere highlighted a story of promotion from teacher to principal to superintendent while still at a noticeably young age, the acceleration primarily due to male gender. Most female principals of this time were found leading elementary schools, due to the lack of men working in elementary education, with the position then requiring multiple roles including teaching, leading clubs, coaching athletics, and working with the community (Rousmaniere).

Grupton (2009) reflected upon the pursuit of leadership roles in education by women, including the increase in the number of women administrators and the differences in pay compared to men in similar roles. The author included mention of

major categories from study data that offer advice to aspiring women leaders; be prepared, work hard, persevere, practice good people skills, develop and maintain strong support systems, uphold and protect your personal integrity, and believe in yourself – go for it (Grupton). Grupton continued with a discussion of the evolution of issues connecting leadership and gender, emphasizing the movement from access to equity as the ultimate shift.

Morrison's (2012) replication study of Grupton's work from 1992 investigated the topic of gender issues to determine additional information regarding perceptions and experiences of women educational leaders. Demographic information indicates that within an upward trend in the number of women holding educational administrative positions, women persistently lack equal representation in administration roles overall when compared to men (Morrison).

Barriers.

Rousmaniere (2013) discussed pay discrepancies between male and female principals in a comprehensive depiction of the overall historically low pay principals receive. Gregg's (2007) review of the assistant principal role from a female and personal perspective included discussion of the barriers and essential knowledge for aspiring leaders to ultimately hold secondary principal positions after completing the assistant role. The duties of the assistant principal comprise acting as a disciplinarian, solving problems to maintain a peaceful school culture, with underrepresentation of women in the role, and, generally, choosing men for open positions (Gregg). Gregg further discussed the challenges women face in fitting in as administrators, due to balance of family life with work.

Barriers to obtaining these positions include social working networks for hiring accessible to men and high levels of stress and responsibility comparative to pay levels (Morrison, 2012). Reflecting upon the number of women currently in educational leadership roles, Morrison discussed the effect of long held stereotypes deterring those considering the role. The contention that occurs in balancing family responsibilities while holding a leadership role becomes the most lingering and significant issue female leaders' face, with a call to action for development of work-family policies and flexible working arrangements (Grupton, 2009).

Gregg (2007) concluded that while women have traditionally observed men in leadership, if given the opportunity, women can offer alternative approaches to leadership. Depiction of the history of women in educational leadership in the time period after World War II emphasizes the common perception that teaching provides a viable career for blending family life and vocation, leading to more females in teaching roles and less females pursuing administration (Gregg). Traditionally, barriers in hiring female assistant principals (i.e., student discipline and sports) continue to be a major focus of the assistant principal role responsibilities (Gregg). Additionally, a lack of role models prohibits females from receiving supports that could provide paths to promotion, including female mentors (Gregg).

Jacobs (2002) examined administrator social networking events including golfing outings, cigar nights, and motorcycle clubs, excluding female principals responsible for balancing job responsibilities and families, while enduring a lonely job. Socialization in the workplace to extend the learning and network problem-solving strategies where both male and female principals can collaborate continues to elude mainstream practices

(Jacobs). Morrison (2012) discussed the slower advancement of women in administrative roles, lower pay rates than male counterparts, and lesser self-ratings, while holding more additional degrees than men. Stereotypes and barriers combining to lead to fewer women securing administrative leadership positions, Morrison stated, “History made it clear: Such inequitable treatment of any segment of a society eventually takes its toll on everyone” (p.7).

Morrison (2012) highlighted four shifts in gender leadership issues to combat barriers including the need for supports, preparation quality for the role and skill sets, job retention strategies, and moving from access to equity. The societal perception of the teacher role as feminine is another barrier to females acquiring principal positions, with the principal role generally seen as masculine and corresponding leadership styles seen as too aggressive for females (Morrison). Women’s contributions to household budget decisions and corresponding pay discrepancies to parallel male counterparts even lead some female administrators desiring a superintendent position to remain childless (Morrison). Lemasters and Roach (2012, p.2) addressed female barriers in the educational superintendent role in stating, “Statistics indicate that the female superintendent operates in a world not of her making and in a paradigm designed around men.”

Female African American superintendents also encounter barriers in securing educational leadership roles (Gales-Johnson, 2003). Highlighting the overwhelming representation of females in minority teaching positions, women securing subsequent leadership roles remain amiss (Gales-Johnson). Males tend to incorporate sports coaching alongside administrative career progression, while females pursue other paths (Gales-Johnson). Additional barriers for African American women include a lack of supporting

research literature, challenges to publishing research about women leaders, and narrow perspectives regarding the leadership role (Gales-Johnson).

Labeling stereotypes as a substantial barrier to advancement connects to feelings of prejudice towards minorities through the hiring process (Gales-Johnson, 2003).

Attributing common oppression experiences by the females pursuing educational leadership roles to historical positioning of African American females at the bottom of the hierarchy within American social structures, Gales-Johnson stated, “Because black [*sic*] women are positioned outside of the power structure within the organizations they occupy, their participation in networks that could advance their mobility and provide opportunities for advancement is limited” (p. 29).

Innovative approaches to leadership.

Numerous researchers describe alternative approaches to leadership female school leaders employ. Sharing leadership and the approach of women educational leaders to collaborate regarding issues of equity and diversity in similar methodology to social justice organizations opposes traditional, masculine styles (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011). For example, women’s progressive methods of forming committees and advisory boards for collective communication and issue resolution differs from historically male leadership approaches of independence, authoritativeness, and mission (Grogan & Shakeshaft). Discussing the leadership research literature, Grogan and Shakeshaft (p. 43) stated, “In contrast, women were described as forming webs, rather than pyramids, in their institutions, especially when institutional governance structures created the necessary spaces.” Considering perceptions of female leadership in direct opposition to

traditional male norms of school management permits the possible influence of innovative outlooks for school reforms (Grogan & Shakeshaft).

Jean-Marie, Normone, and Brooks (2009) detailed preparation programs for today's school leaders in addressing social issues of diversity and multicultural integration in tandem with providing college and career readiness skill sets for students. A review of educational administrative styles of leadership in the time period at the beginning of the twentieth century includes influences on school leadership methods from one-dimensional and tiered business models with a holistic approach toward student education (Jean-Marie et al.).

Shifts in responsibilities of school administrators to address matters of race, gender, and culture within the public school system, in addition to meeting standards of accountability in current educational reform policies, create a timely foundation for principal preparatory program revisions to reflect new theories of leadership style addressing social justice issues (Jean-Marie, Normone, & Brooks, 2009). Emphasizing constructivist methods connecting to feminist and critical theory for leadership preparation, Jean-Marie et al. conveyed the assertion for leaders to address the importance of social issues in schools affecting students today including bullying, racism, and homophobia. Proposing a revised perspective moving from a linear to an interrelated methodology, Jean-Marie et al. (p. 19) stressed,

Based on our review of literature and subsequent analysis, a growing concern among educators is whether emerging school leaders are prepared to face political, economic, cultural, and social pressures and create schools that advocate for education that advances all children.

The authors next elicited a call for additional research studies of educational leadership and social justice in various countries around the globe for a broader perspective to emerge (Jean-Marie et al.).

Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2000) described the underrepresentation of females in superintendent roles remaining stagnant over a 10 year period, conveying the need for information female role models can provide to women with interest in pursuing leadership positions. The results of collective demographic data reveal that male and female superintendents differ widely in the area of prior educational leadership, with men having five additional years' experience on average (Glass et al.). Conversely, women superintendents hold more doctoral degrees and memberships to national curriculum associations and teach an average of 10 years in the classroom, with men teaching an average of about five years in the classroom and securing more specialist degrees than women leaders (Glass et al.). Women typically acquire an assistant or principal position at a later age in comparison to men, developing communication, collaboration, curriculum, and instruction skill sets that differentiate female leadership methods from traditional male approaches (Glass et al.).

The progression of females in educational leadership contains the initial emphasis on early childhood education in the early twentieth century to the development of innovative methods of leadership differing in multiple ways from customary male styles seen in educational research literature. Examination of the differences in leadership procedures by gender offers insights for consideration of both male and female future leaders.

Gender

Women leaders.

Studies that focus upon female principals are deficient in education research. However, women's leader style and gender have been a topic for investigation. Gilligan's (1982) exploration of gender and varying approaches among men and women in leadership continues to influence the evolution of the female in all types of leadership positions. Discussing psychological theory and women's development in defining the role of mother versus self, Gilligan (1982, p. 24) stated, "...the problem of interpretation that shadows the understanding of women's development arises from the differences observed in their experiences of relationships." Kropiewnicki and Shapiro (2001) examined the ethic of care in leadership practices and gender stereotypes in a case study of women principals. Data findings indicate connections to teaching and learning, making a difference, creating child-centered schools among the female leaders, and the ethic of care as an important value female principals embrace (Kropiewnicki & Shapiro).

Shakeshaft, Brown, Irby, Grogan, and Ballenger (2007) discussed representation of women in school administration and emphasized concerns for accuracy regarding consistent data. The authors discussed the transition in research literature of male to female comparisons towards understanding women as leaders, with most female leadership research occurring in dissertations (Shakeshaft et al.). The authors examined multiple barriers women in educational leadership roles experience including poor self-image, lack of aspiration or motivation, family and home responsibilities, working conditions and sex discrimination, lack of support, encouragement, socialization and sex role stereotyping, finances for continuing training, too few role models, sponsors,

mentors, and networks, and sex discrimination in hiring and promotion (Shakeshaft et al.). Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) distinguished diverse collective leadership as an innovative female course separate from traditional authoritative leadership and towards a networking approach allowing positive change.

In discussion of five ways that women lead, Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) shared insights and issues women encounter in finding balance between work and home life. The authors emphasized the need for a woman leader to have this balance for success in stating, “Many women argue that it is very important for women to be themselves and to figure out what leadership approaches they will need to embrace so that they can negotiate the competing demands of family and profession” (p. 24). Morrison (2012) indicated women educational leaders exhibit empathy, accommodation, inspiration, and relationship-oriented styles of management connecting to staff development and student academics. A description of female leaders’ awareness of classroom activities, teacher evaluation, and curriculum development differs from male management of school finances and facilities (Morrison).

Eckman’s (2002) investigation of female high school principals’ perspectives focused upon role conflict, role commitment, and job satisfaction. Role conflict entails time demands with regularly extended workweeks and masculine images traditionally connecting to the high school principal role (Eckman). Choices made by female high school principals to raise families and pursue career advancement describe role commitment, and job satisfaction entails perceptions of success and effectiveness in the principal role (Eckman). Women leaders tend to delay attaining principal positions until

later in a career, thus creating less available applicants for open leadership roles and a need for encouragement to women interested in school administration (Eckman).

Surveying job satisfaction among female principals with questions measuring levels of satisfaction with colleagues, school characteristics, workloads, student to administrator proportions, and prospects for career developments, Eckman (2002) indicated moderate levels of satisfaction among leaders. Length of administrator experience affects satisfaction reports with indications of higher levels of confidence, as principals who have experience anticipate issues and use successful problem-solving strategies (Eckman).

Eckman (2002) emphasized the need for administrators to balance the role commitment demands and workload to reduce the number of role conflicts that females experience. Recommendations for the appropriate balance between the number of students and corresponding workloads include mentoring supports to improve job satisfaction rates (Eckman). Wickham (2007) listed strategies for females desiring to progress leadership careers that includes increasing skills to support instructional improvements, understanding best practices in pedagogy, building relationships among staff, and addressing communal and parental requests.

When school boards use search consultants to locate and hire eligible superintendent applicants instead of hiring known candidates from within a local candidate pool, obstacles are created for females with relocating restrictions who want to advance their careers (Wickham, 2007; Gales-Johnson, 2003). Hiring women leaders often occurs from within organizations that afford opportunities to gain leadership experiences prior to the role of principal (Wickham). Noting the alternate paths males and

females pursue to advance in educational leadership, Gales-Johnson reported the common vertical pursuit from secondary principal roles for men, while women typically move horizontally through instructional and curriculum roles.

Once in administrative roles, women leaders in education report inadequate provision of supports through mentoring and social organizations (Shakeshaft, Brown, Irby, Grogan, & Ballenger, 2007). Wolverton and Macdonald (2001) reviewed the foreseen shortage of qualified applicants for superintendent roles in educational leadership, and the critical necessity of skill development of all potential leaders encompassing reflective practice.

Women leaders in education exhibit different paths to management positions than male counterparts while grappling with barriers in preparation for leadership and hiring paths to advancement. Once in the administrative role, women contend with role conflicts, role considerations, and job satisfaction concerns that contrast to experiences of male leaders. Consideration of these differences may provide insight into variances in approach to educational leadership roles and behaviors women exhibit when compared to men.

Gender differences in leadership

Cuadrado, Navas, Molero, Ferrer, and Morales (2012) debated global glass ceiling barriers for women seeking leadership positions and the corresponding absence of a causal explanation of remaining obstacles in studying influences from leadership style differences among women and men. Defining leadership styles through repeating actions, either through tasks or relationships, Cuadrado et al. aligned females with relationship approaches and males with autocratic styles, linking perceptions of masculinity and

femininity to leadership actions as well. Associating transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership style headings to females and males, Cuadrado et al. delineated transformational leadership as a feminine style with a leadership focus upon academic encouragement and individual attention to subordinates, with transactional and laissez-faire as masculine styles that include directing or passive emphases towards subordinates.

A survey of autocratic and democratic leadership styles indicates female leaders demonstrate autocratic leadership styles more frequently when the subordinate survey participant was male (Cuadrado, Navas, Molero, Ferrer, & Morales, 2012). Additionally, females utilize negotiating leadership styles more than males (Cuadrado et al.). Overall, results indicate both genders employ democratic leadership styles, with a lack of noticeable differences in overall management between males and females regarding change initiatives (Cuadrado et al.).

Survey data reveals that women leaders use autocratic behaviors from male subordinates, supporting the perception of the need for female leaders to exert leadership styles through masculine traits (Cuadrado, Navas, Molero, Ferrer, & Morales, 2012). Although the role of leader requires accomplishment of specific duties regardless of a leader's gender, flexibility in leadership approaches allows individuality to emerge and influences overall leadership style (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen, 2003). Eagly et al. examined the inconsistency among leader roles and the female gender role, stating,

One reason that gender roles have different implications for female and male leaders is thus that the inconsistency often exists between the predominantly communal qualities that perceivers associate with women (e.g., friendly, kind,

unselfish) and the predominantly agentic qualities that they generally believe are necessary to succeed as a leader (e.g., assertive, masterful, instrumentally competent). p. 572

Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) discussed social network theories by describing collective actions to share information with stakeholders within the educational setting. The importance of open channels of communication among social networks connects to transformational leadership criteria as Grogan and Shakeshaft (p. 53) stated, “A willingness to allow differences and challenges to surface, rather than suppressing them, is fundamental to the productivity associated with this approach.” Outlining the steps of transformational change by way of cognitive shifts, Grogan and Shakeshaft emphasized the approach of the female leader to reframe problems in pursuit of viable solutions. The authors also acknowledge the absence of reliable research methods to collect measurable data of leadership actions beyond reporting perceptions and beliefs (Grogan & Shakeshaft).

Lemasters and Roach (2012) discussed the differences of female school leaders in approaching power and corresponding perceptions when considering actions in the administrative role. Descriptions of female leadership actions include ardent, communicative, and persistent (Lemasters & Roach). Females generally pursue indirect influences as opposed to traditionally direct male approaches when implementing initiatives and consequentially avoid negative perceptions and attitudes. (Lemasters & Roach).

Women in educational leadership settings with poor historical achievement may be set up to fail (Ryan, Haslam, and Postmes, 2007). Ryan et al. discussed demographics

of minority women in leadership roles in urban school settings and women on boards of companies with recent poor performance and critical views regarding female leader job performance. Sexism in the workplace, a lack of support networks for female leaders, differing perceptions between leadership actions and female actions, and contradictory stereotypes regarding female leaders and crisis management all contribute to a *glass cliff* of barriers for women to address (Ryan et al.).

Organizations endure losses by not exhausting the possibilities for success in supporting female skill sets women leaders can offer (Appelbaum, Audet, & Miller, 2003). Conclusions of research regarding biological influences indicate a lack of connection to gender differences in leadership (Appelbaum et al.). Women's personal attitudes toward leadership, self-confidence, experience, the corporate environment, and the "old boys' networks" peripherally bar female leadership advancements (Appelbaum et al.). Traditionally female leader values include listening, gentle interactions, empathy, and mediation (Appelbaum et al.). Appelbaum et al. suggested that future studies investigate negative perceptions of women's leadership abilities and the impacts of organizational situations for researchers to predict and influence leadership effectiveness.

Positive evaluations result when leaders of either gender perform in alignment to preconceived expectations (Pounder & Coleman, 2002). In stating, "Arguably, a hostile, rapidly changing environment, replete with conflicting and competing pressures, confronts most modern organizations. This situation demands leaders that have the flexibility to range over an array of leadership qualities that have been labeled masculine and feminine" Pounder & Coleman (p.128) emphasized the need for a mixed approach to

management. Leaders of both genders must gain a variety of skill sets to address numerous challenges in administrative roles (Pounder & Coleman).

Reviewing the evolution of female leadership, Grogan & Shakeshaft (2011) revisited the collective leadership practice and progress towards a time when gender does not matter for leadership even if influence for innovative practices comes from traditionally female methods to organize, motivate, and nurture subordinates. Transfer of mothering skills by female leaders to those they supervise creates a metaphor of organizational leadership to managing a family, and through the usage of collective action, indirect power creates program and initiative reforms (Grogan & Shakeshaft). Perceptions of gender differences towards overall goals in leadership with female desires to create communal change and male desires to create individual career success perpetuates alternative definitions of leadership for both genders (Grogan & Shakeshaft). Relational, trusting, and role-modeling power through persistent, communicative collaboration with colleagues surrounds the communal pledge to improve instructional practices female school leaders enact to create and sustain school reforms (Grogan & Shakeshaft).

Actions/Perceptions of Actions

The actions of a principal are a frequent topic of examination in the educational research literature. Authoritarian leaders, participative leaders, transactional leaders, and transformational leaders categorize actions of both genders (Hoyle, 2006). The authoritarian leader is indifferent and separate from the humanness of the school environment, opposite from participative leaders advocating collective decision making and teaming with staff for solutions to solve problems and achieve goals (Hoyle).

Transactional leaders manage with balance to the needs of the individual *idiographic* and the goals of the organization *nomothetic*, in contrast to transformational leadership, ideal for reforming organizations when leading as a servant with inspiration, inclusion, and social justice (Hoyle).

Zaccaro (2012) provided a prospective third *tipping point* in current research regarding differences among leadership styles, with the first beginning during the late 1940s and lasting until the mid-1970s, when research discussion focused on conditions leaders create instead of discrete variances in a leader's actions. The second tipping point began in the late 1970s, when use of meta-analyses examining various known management models began to appear in research studies (Zaccaro). Identifying the necessity for examining multidimensional leadership methods, which include specific leader variances and resulting outcomes, Zaccaro classified the third tipping point emerging in leadership research trends as multivariate investigations of leader characteristics, procedure examples, and distinctive habits among successful leaders.

The study of leadership characteristics concerning motivational, cognitive, social and personality influence over management performance provides the researcher with an opportunity to address variable biases and allows patterns of connection among the variables to emerge (Zaccaro, 2012). Antonakis, Day, and Schyns (2012) highlighted the individual variances among leadership behaviors' and the significance of intelligence and leader personality in supervision roles emerging from recent multivariate investigations of leadership, ascertaining this trend to be a *renaissance* for leadership theory.

Leadership actions

Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) identified 21 actions of effective school leaders for their potential impact on academic success of students from meta-analysis study. Leadership actions for lasting second-order change involve a leader's knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment, being a driving force behind new reforms, knowing the research and theory behind reforms to support teacher buy-in, challenging old beliefs, reflecting upon reform effects, exhibiting willingness to alter reforms as needed, and implementing reforms with accuracy to the design (Marzano et al., p. 70-72, Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, and Anderson, 2010, & Harvey, 2011). Harvey emphasized the overlap among all tasks to achieve success in school leadership in the recent shift to focus upon academic achievement expectations for all students. A major shift in the role of the principal is an increased focus upon utilization of data sources, as Harvey (p.12) stated, "Effective leaders view data as a means not only to pinpoint problems but to understand their nature and causes."

Ten variables of leadership that influence student achievement identified by Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Walhstrom (2004) include state and district policies and practices, stakeholders support, a leader's professional learning experiences, school conditions, teachers, classroom conditions, student and family background, and student motivation. These variable connections begin at the district level and reach to effective schools (Leithwood et al.). Awareness of how teachers learn to teach is a relevant point for principals in providing appropriate professional development for teachers to enhance student learning achievement (Stein & Nelson, 2003). However, leaders' content

knowledge is a *missing paradigm* in the review of principal actions and influence on student achievement (Stein & Nelson).

The Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) report investigated measurement of effective teaching, prevalent in the current political reform climate of teacher and principal evaluation (Cantrell & Kane, 2012). Questioning the dependability of administrators to measure teacher instructional practices, Cantrell and Kane utilized multiple observations and included peer observers to address reliability concerns among interpretations. A general recommendation for leaders is to provide teachers appropriate feedback to improve instruction (Cantrell & Kane). However, Rothstein and Mathis (2013) contested the MET report results, illuminating concerns surrounding the usage of student outcomes in determining teacher effectiveness and indicating the first observation of a teacher tends to forecast conclusions of future observations as well, ultimately providing faulty investigation results.

Although evaluation of instructional practices is highly contested in the literature due to various biases and investigational approaches, the impact of principals' evaluation skill sets and indirect leadership influences are a popular and frequent research topic. Leithwood and Jantzi (2008, p.497) stated, "Efficacy is a key variable in better understanding effects in most organizations", and acknowledged a breach of insight in the research with the limited number of leader efficacy studies in recent education literature. Leithwood & Jantzi indicated positive influences from district leadership and organizational conditions when connected to the positive beliefs of the school leader, mainly when a leader perceives sustainability and support in the organization. Leithwood

and Jantzi suggested further research of personal approaches to leadership to add to the literature.

While Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) emphasized the influence of collective efficacy towards overall student achievement, moderator variables of leader gender, experience, race, and ethnicity provide little evidence of connection in the investigation outcomes. Tschannen-Moran & Gareis (2004) likewise examined principal efficacy through committed performance of persistent actions in completing school reforms. Analysis of three separate studies that address leader efficacy eliminates the first two studies due to poor outcomes and statistical analysis concerns (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis). The creation of a scale to measure efficacy reveals correlations between principal efficacy and trust in teachers, and trust in students and parents (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis).

An investigation of relationships between teachers and principals and possible influence upon instructional practice revealed connections between perceptions of shared leadership and trust among teachers (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). The authors stated, “Our data suggest that elementary, middle, and high school principals can all have a significant effect on instruction” and advocated additional observation of leadership actions for further insights (Wahlstrom & Louis, p. 479).

Teacher perceptions of a leader’s actions

Although actions of a leader are a topic of research, gaps exist in the literature regarding the perceptions of teachers and principals and considering gender in examining effective school leadership. Providing frequent feedback, promoting an academic emphasis in the school and affirming teacher competency through communal decision-

making all influence teacher beliefs (Ross & Gray, 2006). Most importantly, teachers who embrace a commitment to the school community identify their role as an instructional team member and increase actions of personal accountability towards school outcomes (Ross & Gray). The influence of transformational leadership actions by a principal holds great potential to increase positive teacher beliefs (Ross & Gray).

Hardman (2011) examined teachers' perceptions of principal leadership style for connections to student achievement outcomes with a focus on transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant categories of leadership. Analyses indicated positive connections between teacher perceptions of transformational leadership and student achievement results with the influence of the principal's leadership connected with the number of years a teacher works in a school (Hardman). Leaders described as 'Hands on' who use contingent rewards to support teachers' efforts influence positive teachers' perceptions of leadership (Hardman). Principals who convey the ability to build school capacity, model confidence in leadership, and exhibit advanced decision-making skill sets created positive teachers' perceptions as well (Hardman).

Principals' beliefs regarding their own effectiveness influence teachers' perceptions of a leader's success (Campbell, 2012). Ross and Gray (2006, p.801) highlighted the importance of principal actions to improve feelings of teacher efficacy and stated, "By setting feasible goals, clarifying standards, and linking actions of teachers to student outcomes, a principal influences teacher self-assessments that contribute to efficacy beliefs." Providing settings for teachers to share experiences of successful instructional practices, supporting collaborative participation of teachers in school

improvement planning, and reducing teacher stresses are actions a leader can employ to secure increases in teacher efficacy perceptions (Ross & Gray).

Referencing the diverse challenges principals face in leading instruction, Sebastian & Allensworth (2012) discussed the prerequisite pedagogical content knowledge of principals who must observe teaching and guide student achievement. Debate regarding definitions and models of ‘best instructional practices’ held within the current research complicates determining which actions principals should take to improve instructional outcomes (Sebastian & Allensworth). Sharing leadership includes providing time for teachers to interact and supporting teachers’ reflections of instructional practices within professional learning communities (Printy & Marks, 2006). Johnson (2011), Dillon (2011), and Rowland (2008) similarly expressed the importance of teacher perceptions of principal leadership for the successful creation of change and influence upon student achievement outcomes.

Perceptual significance

Determining the perceptions of both principals and teachers allows a comprehensive view of the daily actions principals may pursue to affect student outcomes lacking in the current research literature. Investigation of teachers’ perspectives of school climates may expand understandings for choosing appropriate school reforms (Finley, 2014). Differences in self-rating by female principals in the skill categories relating to instructional and organizational management, as well as differences in self-rating from principals with higher levels of education can provide insights to needed areas of professional development for those leading schools (Grissom & Loeb, 2009).

Noticeable discrepancies among perceptions of principals and teachers surrounding high expectations in lower performing schools included contrasting reports for evidence of positive beliefs that students can achieve within the school culture by principals and teachers (Englert, Fries, Martin-Glenn, & Douglas, 2007). However, in schools making gains in achievement outcomes, perceptions were in accord between teachers and principals regarding beliefs in students' success and positive feelings among staff members; Englert et al. stating, "This finding is especially noteworthy because it is a fundamental component of the standards based reform movement" (p. 9).

Research includes examination of the perceptions teachers hold regarding leadership abilities in creating trusting school cultures, yet principal levels of apparent trust towards the teachers they manage is absent in the literature (Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010). An investigation of principal perceptions of leadership hold promise as the chosen method to progress the research literature during the current political climate of education systems regarding increased accountability and effectiveness (Provost, Boscardin, & Wells, 2010; Louis et al.).

Summary

Collection and investigation of perceptions of a principal's actions with consideration to leader and teacher gender is lacking in the research literature. Identifying specific actions for principals to create cultures of student learning holds potential to achieve momentous strides in achieving learning goals. The intent of this study is timely and relevant in the current era of national reform policies regarding evaluation of principals. The preceding literature review contains an examination of the historical role of the principal and how it is rapidly evolving today while experiencing political reforms

for educator effectiveness. Other areas of discussion include the account of females in principal and superintendent leadership roles, and an investigation of perceptions of leadership.

Recent educational research examining gender differences in leadership approaches and supports given to staff indicates movement from a traditionally male perspective towards an androgynous theory of leadership that contains sharing and distributing management responsibilities (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). Hoyle (2006, p. 6) summarized, “A gradual shift from top-down authoritarian to transformational leadership is occurring in America’s schools, but the need remains to conduct research that centers on research about leadership styles, staff morale, and student performance”.

Perceptions held by both teachers and principals include insights about feelings of leadership trust held by teachers, beliefs about abilities of students to learn, and reforms for educational improvements to improve student achievement outcomes. Principal preparation programs with curriculums supporting the development of leader skill sets to create cooperative relationships among teachers and to convey expectations for enhanced learning conditions in the classroom are generally lacking for leaders learning the role (Bellamy, Crocket, & Nordengren, 2014).

In conclusion, the previous literature examination observes the changing role of the principal through reviews of historical and current literature. The evolving experiences of female leaders and differences when compared to male leader approaches is included in a discussion of leadership actions. An examination of perceptions principals and teachers hold about roles and actions taken in the course of instructional

delivery completes the review. As this analysis of recent research literature reveals, identifying a principal's feelings of success by self-reporting actions and commensurate teacher beliefs merit further examination and may lead to innovative insights for addition to research.

Chapter III

Methodology

The intent of this research is to examine the perceptions of principals regarding personal application of important leadership actions in comparison to teachers' perceptions regarding the principals' application of these actions. Leader and teacher gender will be separated in attempt to answer questions arising from the literature review. The previous literature review provides a discussion of the history of the school principal role, females in school leadership, leadership actions surrounding student learning outcomes, and the perceptions of teachers and principals. The intentional exploration of perceptions by gender is meaningful to the existing concepts of leadership theory, most importantly, regarding expansion of female leaders in the principal role.

Research Questions

1. Given the important leadership actions of a principal, do the perceptions of principal application of these actions differ between teachers and principals?
2. Are there differences in these perceptions of leadership actions among male and female teachers and principals?
3. Do demographic variables, including principal experience and tenure in the building, moderate the differences in perceptions between teachers and principals?

4. What environmental or demographic variables moderate any differences in perception between teachers and principals, including public, private, or charter, district size or school level?

Research Design

The cross-sectional survey research design for this investigation seeks to determine perceptions of principals and teachers to address the research questions in an efficient and timely manner with minimal costs. The first research question will examine principal and teacher perceptions of principal application of leadership behaviors. The second research question addresses differences in perceptions by gender. The third and fourth questions examine considerations of demographic and environmental variables' relationship to perceptual differences of leadership actions between teachers and principals. Trochim and Donnelly (2008) discussed the evolution of survey research, highlighting the changes occurring due to the use of technology in soliciting participant questionnaire responses. In discussing the advantages and disadvantages of survey methods, Trochim and Donnelly maintained that survey research provides benefits including ability for privacy, low cost, access to dispersed samples, respondent time for answer formulation, and quick turnaround. The authors also outlined concerns for researchers to consider, such as the inability to adapt questions or provide a format for longer, open-ended questions, not being able to explain the survey responses, and the relative feasibility of a longer survey format. In an effort to allay the concerns about the lack of open-ended questions, they will be part of the current investigation.

The appendices of this investigation include two versions of the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) survey, with each edition a data collection source to measure and evaluate perceptions of application of principal actions. Analysis of survey responses will include comparison by principal gender and teacher gender for observable differences and potential impact of moderator variables. Survey responses will be assessed for factor stability and reliability of responses. Surveys will include questions regarding demographic information to determine characteristics of the participants. Analysis of the data collection will include alignment to each research question independently and corporately.

Sample

The sampling for the investigation consists of principals and teachers within the tri-county area of Northwestern Pennsylvania, namely, Erie, Crawford, and Warren counties that the Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit #5 serves. Principals and teachers from each school district in the area will be sent surveys linked on Survey Monkey by email for participation. The comparison of teacher responses to principal responses will occur to allow representation of both data sources in analyzing perceptions and to determine emerging themes regarding principal daily actions. Survey participants will receive notice of anonymity and confidentiality in participation.

Soliciting participants through email lists accessible through the researcher's employer will allow for direct contact with a wider range of principals and teachers. Rudestam and Newton (2007) noted the benefit of using the Web for participant selection, stating, "Though there may be bias in terms of computer access and computer

savvy, there is also the possibility of obtaining geographically heterogeneous samples that may not be available when using traditional data collection strategies” (p. 92).

Currently, there are 17 public school districts that the Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit #5 in Northwestern Pennsylvania serves. Using available data, an approximation of the number of school principals within this region for the 2013-14 school year is 172. Addition of non-public schools that include both charter and diocesan schools, would increase the number of principals to approximately 202 for research sampling purposes. The number of teachers for possible survey participation would be approximately 4,000.

Instrumentation

Instrumentation will include both the teacher and principal versions of an existing questionnaire survey, the Principal Instructional Management Rating survey (PIMRS). The PIMRS was chosen due to the different survey editions available for teachers and principals that align to the four research questions. The PIMRS will collect perceptual data regarding three question themes examining principal leadership actions that have been utilized in numerous studies to capture perceptions of leadership actions (Hallinger, 2008). Each of these themes, framing the school goals, managing the instructional program, and developing the school learning climate resonate with the research literature discussion as well as recent principal evaluation legislation in Pennsylvania. The author’s granted permission of use allows the survey administration through the Survey Monkey website program and a copy of both the teacher and principal version are included in the appendices.

Preparation of separate surveys for both the principal and teacher will allow self-reporting according to the respective role of the survey participant. The three available versions of the PIMRS survey permits either teachers, principals, or supervisors to answer duplicate items on each form as well as separate stems according to the participant's role (Hallinger, Wang, & Chen, 2013). Each of the three survey themes connect to leadership actions for creation of a culture of instruction, including supervision, organization of curriculum, and monitoring student growth (Hallinger et al.). Authentication of the three survey themes has been ongoing in educational research, mainly in dissertations (Hallinger, 2008; Hallinger et al.).

The three PIMRS themes contain additional subsets for measurement. The first theme the survey measures includes framing the school's goals and communicating the school goals for defining the school mission (Hallinger, Wang, & Chen, 2013). Managing the instructional program is the second theme, encompassing coordination of the curriculum, supervising and evaluating instruction, and monitoring student progress (Hallinger et al.). The third theme, developing the school learning climate, includes the leader's protection of instructional time, providing incentives for teachers and for learning, promoting professional development, and maintaining high visibility (Hallinger et al.). As Hallinger et al. (p. 277) indicated, "The instrument is scored by calculating the mean for the items that comprise each subscale. This results in a data-based profile of principal performance." Hallinger et al. addressed the self-assessment aspect of the principal's survey version through discussion of the use of Cronbach's alpha test for reliability assessment, additionally highlighting benchmarks for content validity,

discriminant validity, and construct validity for both subscale inter-correlation and using documentary support to meet instrument internal validity concerns.

Reliability analyses of results from multiple independent studies utilizing the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) investigated the research questions asked surrounding assessment of principal leadership, differences among respondent groups, and different school levels or cultural contexts (Hallinger, Wang, & Chen, 2013). Internal consistency assessment in 43 studies using the PIMRS incorporated testing for Cronbach's alpha and for reliability testing of the full scale (Hallinger et al.). For the principal form of the PIMRS, the overall alpha reliability estimate was .96, with a meta-analysis of the teacher version of the PIMRS indicating a complete scale reliability of .99 (Hallinger et al.). Due to the inability to combine Cronbach and Ebel's reliability testing in meta-analysis, Hallinger et al. utilized a generalization theory to reveal alpha coefficients for each subset of the teacher survey, including .97 for defining the school mission, .98 for managing instruction, and .98 for developing school learning climates as well as reliability levels above .90 among all school levels and assessment of cultural contexts (Hallinger et al.).

Alatzoglou, Athanailidis, and Sampanis (2013) investigated the potential effectiveness of physical education teachers as school principals through use of the PIMRS to assess teacher perceptions of leadership. Greek translation and partial modification to the survey for alignment to 44 questions overall yield Cronbach reliability results ranging from .74 to .90 (Alatzoglou et al., 2013). Hallinger (2011) comprehensively examined the usage of the PIMRS within doctoral dissertations for consideration of research topic, conceptual model, design, and statistical methods

employed. In discussion of reliability of the PIMRS, Hallinger stated, “All 10 subscales exceeded .80 using Cronbach’s test of internal consistency” (p. 277). Furthermore, Hallinger reviewed examples of research analyzing the face, content, and discriminant validity of the PIMRS instrument that indicate the tool as a valid and reliable measure for determining the coefficients of instructional leadership actions. In utilizing the PIMRS rating tool for the purpose of this investigation, computation of aggregate as well as factor-level reliability estimates for the current investigation will follow the guidelines Hallinger provides.

Open-Ended Principal Questions

1. What do you believe is the role of the building administrator?
2. What do you think influences how well the building administrator is able to fulfill that role?
3. What do you think distinguishes an exemplary educational leader?

Analysis

Factor calculations will assess factor validity and reliability of the responses. Inclusion of demographic information will provide a snapshot of participants represented in the survey responses. Additionally, inclusion of demographic information will support classifying participant responses for causal-comparative analyses.

The researcher will use all inferential data analysis methods in an effort to address each stated research question. Support for these analysis choices will occur through the testing of appropriate statistical assumptions. Data analysis will likely include a general linear modeling approach for assessing the associations between and within variables. Also, this analysis will include the factors Hallinger, Wang, & Chen (2013) identified.

These factors, in association with the demographic variables, will answer the research questions. Responses to open-ended questions will be assessed for themes. Participant's open-ended responses will also be assessed in association to their survey responses in an effort to see if further analysis (e.g. quadrant analysis) is of value. The reporting section will include implications for future research, with recommendations based on careful analyses of the results.

Limitations

Some of the potential limitations to the research for consideration are sample issues, researcher biases, issues with survey questions, and administration concerns. Researcher biases surrounding influence upon survey responses due to knowledge of the researcher must be acknowledged. Additionally, social desirability is a concern, as the new principal evaluation system being employed this year in Pennsylvania may prompt respondents to answer in a manner for positive impression on management and not revealing truth in responses (Trochim & Donnelly, 2008). Administrative concerns address the researcher's time involvement in conducting the surveys of participant responses. Generalization of results may potentially be minimized by the number of participating respondents (Trochim & Donnelly).

There are a number of potential benefits that will result from the proposed investigation. These include potential identification of additional and innovative understandings of leadership. These new understandings may offer insights to leaders of both genders and the schools that they serve. Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) emphasized the indirect influence principals hold in the leadership role in stating, "In the end, teachers still have ultimate control over how they spend their time with students.

Understanding how leaders may influence those private choices will be key to linking effective leadership with quality instruction” (p.485).

Provision of survey results for those survey participants requesting outcomes may lead to reflection of school planning options and consideration of professional developments for leadership actions. Surveying teachers reinforces the message that faculty input is valid and necessary for feedback to principals. Support for principals through the data analyses may provide insights for improving application of leadership actions in daily practice. Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2004) accentuated the necessity or supporting principal perceptions of efficacy:

Social cognitive theory provides guidance about practical implications for the preparation and professional development of school principals in order to equip them with the capabilities and a resilient sense of efficacy that will enable them to enhance both their well-being and accomplishments. (p. 583)

In conclusion, the anticipated research from this study may ultimately provide valuable supports for principals, teachers, and the communities that they serve. Ideally, students will receive the most benefit through improvements in leadership actions.

Chapter IV

Introduction

The intent of this study is to examine levels of perception of daily principal leadership actions held by teachers and principals. To obtain an extensive data sample, the Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) survey was sent out to teachers and administrators in the seventeen public school districts within the area serviced by Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit 5 and across the state of Pennsylvania, as well as to private, and charter schools. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) survey tool examines ten areas of school leader actions with 50 Likert scale questions. Survey questions relate to action areas of framing school goals, communicating school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, promoting professional development, and providing incentives for learning.

The results of all survey respondents was collected online using Survey Monkey cloud based programming tools. Outcomes were transferred into SPSS for statistical analysis. A total of $n = 505$ completed surveys were submitted from teachers and principals within public, private, and charter schools. The research reported in this chapter includes explanations of the quantitative data analysis in addition to the statistical outcomes that were used to answer the four research questions.

First, an examination of the demographic data is presented. Reliability testing of survey answers regarding each of the ten areas of leadership actions is presented next. All

statistical analysis need to address each of the research questions are presented and the results are provided.

Descriptive Statistics

Demographics of participant schools varied in size and included public, private, and charter schools in five intermediate unit regions in Pennsylvania. First, the demographics of all PIMRS responses ($n=505$) including both teacher ($n= 402$) and principal ($n = 103$) survey respondents was collected and sorted. A matching sample of teacher and principal data from matching school buildings was then extracted from the complete sample to include $n =207$ teachers with data from $n =35$ principals from the same school buildings that completed the surveys. Demographic variables of teacher gender, principal gender, years worked with the current principal, and years as a teacher were asked of the teachers surveyed. Principals were asked to report gender, years of experience as a teacher, years of experience as a principal and years as a principal in the current building. The statistics gathered from these inquiries provides additional survey participant information to address the study research questions.

Survey respondents initially were asked to identify the school of employment. The entire data sample is presented first with principals completing the survey from 81 different schools and teachers participating from 84 schools as described in Table 1.

Table 1. *Whole group sample participating schools*

Role	<i>N</i>
Principal	81
Teacher	84

Table 2 describes the matching sample of teachers and principals from the same school building responding to the surveys. The demographic information of the matching sample is of value in answering this study’s research questions comparing perceptions of leadership actions held by teachers and principals.

Table 2. *Matching sample participating schools*

Role	<i>n</i>
Principal	34
Teacher	34

Additionally, consideration of gender when surveying perceptions of leadership actions from both teacher and principals is a major component of this study. Principals were asked to identify gender as a second survey question. Teacher surveys separately asked for both teacher gender and principal gender. Table 3 identifies gender for entire survey sample, indicating participants as male for 30.49% of those surveyed and female for 69.50%. Next, Table 4 identifies gender for the whole group sample by role and Table 5 identifies gender by role for the matching group sample, accordingly.

Table 3. *Participant Gender*

Gender	<i>n</i>	%
Male	154	30.5
Female	351	69.5

Table 4 identifies gender for the whole group sample by role.

Table 4. *Whole Group: Gender by role*

Gender	Principal	%	Teacher	%
Male	67	65	87	21.6
Female	36	35	315	78.4

As can be seen in Table 5, the gender distribution by role does not widely differ for the full sample when compared to the matched sample.

Table 5. *Matched Group: Gender by role*

Gender	Principal	%	Teacher	%
Male	19	65.5	44	21.3
Female	10	34.4	163	78.7

As the tables above indicate, females were the majority percentage of survey respondents for those in the role of teacher and principals more often identified as males. This distribution of gender among roles is consistent with 2011-2012 NCES Schools and Staffing Survey data results for the state of Pennsylvania which indicates 61.1% of principals are male and 38.9% of principals are female (NCES, 2015).

Years worked with the current principal was the question asked next for teacher survey participants as described below in Table 6.

Table 6. *Whole Group: Years Working with Current Principal*

Years	F	%
1	103	25.6
2-4	149	37.1
5-9	107	26.6
10-15	27	6.7
More than 15	16	4.0

The category with the largest number of respondents was 37.1% of teachers, with this group identifying that they had worked with the same principal for the last 2-4 years. Those teachers reporting working with the current principal for 5-9 years included 26.6% of respondents. It is of interest that 25.6% of respondents indicated this as the first year of

work with the current principal in consideration of principal turnover and the increasing duties of the administrative leader role.

Table 7 depicts the matching group sample for the number of years that teachers report working with the current principal and indicates a similar distribution when compared to the whole group sample with the majority of teachers reporting 2-4 years worked with the current principal.

Table 7. *Matching Group: Years Working with Current Principal*

Years	<i>f</i>	%
1	62	30.0
2-4	79	38.2
5-9	45	21.7
10-15	11	5.3
More than 15	10	4.8

Next, principal survey participants were queried for years of principal experience at the end of this year as represented in Table 8, with 31.1% of the whole group sample ($n = 103$) indicating 4-6 years as the current level of experience and only 7.8% reporting more than 15 years of experience.

Table 8 *Whole Group: Years of Experience as Principal*

Years	<i>f</i>	%
1	22	21.4
2-4	32	31.1
5-9	27	26.2
10-15	14	13.6
More than 15	8	7.8

Table 9, shown below, depicts the matching sample distribution of principals' reported experience levels in the role of a principal.

Table 9 *Matching Group: Years of Experience as Principal*

Years	f	%
1	3	8.6
2-5	7	20
5-9	8	22.9
10-15	9	25.7
More than 15	8	22.9

Principals were additionally asked to report years of experience as a teacher as this is a common pathway to the principal administrative role discussed in the literature review. Table 10 indicates that 42.7% of the whole group sample ($n = 103$) of reporting principals maintain 5-9 years of experience as a teacher. Of note is the second largest group of 37.9% principals reporting 10-15 years of teaching experience.

Table 10 *Whole Group: Principal years of experience as a Teacher*

Years	<i>f</i>	%
2-4	4	3.9
5-9	44	42.7
10-15	39	37.9
More than 15	16	15.5

The matching sample group portrayed in Table 11. In comparison to the whole group sample, principals similarly reported multiple years of experience as a teacher in the matching group sample, with 30% of principals indicating 10-15 years and 37.7% designating more than 15 years of classroom practice.

Table 11 *Matching Group: Principal years of experience as a Teacher*

Years	f	%
1	6	2.9
2-4	19	9.2
5-9	42	20.3
10-15	62	30
More than 15	78	37.7

Levels of experience in teaching includes years of experience with principal leadership actions. Teachers were queried regarding years of experience and reveal in Table 12 that 40% of teachers in the whole group sample (n = 402) have been teaching for more than 15 years, as well as 27.6% reporting 10-15 years of teaching experience.

Table 12 *Whole Group: Teachers' Years of Experience*

Years	<i>f</i>	%
1	13	3.2
2-4	41	10.2
5-9	76	18.9
10-15	111	27.6
More than 15	161	40.0

The matching group sample of teachers (n = 207) described in Table 13 illustrates a similar distribution with the majority of teachers (37.7%) reporting more than 15 years of experience and 30% reporting 10-15 years. The teaching experience levels for both samples indicates teachers with multiple years of experience in observing principal leadership actions and is relevant for the research study questions to be investigated.

Table 13 *Matched Group: Teachers' Years of Experience*

Years	<i>f</i>	%
1	6	2.9
2-4	19	9.2
5-9	42	20.3
10-15	62	30
More than 15	78	37.7

The demographic data presented reveals multiple items of relevance to the current investigation in examining teacher and principal perceptions of leadership actions. In particular, 25.6% of whole group for teacher survey respondents (n = 402) indicated this

as the first year of work with the current principal and 30% of the matching group sample for teacher survey respondents (n = 207). The whole group sample of teacher survey respondents (n = 402) reports 40% of teachers with more than 15 years' experience and 37.7% of teachers in the matching sample group with the same level of more than 15 years is additionally notable.

Reliability Analysis

Analysis for reliability of the survey participant responses was completed on each of the factor areas for principal leadership actions to verify the stability of the survey questions. The Principal Instructional Management Rating Scale (PIMRS) contains 50 questions which are separated into ten areas of principal leadership action: frame the school goals, communicate the school goals, supervise and evaluate instruction, coordinate the curriculum, monitor student progress, protect instructional time, maintain high visibility, provide incentives for teachers, promote professional development, and provide incentives for learning. Reliability estimates were computed using the Cronbach's alpha, α .

The PIMRS survey questions in the first factor area of principal leadership actions regard framing the school goals. Perceptions are collected regarding the principal's use of needs assessments, data on student performance for goal setting, and the attainability of chosen goals. The reliability coefficients of responses for both principals and teachers is contained in Table 14 below.

Table 14. *Frame the School Goals*

Factor	Items	α
Principals	5	.75
Teachers	5	.92

Communicating the school goals is the second factor area of the PIMRS survey. Participants are asked questions considering the principal’s actions in sharing the school goals with community stakeholders, teachers, and students through a variety of methods. Questions separately address connecting school goals with curriculum decisions, assemblies, faculty meetings, and school bulletin boards. Table 15 provides the reliability coefficients for both principal and teacher respondents for communicating the school goals.

Table 15. *Communicate the School Goals*

Factor	Items	<i>a</i>
Principals	5	.81
Teachers	5	.90

The third factor area of the PIMRS survey analyzed for reliability includes perceptions of a principal’s supervision and evaluation of instruction. Leadership actions for ensuring classroom practices connect to goals, monitoring student work products, informal and formal observations encompass this factor area. The reliability factor for supervision and evaluation of instruction is shown in Table 16.

Table 16. *Supervise and Evaluate Instruction*

Factor	Items	<i>a</i>
Principals	5	.71
Teachers	5	.86

Coordinating the curriculum is the fourth area of principal leadership action that the PIMRS survey examines. A principal’s actions for coordinating curriculum, incorporating school-wide assessment results for curricular decisions, connecting classroom practices to curriculum, and actively reviewing curriculum are all components

of the fourth factor area. Factor analysis for coordinating the curriculum is depicted in Table 17, below.

Table 17. *Coordinate the Curriculum*

Factor	Items	<i>a</i>
Principals	5	.77
Teachers	5	.93

The PIMRS survey's fifth factor area features the principal's actions in monitoring student progress. This includes meeting and discussing student progress with teachers, using assessment results to address school goals, and communicating academic achievement with students. Below, Table 18 represents the reliability factor for monitoring student progress for both principal and teacher survey responses.

Table 18. *Monitor Student Progress*

Factor	Items	<i>a</i>
Principals	5	.72
Teachers	5	.88

The next factor area of the PIMRS survey reviews a principal's actions in protecting instructional time. Survey respondents are asked to rate a principal's efforts to limit interruptions during times of instruction for a variety of reasons including announcements, office visits, and extra-curricular events. Also included in this factor is a principal's actions in addressing truant and tardy student consequences and supporting teachers' incorporation of new instructional techniques. Table 19 depicts reliability results from the sixth factor area of protecting instructional time.

Table 19. *Protect Instructional Time*

Factor	Items	<i>A</i>
Principals	5	.66
Teachers	5	.84

Maintaining high visibility is the seventh factor area of the PIMRS survey.

Principal actions in regards to informal and formal student discussions, visiting classrooms, attending extra-curricular school events, providing students tutoring support, and covering classrooms for teachers are included. Table 20 below outlines the reliability analysis for the factor of maintaining high visibility.

Table 20. *Maintain High Visibility*

Factor	Items	<i>A</i>
Principals	5	.73
Teachers	5	.85

The eighth factor area for the PIMRS survey is providing incentives for teachers.

This area includes principal actions in rewarding excellent teaching through awards, public and private recognition, and creating professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for school contributions. The factor analysis for providing incentives for teachers is delineated in Table 21.

Table 21. *Provide Incentives for Teachers*

Factor	Items	<i>A</i>
Principals	5	.76
Teachers	5	.92

The ninth factor area of principal actions is promotion of professional development. The PIMRS survey queries principal actions towards aligning of professional development to school goals, attending important professional developments

with teachers, supporting implementation of new instructional practices learned, encouraging whole staff participation at important professional development trainings, and providing time for teachers to collaborate implementation concerns and ideas. Factor analysis for promoting professional development is presented in Table 22, below.

Table 22. *Promote Professional Development*

Factor	Items	<i>a</i>
Principals	5	.74
Teachers	5	.88

The tenth and final factor area for the PIMRS survey surrounds a principal’s actions in providing incentives for learning. Recognizing exemplary student academic work and behavior through assemblies, honor rolls, and newsletters, communicating to students, parents, staff, and community stakeholders, and supporting teacher recognition of student efforts encompass this final area. The reliability factor for providing incentives for learning is displayed in Table 23.

Table 23. *Provide Incentives for Learning*

Factor	Items	<i>a</i>
Principals	5	.76
Teachers	5	.88

In conclusion, the reliability estimates for each of the ten areas of principal actions included on the PIMRS survey equate or surpass established minimum reliability criteria ($\alpha > .60$) established by Field (2009). Thus, the questions regarding actions in the ten areas of principal’s leadership included on the PIMRS survey are considered to reliably measure the intended factors.

Test of Basic Statistical Assumptions

Participants completing the PIMRS surveys were sent email requests to voluntarily answer the questions about principal leadership actions. To review the assumptions for the survey data to maintain autonomy of participant responses, statistical tests were conducted to verify distribution of the variables. Emphasizing the importance of conducting assessment on assumptions, Field (2009, p. 132) states, “Different statistical models assume different things, and if these models are going to reflect reality accurately then these assumptions need to be true.” Field (p. 132) continues, “If you use a parametric test when your data are not parametric then the results are likely to be inaccurate.” The PIMRS Survey includes 50 questions about principal leadership actions within ten divisible factor areas. Factor areas encompass framing the school goals, communicating the school goals, supervising and evaluating instruction, coordinating the curriculum, monitoring student progress, protecting instructional time, maintaining high visibility, providing incentives for teachers, promoting professional development, and providing incentives for learning.

Mean and standard deviation analysis on each of the PIMRS factor areas was conducted in SPSS for both the entire data sample from responding principals as well as the entire sample from teachers. Moreover, analysis for skewness and kurtosis of the variable distribution was conducted as well to determine if the data samples were within normal distribution ranges with skewness within $|2.0|$ and kurtosis within $|5.0|$ (Field, 2009) . The results associated with the first five factors for the analysis of the whole group principal sample are represented in Table 24.

Table 24. *Principals Whole Group: Descriptive Statistics for Sub-Factors 1-5*

	Frame School Goals	Communicate School Goals	Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	Coordinate Curriculum	Monitor Student Progress
n	97	94	95	95	92
Mean	4.11	3.45	4.13	4.13	3.82
SD	0.62	0.73	0.57	0.57	0.69
Skewness	-0.58	-0.03	-0.71	-0.71	-0.23
Kurtosis	-0.02	-0.77	0.29	0.29	-0.39

Table 25 depicts the descriptive analysis results for the principal whole group sample for the remaining PIMRS sub-factors.

Table 25. *Principals Whole Group: Descriptive Statistics for Sub-Factors 6-10*

	Protect Instruction Time	Maintain High Visibility	Provide Incentives For Teachers	Promote Professional Development	Provide Incentives For Learning
n	91	91	91	90	84
Mean	4.04	3.73	3.39	4.15	3.51
SD	0.60	0.72	0.78	0.61	0.93
Skewness	-0.73	-0.35	-0.27	-0.36	-0.17
Kurtosis	0.84	-0.32	-0.43	-0.59	-0.74

Field (2009) provides general parameters for normal ranges of data distribution around a value of zero. Skewness and kurtosis analysis results for all factors from the principal whole group sample are within ranges stated above. Next, the teacher whole group sample was similarly analyzed for each of the ten PIMRS sub-factors. The analysis of mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis of the data results including the first five sub-factors for the teacher whole group sample is depicted in Table 26. Table 27 similarly contains the analysis for the second five sub-factors. Results for all sub-factors for the whole group sample are within normally distributed ranges stated above.

Table 26. *Teacher Whole Group: Descriptive Statistics for Sub-Factors 1-5*

Measure	Frame School Goals	Communicate School Goals	Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	Coordinate the Curriculum	Monitor Student Progress
<i>N</i>	345	333	327	327	317
Mean	3.86	3.60	3.79	3.79	3.54
SD	0.96	1.05	0.97	0.96	1.11
Skewness	-0.85	-0.55	-0.87	-0.87	-0.49
Kurtosis	0.22	-0.55	0.27	0.27	-0.69

Table 27. *Teacher Whole Group: Descriptive Statistics for Sub-Factors 6-10*

Measure	Protect Instruction Time	Maintain High Visibility	Provide Incentives For Teachers	Promote Professional Development	Provide Incentives For Learning
<i>N</i>	310	310	304	302	302
Mean	3.65	3.11	3.06	3.77	3.41
SD	0.99	1.06	1.21	0.99	1.13
Skewness	-0.54	-0.11	-0.04	-0.50	-0.31
Kurtosis	-0.57	-0.88	-1.09	-0.67	-0.83

Mean and standard deviation analysis on each of the PIMRS factor areas was furthermore conducted in SPSS for the matching building data sample from responding principals and teachers to verify assumptions of the data distribution. Determination of normal data distribution ranges was led through analysis for skewness and kurtosis of the variable distribution for both data sample sets as well. The results associated with the first five factors for the analysis of the matching group principal and teacher sample are represented in Table 28 with the second set of factors correspondingly detailed in Table 29. The samples' range distributions are within acceptable parameters.

Table 28. *Matching Sample: Descriptive Statistics for Sub-Factors 1-5*

Role		Frame School Goals	Communicate School Goals	Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	Coordinate Curriculum	Monitor Student Progress
Principal	N	34	32	32	32	32
	Mean	4.04	3.44	4.15	4.15	3.63
	SD	0.67	0.67	0.58	0.58	0.67
	Skewness	-0.57	-0.13	-0.63	-0.63	0.13
	Kurtosis	-0.06	-0.145	-0.59	-0.59	-0.31
Teacher	N	179	171	167	167	161
	Mean	3.88	3.70	3.79	3.80	3.66
	SD	0.98	1.09	1.04	1.04	1.09
	Skewness	-0.81	-0.71	-0.96	-0.96	-0.64
	Kurtosis	0.021	-0.42	0.23	0.23	-0.51

Table 29. Matching Sample: Descriptive Statistics for Sub-Factors 6-10

Role		Protect Instructional Time	Maintain High Visibility	Provide Incentives for Teachers	Promote Professional Development	Provide Incentives Learning
Principal	N	32	32	32	32	29
	Mean	3.81	3.86	3.45	4.13	3.50
	Std. Deviation	0.59	0.67	0.92	0.53	1.06
	Skewness	-0.01	-0.02	-0.634	0.00	-0.13
	Kurtosis	-0.91	-1.30	-0.30	-1.04	-1.18
Teacher	N	161	161	157	156	156
	Mean	3.75	3.39	3.26	3.88	3.56
	Std. Deviation	0.99	1.01	1.21	1.02	1.13
	Skewness	-0.66	-0.31	-0.31	-0.73	-0.44
	Kurtosis	-0.48	-0.68	-0.94	-0.31	-0.65

Analysis of Research Questions

Four research questions were posed for the investigation of perceptions regarding principal leadership actions. The PIMRS survey instruments for both teachers and principals provided the data sample to address the themes for each of the four questions. The following research question was initially asked in the study:

Research question 1. Given the important leadership actions of a principal, do the perceptions of principal application of these actions differ between teachers and principals?

An Independent Samples t test was conducted across all factors for the matching group participants only. This test indicates whether the participant teachers differed on their evaluation of their principals overall for the group. The findings for these t tests were based on a small adjustment in the degrees of freedom, to account to the failure of group homogeneity of variance (Field, 2009). The results indicate that there were significant differences across many of the factors, *except* “Frame School Goals”, “Communicate School Goals”, “Monitor Student Progress”, “Protect Instructional Time”, “Provide Incentives for Teachers”, and “Provide Learning Incentives”. The greatest difference was found for the “Maintain High Visibility” factor. These results are presented in Table 30.

Table 30. *Independent Sample T tests*

Variables	t	df	sig	Mean Difference
Frame School Goals	1.15	63.03	0.26	0.16
Communicate School Goals	-1.78	65.21	0.08	-0.26
Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	2.70	75.15	0.01	0.35
Coordinate Curriculum	2.70	75.15	0.01	0.35
Monitor Student Progress	-0.15	68.84	0.89	-0.02
Protect Instructional Time	0.44	72.46	0.67	0.06
Maintain High Visibility	3.28	62.78	0.00	0.47
Provide Incentives for Teachers	1.00	55.65	0.32	0.19
Promote Professional Development	2.04	85.51	0.04	0.25
Provide Incentives for Learning	-0.23	183.00	0.82	-0.05

A second dependent sample t test was conducted in which matching pairs of teacher to administrator responses to each factor were compared. For this analysis, the

data for each teacher was matched to their building level administrator’s data and the differences in their perceptions were computed by subtracting the principal’s perception score on each factor from the teacher’s perception score on each factor. The resulting score was a difference measure for each factor. The results of this analysis are more specifically focused on the mean of those differences in assessing the significance of the results (Field, 2009). These results are provided in Table 31.

Table 31. *Matching Pair’s Comparisons of Factor Scores*

Variable	Mean Differences	t	df	Sig.
Frame School Goals	-0.16	-1.96	169	0.05
Communicate School Goals	0.31	3.2	161	0.00
Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	-0.41	-4.31	157	0.00
Coordinate Curriculum	-0.41	-4.31	157	0.00
Monitor Student Progress	0.12	1.15	151	0.25
Protect Instructional Time	0.02	0.24	151	0.81
Maintain High Visibility	-0.37	-4.05	151	0.00
Provide Incentives for Teachers	-0.15	-1.33	148	0.19
Promote Professional Development	-0.27	-2.89	147	0.00
Provide Incentives for Learning	0.07	0.77	132	0.44

As indicated in Table 31, all factors were found to be significantly different *except* for the sub-factors of “Monitor Student Progress”, “Communicate School Goals”, “Protect Instructional Time”, “Provide Incentives for Teachers”, and “Provide Incentives for Learning”. The largest mean differences between principal and teacher responses were found with the sub-factors “Supervise & Evaluate Instruction”, “Coordinate the Curriculum”, and “Maintain High Visibility”.

The second research question was next assessed through a factorial ANOVA to assess if differences by gender in leadership perceptions exist.

Research question 2. Are there differences in these perceptions of leadership actions among male and female teachers and principals?

The data for the whole group sample is represented in Table 32.

Table 32. *Whole Group: Factorial ANOVA of Gender by Role*

Factor	<i>F</i>	sig
Frame School Goals	0.80	0.37
Communicate School Goals	1.81	0.18
Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	2.18	0.14
Coordinate Curriculum	2.18	0.14
Monitor Student Progress	2.63	0.11
Protect Instructional Time	0.86	0.35
Maintain High Visibility	1.72	0.19
Provide Incentives For Teachers	0.28	0.60
Promote Professional Development	4.37	0.04
Provide Incentives Learning	1.45	0.23

Based on the results presented in Table 32, the interaction between gender and role was found to be significant for the “Promote Professional Development” factor. Specifically, as indicated in Table 33 below, the largest mean of responses is represented by female principals. Mean differences compared between male principals to male teachers, female principals to male teachers, male principals to female teachers and female principals to female teachers result in the largest areas of difference between female principals to female teachers (4.45-3.78 = .67) and female principals to male teachers (4.45-3.82 = .63).

Table 33. *Gender by Role on Promote Professional Development Factor*

Role	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation
Principals	Male	4.02	0.54
	Female	4.45	0.55
Teachers	Male	3.82	0.94
	Female	3.78	1.01

A second factorial ANOVA assessed the impact with the matching sample. These results are presented in Table 34.

Table 34: *Matching Group Sample: Factorial ANOVA of Gender by Role*

Variable	F	Sig.
Frame School Goals	0.16	0.69
Communicate School Goals	0.13	0.72
Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	0.96	0.33
Coordinate Curriculum	0.96	0.33
Monitor Student Progress	0.87	0.35
Protect Instructional Time	0.20	0.66
Maintain High Visibility	3.17	0.08
Provide Incentives For Teachers	0.08	0.78
Promote Professional Development	1.27	0.26
Provide Incentives Learning	0.57	0.45

While no factors were significant, the “Maintain High Visibility” factor presented the largest differences across gender and roles (with greater than twice the effect of the other variables). As can be seen in Table 35, the scores for “Maintain High Visibility” for males and females across the different roles indicate the largest mean differences among female principals when compared to female teachers (3.78-3.07=.71). Female teachers and male principals reveal the next largest mean difference (3.71-3.07 = .64) in Table 35, below.

Table 35. *Gender by Role on Maintain High Visibility Factor*

Role	Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation
Principals	Male	3.71	0.76
	Female	3.78	0.65
Teachers	Male	3.25	1.06
	Female	3.07	1.07

The third research question queried potential demographic variable influences. A Pearson’s zero order correlation was computed to determine any relation between principal experience or tenure in the building and differences in perceptions. For this analysis, the data for each teacher was matched to their building level administrator’s

data and the differences in their perceptions were computed by subtracting the principal’s perception score on each factor from the teacher’s perception score on each factor. The resulting score was a difference measure for each factor. The correlation that was conducted looked at how each of these difference factors scores was associated with each reported amount of years as a principal and then with the reported years as a principal specifically in that building.

Research question 3. Do demographic variables, including principal experience and tenure in the building, moderate the differences in perceptions between teachers and principals?

Table 36, below, depicts the outcomes of the analysis.

Table 36. *Matched Sample: Zero-Order Correlation of Years as a Principal*

Variable	Factor Based on Difference	<i>r</i>	sig
Years as Principal			
	Frame School Goals	-0.03	0.67
	Communicate School Goals	0.01	0.95
	Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	0.01	0.89
	Coordinate Curriculum	0.01	0.89
	Monitor Student Progress	-0.08	0.32
	Protect Instructional Time	-0.14	0.09
	Maintain High Visibility	0.00	0.96
	Provide Incentives For Teachers	.185*	0.02
	Promote Professional Development	-0.10	0.25
	Provide Incentives Learning	0.01	0.94

As indicated in Table 36, the difference between teacher and principal perceptions reveals a small positive significant correlation with the principal’s reported years’ experience as a principal, with the “Provide Incentive for Teachers” factor. No other

significant correlations were revealed. Next, Table 37 provides the outcomes for this principal’s reported years at that particular school.

Table 37. *Matched Sample: Zero-Order Correlation of Years as a Principal at the School*

Variable	Factor Based on Difference	<i>r</i>	sig
Years as Principal at This School	Frame School Goals	-.173*	0.02
	Communicate School Goals	-0.09	0.27
	Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	-0.1	0.20
	Coordinate Curriculum	-0.1	0.20
	Monitor Student Progress	-0.08	0.30
	Protect Instructional Time	-0.08	0.36
	Maintain High Visibility	-0.03	0.71
	Provide Incentives For Teachers	-0.08	0.33
	Promote Professional Development	-.173*	0.04
	Provide Incentives Learning	-0.11	0.19

The second correlation, as indicated in Table 37, the difference between teacher and principal perceptions reveals a small negative significant correlation with the principal’s reported years as a principal *at that school*, with the “Frames School Goals” and “Promotes Professional Development” factors. No other significant correlations were revealed. Table 37 provides the outcomes for principals’ reported years at that particular school.

Research question four examines three possible environmental variables regarding the differences between teacher and principal perception scores: type of school, district size, and school level.

Research question 4. What environmental variables moderate any differences in perception between teachers and principals, including type of school (private, public, or charter), district size or district level (elementary, junior high, high school)?

For the question of district size, a Pearson’s zero order correlation was used to see if any association exists. These results are presented in Table 38.

Table 38. *Analysis of Variance for District Size*

Variable	Factor Based on Difference	<i>r</i>	sig
District Size	Frame School Goals	-0.02	0.77
	Communicate School Goals	0.09	0.27
	Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	-0.03	0.71
	Coordinate Curriculum	-0.03	0.71
	Monitor Student Progress	0.06	0.46
	Protect Instructional Time	0.09	0.27
	Maintain High Visibility	0.03	0.70
	Provide Incentives For Teachers	0.28	0.00
	Promote Professional Development	-0.02	0.80
	Provide Incentives Learning	0.15	0.09

As can be seen in Table 38, data was examined with the whole sample. Based on this analysis, district size revealed the greatest moderate positive significant association with the factor of “Provide Incentives for Teachers”. This was followed by “Provide Incentives for Learning” which revealed a small positive significant association.

For consideration of school type, including private, public, or charter, an analysis of variance was completed on the matched sample of responses. As Table 39 below depicts, multiple factors revealed significant difference for the variable factors and include “Frame School Goals”, “Supervise & Evaluate Instruction”, “Coordinate Curriculum”, “Monitor Student Progress”, and “Provide Incentives for Learning” when comparing private, public, and charter schools in the matched group sample.

Table 39. *Analysis of Variance for School Type*

Variable	Factor Based on Difference	F	Sig.
School Type	Frame School Goals	6.645	0.002
	Communicate School Goals	2.827	0.062
	Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	3.734	0.026
	Coordinate Curriculum	3.734	0.026
	Monitor Student Progress	3.276	0.041
	Protect Instructional Time	0.844	0.432
	Maintain High Visibility	4.418	0.014
	Provide Incentives For Teachers	2.029	0.135
	Promote Professional Development	0.038	0.962
	Provide Incentives Learning	4.524	0.013

As indicated in Table 40, the greatest difference is found between the private and charter schools for the “Provide Incentives for Learning” factor with a difference of 1.56, followed by the public and charter school type for the “Frame the School Goals” factor with a difference of 1.02. The factor of “Provide Incentives for Learning” reveals the next largest difference of .99 between public and charter school types. Lastly, two factors similarly produced differences between private and public school types for the “Supervise & Evaluate Instruction” factor and the “Coordinate Curriculum” factor at .7055.

Table 40. *Means of Different School Types for Significant Factors*

Factor Based on Difference	Public	Private	Charter
Frame School Goals	-.028	-.71	-1.05
Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	-.29	-1.00	-.49
Coordinate Curriculum	-.29	-1.00	-.49
Monitor Student Progress	.24	-.28	-.87
Provide Incentives Learning	.04	.61	-.96

The final area addressed in the fourth research question encompasses differences in responses among participants from elementary, middle, and high schools. Table 41 entails the results of the ANOVA, representing the largest areas of significance within the sub-factors of three variables. These include, “Supervise and Evaluate Instruction”, “Coordinate Curriculum”, and “Maintain High Visibility”.

Table 41: *Analysis of Variance for School Level*

Variable	Factor Based on Difference	F	Sig.
School Level	Frame School Goals	2.17	0.09
	Communicate School Goals	1.14	0.34
	Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	4.09	0.01
	Coordinate Curriculum	4.09	0.01
	Monitor Student Progress	2.02	0.11
	Protect Instructional Time	2.09	0.11
	Maintain High Visibility	3.1	0.03
	Provide Incentives For Teachers	2.33	0.08
	Promote Professional Development	1.14	0.33
	Provide Incentives Learning	1.45	0.23

As indicated in Table 42 below, the greatest difference is found between the middle school level and the high school level for the “Supervise and Evaluate Instruction” factor and similarly “Coordinate Curriculum” at .71, and lastly between the elementary and high school levels for the same factor at .64.

Table 42. *Means of Different School Levels for Significant Factors*

Factor Based on Difference	Elementary	Middle	High School
Supervise & Evaluate Instruction	-.7032	-.7750	-.0661
Coordinate Curriculum	-.7032	-.7750	-.0661
Maintain High Visibility	-.6247	-.4375	-.0633

Open-Ended Responses

Additionally, principals were asked to complete three open-ended text box questions at the end of the PIMRS survey instrument. The questions were numbered 57-59 and are included in Appendix C. The questions asked participants to reflect and write anonymous personal interpretations regarding perceptions of the leadership role, influences of success for the role, and the characteristics of a model principal. The included open-ended questions are:

1. What do you believe is the role of the building administrator?
2. What do you think influences how well the building administrator is able to fulfill that role?
3. What do you think distinguishes an exemplary educational leader?

The participant submissions were manually sorted for patterns of commonality in responses. The first question reveals a variety of responses comprising specific actions of a building leader. Recurring themes in collected data first and foremost includes responses of principal leadership actions listed as “supporting instruction” and “being an educational leader”. Supporting staff and students through monitoring of needs and in sharing enthusiasm for the completion of school goals was repeatedly indicated in the responses as well. Finally, facilitating the emotional climate of the building through leadership to help all students to develop abilities in a safe environment was identified continually in the responses for question one.

Responses for the second question of influences on the principal to fulfill the role surround repeating themes describing effort, commitment, teaming, support from central office, desire, positive school climate, and building relationships. Similarly, participants' reflections for the final question most frequently include comments of honesty, compassion, vision, openness, fairness, dedication, and visibility as the most vital traits an exemplary principal needs to possess.

Summary

Observation and investigation of the levels of perception of daily principal leadership actions held by teachers and principals was conducted through collection and analysis of the PIMRS teacher and principal data samples ($n = 505$). Examination of the collected data sample included a whole group and matching group of teachers and principals from public, private, and charter schools from the area serviced by the Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit 5 in northwestern Pennsylvania. The entire data sample comprises a whole group of teacher ($n= 402$) and principal ($n = 103$) survey respondents and a matching sample of teacher ($n =207$) and principal ($n =35$) data from matching school buildings.

The descriptive statistical analysis began with demographics of participant survey responses and scrutiny to participant gender and role. Gender for entire survey sample indicates 30.49% male ($n=154$) and 69.50% female ($n=351$) participants providing responses. Examination of gender by role in the whole group sample identifies female teachers ($n = 315$) at 78% as the majority percentage of survey respondents. Male teachers ($n = 87$) are 21.6% of the total group sample. Principals for the whole group

sample include males ($n = 67$) at 65% and females ($n = 36$) at 35% with the matching group sample similarly revealing males ($n = 19$) at 65.5% and females ($n = 10$) at 34.4%. Principal gender results for both the whole group and matching group data samples correspond to 2011-2012 NCES Schools and Staffing Survey data results for the state of Pennsylvania, representing 61.1% of principals as male and 38.9% of principals as female (NCES, 2015).

Next, reliability testing of survey answers regarding each of the PIMRS ten factor areas of leadership actions was conducted to determine the stability of responses. Field (2009) emphasizes the importance of assessing an investigation tool's capability for producing consistent results repeatedly under different research conditions. The concluding reliability estimates conducted for each of the ten factor areas of principal actions included on the PIMRS survey for this investigation align with or surpass recognized statistical reliability criteria for all factors analyzed. Parametric testing of the whole group sample and the matching group sample was also conducted to verify the normality of distribution of survey responses and to collect mean and standard deviations. Both the whole group and matching group samples revealed dispersal of collected data within standard criteria ranges.

Independent sample t testing of the matching schools sample indicated whether the participant teachers differed from their principals in responses to the survey questions. Findings demonstrate significant differences across six of the ten factors including, "Communicate the School Goals", "Supervise and Evaluate Instruction", "Coordinate the Curriculum", "Protect Instructional Time", "Maintain High Visibility", and "Promote Professional Development". The four factors that did not provide

significant differences comprise “Monitor Student Progress”, “Protect Instructional Time”, “Provide Incentives for Teachers”, and “Provide Learning Incentives”.

Factorial ANOVA testing for both the whole group sample and matching group sample provided analysis of differences by gender in leadership perceptions. Results reveal no significant differences in the whole group sample and the only significant interaction for gender with the matching sample was discovered for the “Maintain High Visibility” factor. A Pearson’s zero order correlation was then calculated to determine any relation among principal experience or tenure in the building and differences in perceptions. Outcomes point towards a small positive significant correlation with the principal’s reported years’ experience as a principal, with only the “Provide Incentive for Teachers” factor. The difference between teacher and principal perceptions reveals a small negative significant correlation with the principal’s reported years as a principal *at that school*, with only the “Frames School Goals” and “Promotes Professional Development” factors.

Environmental variables of school type and district level were analyzed for any potential differences in perception through a Pearson’s zero order correlation. The factor of “Provide Incentives for Teachers” was identified as having the largest association to district size in the whole group sample. Multiple factors revealed significant difference for the variable factors when comparing private, public, and charter schools in the whole group sample with the largest variance found between the private and charter schools for the “Provide Incentives for Learning” factor. Comparison of differences in responses among participants from elementary, middle, and high schools shows the largest areas of significance between the middle school level and the high school level for the “Frame

School Goals” factor. Discussion of open-ended principal responses concludes the statistical analysis of the investigation.

Chapter V

Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of the study, a summary of the findings, conclusions, implications, recommendations for school leaders, and potential future research. The role of the school principal has evolved considerably over the past fifty years from primarily management focused to a position that requires additional emphasis on curriculum integration and evaluation of instructional leadership. Legislation such as No Child Left Behind (2001) has increased accountability of the school leader in unprecedented ways. This progression has been accompanied by the need for advanced skill sets that leaders do not always possess prior to obtaining their position, or they do not acquire needed professional development once in that position.

As discussed earlier, the current research literature examining the role of the female school principal is limited. An additional exploration of gender influences is a worthy goal within the educational community (Grogan and Shakeshaft, 2011). An examination of gender differences between male and female principal leadership approaches can provides insight for the effectiveness of new and traditional leadership roles irrespective of gender (Grogan and Shakeshaft).

The presented study examined the perceptions of principals and teachers in ten areas of leadership action that principals seek to achieve daily through their complex roles as school leader. The investigation aimed to add to the current body of literature research regarding perceptions surrounding principal leadership actions, with addition to consideration of potential principal's and teacher's gender differences regarding those reported perceptions. The four research questions posed for examination were addressed

through statistical analyses of both teacher and principal perceptions collected through an electronic distribution and response.

The first research question within the study examined differences in perceptions of teachers and principals regarding principal leadership actions. The second research question further explored differences in perceptions in relation to the gender of the teacher and the principal. The third research question considered influences of demographic variables such as years of principal experience in educational leadership and principal tenure in a school building upon teacher and principal perceptions. The fourth research question examined the influence of environmental variables of district size, type of school, and school level upon differences between collected teacher and principal perceptions. Descriptive and inferential statistics analyses were conducted to answer each of the research questions through multiple data samples collected from the PIMRS survey for teachers and principals.

Research Question #1

The first research question pertains to overall differences in perceptions of leadership between principals and teachers. The current investigation revealed significant differences among several PIMRS factors in the matching group sample of teachers and principals from the same school buildings, with the largest discrepancy in responses relating to a principal's actions in maintaining high visibility in the school setting, as well as differences in supervision and evaluation of instruction, and coordinating curriculum. Conversely, the factors of protecting instructional time and providing incentives for learning were highly endorsed by both teachers and principals. These findings support the necessity of today's principal to display intentional visibility to teachers as Wahlstrom,

Louis, Leithwood, & Anderson (2010, p. 13) state, “Teachers described a clear difference in principal behavior between those who *popped in* or *were visible*, as compared with principals who were very intentional about each classroom visit and conversation, with the explicit purpose of engaging with teachers about well-defined instructional ideas and issues.”

These findings suggest that the visible support a principal provides to teachers impacts the level of perceived instructional leadership. The survey questions for maintaining high visibility assess perceptions of principal interactions with students regarding instruction and providing support in the classroom. Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) discuss the challenge of the building principal to directly interact in a ‘visible’ way on a daily basis in the school setting. These results indicate that a need continues to exist for principals to acquire appropriate skill sets that enhance capacity in creating visibility that support instructional improvements. This need is magnified by the current political climate focusing on school success measured through student achievement assessments. Professional developments specific to instructing principals in actions for sharing leadership with teachers may possibly alleviate this issue. Wahlstrom and Louis (p. 483) maintain, “In other words, our finding suggest that when teachers are involved in making decisions that affect them, they tend to strengthen or deepen their instructional practice.” It is essential for today’s building principal to possess the skills for creating authentic visibility in the school setting.

Research Question #2

The second research question investigated potential gender differences among teacher and principal perceptions. One factor area that produced significant results was

“promoting professional developments,” with notable differences between female principals and female teachers and male teachers. These outcomes may relate to the barriers female leaders often report in the research literature when attempting new approaches to leadership. Questions from this factor surround obtaining complete staff participation in professional development, actively supporting the implementation of newly acquired skills in the classroom, and aligning professional developments to school goals. This aligns with Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011, p. 54) emphasis on new dimensions of collective leadership which require cognitive shifts in thinking and state:

The assumptions embedded in diverse collective leadership; the departure from top-down control; the relational nature of this approach; and the activist purposes attributed to it appear to be attractive to many women who lead in ways that could be developed specifically to be more collective.

Leading groups of teachers to cognitive shifts in beliefs is a skill set that principals may lack. This finding could also indicate an area of potential deficiency for female principals who have often spent extensive lengths of time in the classroom and may not have experience implementing successful professional development initiatives or achieving school improvement planning processes. The research literature regarding female leadership often highlights the absence of mentors available for females desiring advancement. Female leaders deficient in professional development skill sets may persist in ineffective methods if left vulnerable and lacking in mentorship support.

The second finding for gender surrounds differences for maintaining high visibility among female principals and female teachers, with female principals rating themselves higher than corresponding female teachers. Barriers females face in the

leadership role include stereotypes regarding those women in the leadership role as teachers predominantly are females (Morrison, 2012). This second finding suggests unique barriers for females continue to persist in some areas of principal leadership. The shortage of research examining integration of the female leader in the school principal role sustains antiquated belief systems. Future research investigating females' experiences in the role would promote the credibility of women as school leaders, and could potentially encourage women considering advancement.

Research Question #3

The third research question sought to examine if the differences in the perceptions of teachers and principals are moderated by principal experience and tenure in a school building. The one factor of providing incentives for teachers was significantly related with principal experience. Veteran principals likely have well-established management functions of the daily principal role and recognize the value in providing incentives and possess the skills necessary to pursue such resources. Principals new to the role may be distracted from attending to such details when balancing the complex job of daily actions to establish leadership and thus may lack skill sets for providing such incentives (Jones, 2014).

Interestingly, the examination of perceptions of leadership actions for principal tenure in a building yielded a small negative correlation with the factors of framing school goals and promoting professional development. Previous unsuccessful implementations of school goal planning and professional developments may be related to this finding. Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2004) discuss characteristics of low efficacy principals surrounding failure, describing a strictness in approach when

unsuccessful with dependence on intimidating and top-down styles of leadership. Jones (2014) maintains the providing mentors for new building principals can help to ameliorate the low self-efficacy that might exist for those in new roles.

Research Question #4

The final research question was written to investigate whether differences in teacher and principal perceptions were moderated by environmental variables: type of school, district size, and school level. The factor of providing incentives for teachers was significantly correlated to district size. Similar to the principal years of experience factor, increased district size may offer the resources necessary for providing incentives for teachers more readily than smaller districts with minimal budgets (Campbell, 2012). Additionally, principals in larger districts may well recognize the influence of incentives for teachers upon overall school and staff morale. In today's constricted school budget climates with cutbacks on expenditures, the impact of being able to provide those meaningful incentives is likely magnified in smaller school districts.

Assessment of school types included an examination of public, private, and charter schools in relation to differences in the perceptions of teachers and principals. This comparison produced significant results for multiple factors, with the greatest difference between private and charter schools for the factor of providing incentives for learning. The difference most likely relates to funding in private schools and the necessity of maintaining enrollment of students for continued operation (Braun, Jenkins, & Grigg, 2006). Additionally, most charter schools are relatively new and may lack developed systems of funding for these types of rewards. The second largest difference was noted between public and charter schools with framing school goals. Similar to the first area of

difference, due to the newness of charter schools, there most likely is a lack of established systems in place to support a principal's work for framing school goals (Cremata, Davis, Dickey, Lawyer, Negassi, Raymond, & Woodworth, 2013). The particular finding should be interpreted with some caution, however, due to the low representation of charter schools in the data.

The final area examined for differences in perceptions is moderated by the different school levels. Elementary, middle, and high school configurations resulted in multiple areas of significance differences. The largest significant difference was revealed by the factor of framing school goals among the middle and high school levels. This finding most likely connects to differing approaches by the middle and high school principals to initiate school improvement initiatives (Campbell, 2012). High school principals may lead implementation of school goals in a more interrelated and cohesive manner towards students' college and career readiness due to increased emphasis on student preparation (Campbell). Middle school configurations may vary in grade levels and framing school goals may prove more of a challenge for building leaders in transitioning students from elementary school into high school while students experience multiple physical, social, and cognitive growth changes (Deschenes, Arbreton, Little, Herrera, Grossman, Weiss, & Lee, 2010).

Open-Ended Responses

At the end of the principal survey tool, open-ended questions were offered to principal participants to gather additional information and personal reflections and accounts of perceptions of a school leader's actions. Through the freedom of this format,

principals provided personal explanations of their experiences as a school leader and the duties required in providing leadership in a building.

Role of the Building Administrator

The first question asked principals to report beliefs about the role of the building administrator. Principals responded similarly in emphasizing the importance of leading and guiding instruction. For example, one principal responded by writing, “Although we are often pushed into management roles to make the daily workings of the building happen, we should be the instructional leaders who help, with the assistance of the staff, develop and implement the school's vision.” Another respondent included this instructional emphasis, “To help provide an environment that enables all students to develop to the best of their abilities.” Numerous principal comments recount the challenges faced by today’s school leader in completing the additional duties now required in this evolved role: “The principal must wear many hats: Educational, Financial, Disciplinarian, Master scheduler, Confidant, Counselor & the person everyone looks to in times of uncertainty.” Similarly another participant provides: “The building administrator role is a multifaceted job that includes instructional leader, building and grounds, discipline, counselor, motivator, resolver, community liaison, PD developer and provider, interviewer, That is just a small window. Each day is different and the roles you fill are ever changing. There is nothing as consistent as change.”

One principal’s description encompasses themes recounted in the research literature surrounding the responsibility of the role in today’s society: “The role of a principal encompasses a wide variety of areas and roles such as an instructional leader but also to work with all the district departments to develop goals for improving all areas

such as special education, technology, transportation, building maintenance, curriculum and assessment, etcetera. The role of a building principal is whatever the day may bring. A principal addresses the obstacles of the day whether dealing with student behaviors or a disgruntled parent and attends a variety of weekly meetings. Principals need to network in the community and with the professionals in other districts. The role is defined but not defined because it becomes whatever needs to be addressed on any given day. Safety is a huge issue in today's schools that cannot be ignored. This job continues to evolve and requires principals to become responsible for overseeing so many facets of academic achievement, safety, and building and grounds management. It also is a social service to help families in need and distress. A good principal addresses the priorities that arise, but is committed to academic achievement and instilling in children the important and appropriate social behaviors as future citizens.”

Some principals simply relayed the passion and creativity needed to sustain positive energy in the role. For example, one principal stated: “To be enthusiastic, supportive, flexible, and keep everyone safe.” Another principal emphasizes the need of a school leader to keep students in the forefront by stating: “Remembering that doing the best thing for the students is the most important thing.” Finally, one principal provides an interesting analogy for their approach to instructional leadership: “Give the teachers the resources they need so they can help students achieve. Act as an umbrella to keep as much of the “white noise” off the teachers so they can spend their time designing effective instruction. Provide a safe environment for students, faculty, and staff.” Responsibility for the nature of the school environment is undeniably reflected in the principal’s thoughts.

Fulfilling Today's Role

The second open-ended question asked principals to consider what influences how well the school leader can fulfill the role today. Multiple principals listed time and money as key factors. One principal states a connection to knowledge levels and offers: "Experience in all facets of education: budget, curriculum, instruction, assessments." Others recount the importance of communication and collaboration. For example, one principal relayed: "Relationships with students, staff and community- communication skills, and listening skills." Another respondent highlights the support of central office for the building principal's efforts, "The fulfillment of the role is impacted by the level of collaboration regularly practiced by the administrative team (central office and building level), the teachers and staff, the level to which student voice is heard and considered, and the extent of engagement with community members, organizations, and businesses."

Evaluation of instruction and monitoring classroom practices also was a common response. One principal recounts: "Many variables impact how well the building administrators fulfill his/her role. These include; teacher effectiveness, parent involvement, budget constraints, student growth, curriculum alignment." Another principal highlights: "Conducting walk-throughs, providing professional development, data meetings, conducting instructional leadership teams and meeting monthly, involvement in curriculum committee, providing observations and feedback to teachers, parents, etc..."

Finally, one principal noted the pledge to service in holding the role of the building leader and affirmed: "The building administrator needs to be committed to providing services to families and being aware of the needs of the students and their

families. Being reflective and adjusting to these needs. It is about the people you serve and helping the students to become confident learners. The importance of commitment, dedication, being reflective and adjusting to the needs of the students. It is important to set the vision and goals but be able to lead a team...the entire school staff.”

Characteristics of an Exemplary Leader

The last open-ended question asked principals to distinguish characteristics of an exemplary leader. The management side of the principal role is often revealed in the principals’ responses. For example, one principal avows: “One who leads by example; sets goals and follows through with the initiatives set for his/her staff. In addition, holding those accountable who may not be completely on board.” Another principal maintains: “Staying focused on the goals and working with all teachers to keep everyone moving toward the goal.”

Knowledge is also identified by responding principals as a characteristic of exemplary school principals. For instance, one principal writes: “Knowledge base and the ability to apply that knowledge in a school setting.” Another includes: “One who supports their staff and students and knows their content; passion for what they do.” Additionally, principals listed the importance of prioritizing students as a characteristic. These responses include: “Remembering that doing the best thing for the students is the most important thing.” Similarly, another principal notes: “One who communicates effectively, relates to the students and one who involves the students in the learning process.” A final principal comment regarding what distinguishes an exemplary principal highlights navigation skills of the leader: “The ability to move through barriers with minimal distraction to the system.”

The open-ended questions asked principals to reflect upon beliefs about the role of principal, consider influences that help or hinder fulfilling the role, and to identify characteristics of exemplary leaders. Principals who responded provided accounts detailing the complexities, priorities, and obstacles facing the principal daily in today's schools. The findings from the collected responses resonate with the recent literature regarding the on-going evolution of the school leader's role (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013). Future research investigations examining the skill-sets principals need to establish and sustain positive perceptions of leadership for themselves and for teachers would provide support for success in the role in today's schools. Gender investigations probing beliefs and exploring innovative gender-free approaches to leadership from both sexes would be worthy additions for future research as well.

Implications

The daily tasks of today's school principal have evolved in a myriad of ways from the principal role of years past to one now that requires multiple skill-sets including those such as leading teachers' instructional practices, creating positive school cultures for students, integrating data results as evidence sources for improvements and goal setting, and facilitating parental and community involvement in the school. Success in the role today requires perceptions of efficacy from self and from staff members. Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) stress the importance for principals to establish motivating school visions while also nurturing feelings that create the foundation for establishment and expansion of efficacy beliefs.

The outcomes from the current investigation offer meaningful insights into the potential leadership perceptions held by principals and teachers, as the job of school

leaders continues to expand in complexity. Findings surrounding differences in the perceptions of a principal's actions for maintaining visibility highlight the critical need for today's principal to have the necessary skills and support to guide and lead instructional best practices in the classroom. School leaders need to establish school goals that include teacher input from the onset and provide principals with foundations for distributed leadership in leading school initiatives and change. Also, school leaders need to support the principal's efficient management of time, with one solution provided by the supports from assistant principals.

Developing staff cultures that promote of increased efficacy is an artistic endeavor. Leithwood and Jantzi (2008) describe this ability as a leader's skill set for emotional intelligence and refer to a principal's actions for sharing continual and meaningful feedback, stimulating professional and intellectual growth, and providing individual support to teachers. Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe (2008) outline the importance of placing instructional improvements as a prioritized goal, maintaining first the establishment of a safe learning environment. Perceptions of teachers are paramount and the creation of teacher led professional learning communities is one method for improving teacher feelings of efficacy and trust (Wahlstrom and Louis, 2008). Establishing authentic professional learning communities within the school is a viable way for principals to build teacher trust and enhance honest discussions of instructional strengths and areas of need (Wahlstrom and Louis).

The current investigation revealed that the gender of the principal uncovered differences in perceptions surrounding the promotion of professional development for female principals across female and male teachers. The findings suggest that female

principals might benefit from being mindful of differences in teacher perceptions to support the breaking of barriers. Incorporating teachers into shared leadership roles as grade level team leaders or department chairs could support this process. Additionally, female principals can openly recognize and embrace new methods of leadership approaches unfamiliar or overwhelming to female and male teachers by coaching all through the process. Female principals should work to change this inhibiting dynamic in a concerted, researched effort to succeed in the role as change agent. Creating original scripts that respond to problems in a gender-free style would provide evidence for teachers to establish alternative beliefs about female principals.

School leaders need to provide mentors for all new principals and openly acknowledge issues that female leaders face in the role of school principal. The development and support of gender specific school leader networks would provide forums for environments to discuss challenges and successes. Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011, p. 68) identify leadership practice communities aiming to develop members' proficiencies in monitoring and facilitating instructional classroom improvements with teachers. School leaders aware of the similar need for principals to network in this fashion, who are willing to create similar groups for principals to reflect upon issues they face and problem-solve potential solutions, will reap the benefits in their school communities.

The current investigation revealed differences among perceptions to providing incentives for teachers, specifically for principal veterans. Veteran female and male school leaders need to share the expertise learned through multiple experiences in the role and provide valuable mentor supports to new principals or to those experiencing

difficulties to improve principal and teacher feelings of self-efficacy. Although large, national professional group networks hold broad benefit for principal improvements, each school system individually faces specific concerns to address. Small member leadership practice communities would provide the mentor guidance platform for principals to aid the planning and facilitating of needed reforms while improving leadership capacity (Jones, 2014).

Additionally, differences in perceptions were revealed among district sizes in providing incentives for teachers. This result highlights the necessity for creativity in problem-solving for today's schools and the current school budget climate. School leaders working together from districts of all sizes can share resources and ideas that benefit the entire educational community and address critical issues in maintaining staff morale. Furthermore, time and effort invested by principals in networking across levels of school governance by including teachers in developing ideas can improve positive perceptions of appreciation would aid implementation of meaningful solutions and increase teachers' feelings of value to the school.

All principals benefit from ongoing professional developments to improve professional capacity and embrace innovations towards best practices introduced, implemented, and encouraged by the educational community. Reflection upon past successes and disappointments experienced within personal situations then shared within environments and networks established for professional growth would allow learning on an individualized level. Customizing supports for principals extends the notion of innovation in addressing the complex concerns principals of today face daily to nurture positive perceptions of leadership actions for their teachers and themselves. The

principal's actions for designing goals for the school, communicating those goals to all stakeholders, managing the instructional process, coordinating curriculum, planning aligned professional developments, and providing incentives for students and teachers requires great finesse and advanced skill sets for success.

Recommendations for Future Research

The present investigation's examination of perceptions of a principal's leadership actions compared between teachers and principals has yielded notable implications for school leaders to contemplate. Although the inquiry has addressed an extensive evaluation of important actions for school principals to reflect in building and sustaining teacher and self-efficacy, additional research is warranted.

Forthcoming research that investigates a principal's success in sustaining 'visible leadership actions' would support further inquiry of the reported outcome difference of perceptions for the principal's actions for maintaining visibility. This might include investigating a principal's actions by measuring the frequency of classroom observations and walkthroughs, having an instructional coach in the building to support instruction, or leading professional learning communities that focus upon guiding teacher's to improve instructional practices.

Examination of a principal's daily actions would prove useful. How does the daily schedule of a 'visible' principal differ from one who is not perceived as 'visible'? Also, future research that focuses on contrasting methods principals employ in achieving schools that yield positive teachers' perceptions of a principal's actions would be of value. The current investigation collected perceptions of teachers and principals, however, additionally asking district leaders and students for their perceptions of

principal actions would provide a more comprehensive picture of leadership perceptions. Further research that connects a principal's actions for supporting instructional improvements to high teacher expectations for student learning could lead to added insights as well.

Research continuing exploration of the experiences of females in the principal role would be of value in considering the differences reported regarding female leaders promotion of professional developments. Investigation of professional development trainings connected to the gender of the principal may provide additional understandings of any gender differences in approach. Do student beliefs also perpetuate antiquated views regarding the principal's gender? Collection of student perceptions regarding principal leadership actions in relation to the principal's gender would allow another level of inquiry about the role of gender in school leadership. Finally, further investigation of employed collective, androgynous leadership actions and impacts on instruction would add to the research. Do these new leadership approaches impact principals' and teachers' perceptions of leader efficacy?

Conclusion

Facilitating the creation of a school climate where a principal enacts leadership actions that positively influence teachers' perceptions in multiple areas is an art form in today's complex school environments. Generally speaking, teachers' perceptions surrounding a principal's actions to support instructional practices are not in accord with a principal's perceptions. With heightened emphasis nationally on educator performance outcomes, teachers truly need support with instruction from the principal's seat more than

ever before. Principals realize and openly acknowledge the responsibility to improve instructional practices. However, the evolved complexity of the school leader role in today's schools includes multiple challenges for even the most effective and experienced principals.

Has the role of the principal in today's schools grown beyond a copious challenge? Yes, principals self-report a dire need for additional supports (Jones, 2014). Principals need to help one another through purposeful networks, recognize the value of teacher recognition and input, and allow teachers to make decisions and include them in drafting professional development plans where they can actively participate in change initiatives. The educator evaluation process now intermingles and entwines all roles in the school of environment for accountability like never before with connections of student achievement for evaluation of job performance.

Leadership in today's schools is multifaceted. As one principal stated, the exemplary principal is, "An individual who inspires and supports teachers to make a positive impact on the student population." Schools are fluid organizations. Creating the right recipe requires a careful combination of the precise ingredients each added to the mix at the exact time and in the correct amounts to increase levels of trust and feelings of support among the current students, staff, parents, and school community. Teaching is a very emotional art of the human spirit and perceptions are critical for positive outcomes. As Aristotle is credited with stating, "Knowing yourself is the beginning of all wisdom." The more principals know themselves and what works best for them, the more successful they will be in improving perceptions of leadership actions.

References

- Alatzoglou, A., Athanailidis, I., & Sampanis, M. (2013). The administrative management capacity of the physical education teacher as a school principal. *Journal of Novel Physiotherapies*, 3(6), 1-4. doi: 10.4172/2165-7025.1000184
- Antonakis, J., Day, D., & Schyns, B. (2012). Leadership and individual differences: At the cusp of a renaissance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(4), 1-32. Retrieved from https://serval.unil.ch/resource/serval:BIB_7DC2FF12B37F.P001/REF
- Applebaum, S., Audet, L., & Miller, J. (2003). Gender and leadership? Leadership and gender? A journey through the landscape of theories. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(1), 43 – 51. doi: 10.1108/01437730310457320
- Bellamy, G., Crockett, J., & Nordengren, C. (2014). *Preparing school leaders for every student's learning*. CEEDAR Center (Document No. LS-2). Retrieved from <http://cedar.education.ufl.edu/tools/literature-syntheses/>
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1999). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38 (2), 130-141. Retrieved from www.peoplelearn.homestead.com/Instruc.Effective.pdf
- Bouchard, E., Cervone, L., Hayden, H., Riggins-Newby, C., & Zarlengo, P. (2002). *Addressing the leadership challenges faced by principals* (Report). Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved from http://www.brown.edu/academics/education-alliance/sites/brown.edu/academics/education-alliance/files/publications/chrncl_pln.pdf

- Branch, G., Hanushek, E., & Rivkin, S. (2013). School leaders matter. *Education Next*, winter 2013, retrieved from <http://educationnext.org/school-leaders-matter/>
- Braun, H., Jenkins, F., & Grigg, W. (2006). Comparing private schools and public schools using hierarchical linear modeling. (Report). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED492570.pdf>
- Campbell, W. (2012). *Correlating principals' self-efficacy ratings with ratings of their efficacy by their teachers: Perceptions of leadership* (Dissertation). Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/ap/10?0::NO:10:P10_ACCESSION_NUM:ysu1341003286
- Cantrell, S., & Kane, T. (2012). *Ensuring fair and reliable measures of effective teaching: Culminating findings from the MET project's three-year study* (Report). Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Retrieved from http://www.metproject.org/downloads/MET_Ensuring_Fair_and_Reliable_Measures_Practitioner_Brief.pdf
- Clifford, M., Behrstock-Sherratt, E., & Fetters, J. (2012). *The ripple effect: A synthesis of research on principal influence to inform performance evaluation design* (Report). American Institute of Research. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/1707_The_Ripple_Effect_d8_Online_0.pdf
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi-experimentation: Design and analysis issues for field settings*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

- Corcoran, A., Casserly, M., Price-Baugh, R., Walston, D., Hall, R., & Simon, C. (2013). *Rethinking leadership: The changing role of principal supervisors* (Report). The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/district-policy-and-practice/Documents/Rethinking-Leadership-The-Changing-Role-of-Principal-Supervisors.pdf>
- Cuadrado, I., Navas, M., Molero, F., Ferrer, E., & Morales, J. (2012). Gender differences in leadership styles as a function of leader and subordinates' sex and type of organization. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(12), 3083-3113. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00974.x
- Cremata, E., Davis, D., Dickey, K., Lawyer, K., Negassi, Y., Raymond, M., & Woodworth, J. (2013). *National charter school study*. (Report). Center for Research on Education Outcomes, Stanford University. Retrieved from <http://credo.stanford.edu/documents/NCSS%202013%20Final%20Draft.pdf>
- Deschenes, S., Arbreton, A., Little, P., Herrera, C., Grossman, J., Weiss, H., & Lee, D. (2010). *Engaging older youth: Program and city-level strategies to support sustained participation in out-of school time*. (Report). The Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/after-school/coordinating-after-school-resources/Documents/Engaging-Older-Youth-City-Level-Strategies-Support-Sustained-Participation-Out-of-School-Time.pdf>
- Dillon, D. (2011). *Teacher perceptions of leadership in high poverty schools* (Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://gradworks.umi.com/34/78/3478283.html>

- Eagly, A., Johannesen-Schmidt, M., & van Engen, M. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(4), 569-591. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.129.4.569
- Eckman, E. (2002). Women high school principals: Perspectives on role conflict, role commitment, and job satisfaction. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12(1), 57-77. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ737637.pdf>
- Elias, M., Zins, J., Graczyk, P., & Weissberg, R. (2003). Implementation, sustainability, and scaling up of social-emotional and academic innovations in public schools. *School Psychology Review*, 32(3), 303-319. Retrieved from <http://olms1.cte.jhu.edu/olms/data/resource/4008/SocialEmotional%20Innovations.pdf>
- Englert, K., Fries, D., Martin-Glenn, M., & Douglas, B. (2007). Accountability systems: A comparative analysis of superintendent, principal, and teacher perceptions. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership*, 2(4), 1-12. Retrieved from http://www.researchgate.net/publication/26636168_Accountability_Systems_A_Comparative_Analysis_of_Superintendent_Principal_and_Teacher_Perceptions
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using spss*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

- Finley, M. (2014). *An exploration of the relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' instructional leadership and transformed leadership behaviors* (Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2149&context=etd>
- Gales-Johnson, K. (2003). *African American women superintendents: Pathways to success* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-09042013-193017/unrestricted/Johnsondiss.pdf>
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glass, T., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. (2000). *The study of the American school superintendency, 2000. A look at the superintendent of education in the new millennium* (Report). American Association of School Administrators. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED440475.pdf>
- Gregg, M. (2007). *The female assistant principal: Stepping stone or stumbling block to the secondary school principalship* (Dissertation). Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/rws_etd/document/get/miami1193805125/inline
- Grissom, J., & Loeb, S. (2009). *Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills* (Report 09-1). Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice. Retrieved from [http://web.stanford.edu/~sloeb/papers/Principal%20Effectiveness%20\(revised\).pdf](http://web.stanford.edu/~sloeb/papers/Principal%20Effectiveness%20(revised).pdf)

- Grogan, M., & Shakeshaft, C. (2011). *Women and educational leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Grupton, S. (2009). Women in educational leadership in the U.S. Reflections of a 50 year veteran. *Forum on Public Policy, Summer 2009*, 1-20. Retrieved from <http://forumonpublicpolicy.com/summer09/archivesummer09/guption.pdf>
- Hallinger, P. (2008). *PIMRS: Making change happen*. <http://philiphallinger.com/old-site/pimrs.html>
- Hallinger, P. (2011). A review of three decades of doctoral studies using the principal instructional management rating scale: A lens on methodological progress in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 47(2), 272-309. doi: 10.1177/0013161X10383412
- Hallinger, P., Wang, W.-C., & Chen, C.-W. (2013). Assessing the measurement properties of the principal instructional management rating scale: A meta-analysis of reliability studies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(2), 272-309. Retrieved from <http://philiphallinger.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Assessing-the-Measurement-Properties-of-the-Principal-Instructional-Management-Rating-Scale-A-Meta-Analysis-of-Reliability-Studies.pdf>
- Hardman, B. (2011). *Teacher's [sic] perception of their principal's [sic] leadership style and the effects on student achievement in improving and non-improving schools* (Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4921&context=etd>

- Harvey, J. (2011). *The school principal as leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning* (Report). Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/effective-principal-leadership/Documents/The-School-Principal-as-Leader-Guiding-Schools-to-Better-Teaching-and-Learning.pdf>
- Hoyle, J. (2006). Leadership styles. *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration*, 595 –598. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Retrieved from <http://www.sagepub.com/northouse6e/study/materials/reference/reference4.1.pdf>
- Jacobs, J. (2002). Can you be an effective principal when you don't smoke, swing a club, or ride a Harley? *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/awl.html>
- Jean-Marie, G., Normone, A., & Brooks, J. (2009). Leadership for social justice: Preparing 21st century school leaders for a new social order. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 4(1). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ875408.pdf>
- Jones, M.K. (2014). The impact of mentoring first year principals. (Doctoral Dissertation). Youngstown State University, Youngstown Ohio.
- Kropiewnicki, M., & Shapiro, J. (2001). *Female leadership and the ethic of care: Three case studies* (Report). American Educational Research Association. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED453599.pdf>
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 496-528. doi: 10.1177/0013161X08321501

- Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Review of research: How leadership influences student learning* (Report). Learning from Leadership Project, Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Pages/How-Leadership-Influences-Student-Learning.aspx>
- Lemasters, L., & Roach, V. (2012). 3-Dimensional portrait of the female ceo. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7(1). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ971686.pdf>
- Louis, K., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 21(3), 315-336. doi: 10.1080/09243453.2010.486586
- Louis, K., Leithwood, K., Wahlstrom, K., & Anderson, S. (2010). *Learning from leadership: Investigating the links to improved student learning* (Report). University of Minnesota, University of Toronto, & Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Investigating-the-Links-to-Improved-Student-Learning.pdf>
- Marzano, R., Frontier, T., & Livingston, D. (2011). *Effective supervision: Supporting the art and science of teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD. Retrieved from <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/110019/chapters/A-Brief-History-of-Supervision-and-Evaluation.aspx>
- Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

- Morrison, M. (2012). *Gender and leadership: Educational leadership through feminine eyes: Have the barriers in acquiring educational administrative positions for women changed in the last fifteen years?* (Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://dspace.iup.edu/bitstream/handle/2069/755/M.%20Holly%20Morrison.pdf?sequence=1>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *Schools and staffing survey (SASS)*. (Report). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/sass1112_2013314_t1s_002.asp
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). *Schools and staffing survey (SASS)*. (Report). U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/sass/tables/sass1112_2013313_p1s_002.asp
- Pierce, M. (2000). Portrait of the 'super principal.' *Harvard Education Letter*, 16(5). Retrieved from <http://www.summerland.school.nz/Cache/Pictures/123059/superprincipal.pdf>
- Podsakoff, P., MacKenzie, S., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879. Retrieved from <http://personal.psu.edu/jxb14/M554/articles/Podsakoffetal2003.pdf>

- Pounder, J., & Coleman, M. (2002). Women – better leaders than men? In general and educational management it still “all depends.” *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 23(3), 122-133. doi: 10.1108/01437730210424066
- Printy, S., & Marks, H. (2006). Shared leadership for teacher and student learning. *Theory Into Practice*, 45(2), 125-132. Retrieved from <http://donnaelder.wiki.westga.edu/file/view/Shared+leadership+for+teacher+and+student+learning.pdf>
- Provost, J., Boscardin, M., & Wells, C. (2010). Perceptions of principal leadership behaviors in Massachusetts in the era of education reform. *Journal of School Leadership*, 20(5), 532-560. Retrieved from <http://myfirstwikipage.wiki.westga.edu/file/view/ResearchsourceLeadershipperception.pdf>
- Richards, H., Brown, A., & Forde, T. (2007). Addressing diversity in schools: Culturally responsive pedagogy. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 39(3), 64 - 68. Retrieved from <http://bcps.org/offices/oea/pdf/addressing-diversity.pdf>
- Rand Corporation. (2004). *The careers of public school administrators: Policy implications from an analysis of state level data*. (Report). Rand Corporation. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_briefs/2005/RB9054.pdf
- Robinson, V., Lloyd, C., & Rowe, K. (2008). The impact of leadership on student outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674. doi: 10.1177/0013161X08321509

- Ross, J., & Gray, P. (2006). School leadership and student achievement: The mediating effects of teacher beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29(3), 798-822.
Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ756123.pdf>
- Rothstein, J., & Mathis, W. (2013). *Review of two culminating reports from the MET project* (Report). National Education Policy Center. Retrieved from <http://nepc.colorado.edu/files/ttr-final-met-rothstein.pdf>
- Rousmaniere, K. (2013). The principal: The most misunderstood person in all of education. *The Atlantic*, the Atlantic Monthly Group. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2013/11/the-principal-the-most-misunderstood-person-in-all-of-education/281223/>
- Rowland, K. (2008). *The relationship of principal leadership and teacher morale* (Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1088&context=documental>
- Rudestam, K., & Newton, R. (2007). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ryan, M., Haslam, S., & Postmes, T. (2007). Reactions to the glass cliff: Gender differences in the explanations for the precariousness of women's leadership positions. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 20(2), 182-197.
Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/09534810710724748>

- Sebastian, J., & Allensworth, E. (2012). The influence of principal leadership on classroom instruction and student learning: A study of mediated pathways to learning. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(6), 626-663. doi: 10.1177/0013161X11436273
- Shakeshaft, C., Brown, G., Irby, B., Grogan, M., & Ballenger, J. (2007). Increasing gender equity in educational leadership. *Handbook of Gender Equity in Schools*. Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved from <http://welv.org/genderequityarticle.pdf>
- Sodoma, B., & Else, D. (2009). Job satisfaction of Iowa public school principals. *The Rural Educator*, 31(1), 10-18.
- Stein, M., & Nelson, B. (2003). Leadership content knowledge. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(4), 423-448. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699585>
- Trail, K. (2000). Taking the lead: The role of the principal in school reform. *CSRD Connections* 1(4), 1-4. Retrieved from <http://www.sedl.org/csrd/connections/oct00/oct00.pdf>
- Trochim, W., & Donnelly, J. (2008). *The research methods knowledge base*. Mason: Atomic Dog of Cengage Learning.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(5), 573-585. doi: 10.1108/09578230410554070

- Turnbull, B., Riley, D., & MacFarlen, J. (2013). *Cultivating talent through a principal pipeline* (Report). *Building a Stronger Principalship, Vol. 2*. Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/principal-training/Documents/Building-a-Stronger-Principalship-Vol-2-Cultivating-Talent-in-a-Principal-Pipeline.pdf>
- Usdan, M., McCloud, B., & Podmostko, M. (2000). *Leadership for Student Learning: Reinventing the Principalship* (Report). Washington, DC: Institute of Educational Leadership. Retrieved from <http://www.iel.org/programs/21st/reports/principal.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Education. (2001). No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2008). Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>
- Wahlstrom, K., & Louis, K. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(4), 458-495. doi: 10.1177/0013161X08321502
- Wickham, D. (2007). *Female superintendents: Perceived barriers and successful strategies to attain the superintendency in California* (Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://boardmeetings.ceres.k12.ca.us/research/documents/D.%20Wickham%20Dissertation-Female%20Supe.pdf>

Wolverton, M., & Macdonald²⁰⁰, R.T. (2001). *Women in the superintendency: Barking up the wrong chain of command* (Report). University Council for Educational Administration. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED466019.pdf>

Zaccaro, S. (2012). Individual differences and leadership: Contributions to a third tipping point. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(4), 718-728. doi:
10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.05.001

APPENDICES

Appendix A

PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT

RATING SCALE

TEACHER FORM

Published by: Dr. Philip Hallinger

7250 Golf Pointe Way Sarasota, FL 34243

Leadingware.com

813-354-3543

philip@leadingware.com

All rights are reserved. This instrument may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the written permission of the publisher.

Teacher Form 2.0

THE PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT RATING SCALE

PART I: Please provide the following information about yourself:

(A) School Name: _____

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

___1 ___5-9 ___more than 15

___2-4 ___10-15

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

___1 ___5-9 ___more than 15

___2-4 ___10-15

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

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

5 represents *Almost Always*

4 represents *Frequently*

3 represents *Sometimes*

2 represents *Seldom*

1 represents *Almost Never*

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

To what extent does your principal . . . ?

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

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

IV. COORDINATE THE CURRICULUM

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

V. MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS

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

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

25. Inform students of school's academic progress 1 2 3 4 5

VI. PROTECT INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

26. Limit interruptions of instructional time by public address announcements 1 2 3 4 5

27. Ensure that students are not called to the office during instructional time 1 2 3 4 5

28. Ensure that tardy and truant students suffer specific consequences for missing instructional time 1 2 3 4 5

29. Encourage teachers to use instructional time for teaching and practicing new skills and concepts 1 2 3 4 5

30. Limit the intrusion of extra- and co-curricular activities on instructional time 1 2 3 4 5

VII. MAINTAIN HIGH VISIBILITY

31. Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks 1 2 3 4 5

32. Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students 1 2 3 4 5

33. Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities 1 2 3 4 5

34. Cover classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives 1 2 3 4 5

35. Tutor students or provide direct instruction to classes 1 2 3 4 5

VIII. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR TEACHERS

36. Reinforce superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos 1 2 3 4 5

37. Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance 1 2 3 4 5

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

IX. PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

X. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR LEARNING

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

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

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

The *PIMRS* was developed with the cooperation of the Milpitas (California) Unified School District, Richard P. Mesa, Superintendent. As a research instrument, it meets professional standards of reliability and validity and has been used in over 150 studies of principal leadership in the United States, Canada, Australia, Europe, and Asia.

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

The *PIMRS* is copyrighted and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the author. Additional information on the development of the *PIMRS* and the rights to its use may be obtained from the publisher (see cover page).

Appendix B

PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT RATING SCALE

Principal Form

Published by: Dr.

Philip Hallinger

7250 Golf Pointe Way Sarasota, FL 34243

Leadingware.com

813-354-3543

philip@leadingware.com

All rights are reserved. This instrument may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the written permission of the publisher.

Principal Form 2.0

(Appendix B Continued)

THE PRINCIPAL INSTRUCTIONAL MANAGEMENT RATING SCALE

PART I: Please provide the following information if instructed to do so by the person administering the instrument:

(A) Gender: _____ Male (A) _____ Female (B)

(B) Number of school years you have been a teacher:

_____ 1 (A) _____ 5-9 (B) _____ more than 15 (C)

_____ 2-4 (D) _____ 10-15 (E)

(C) Number of school years you have been principal:

__ 1 (A) _____ 5-9 (B) _____ more than 15 (C)

__ 2-4 (D) _____ 10-15 (E)

(D) Number of school years you have been principal at this school:

__ 1 (A) _____ 5-9 (B) _____ more than 15 (C)

__ 2-4 (D) _____ 10-15 (E)

(Appendix B Continued)

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

Read each statement carefully. Then circle the number that best fits the specific job behavior or practice as you conducted it during the past school year. For the response to each statement:

5 represents *Almost Always*

4 represents *Frequently*

3 represents *Sometimes*

2 represents *Seldom*

1 represents *Almost Never*

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

Thank you.

To what extent do you . . . ?

ALMOST

NEVER

ALMOST

ALWAYS

I. FRAME THE SCHOOL GOALS

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Develop a focused set of annual school-wide goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. | Frame the school's goals in terms of staff responsibilities for meeting them | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. | Use needs assessment or other formal and informal methods to secure staff input on goal development | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. | Use data on student performance when developing the school's academic goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. | Develop goals that are easily understood and used by teachers in the school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

II. COMMUNICATE THE SCHOOL GOALS

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. | Communicate the school's mission effectively to members of the school community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Discuss the school's academic goals with teachers at faculty meetings | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | Refer to the school's academic goals when making curricular decisions with teachers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | Ensure that the school's academic goals are reflected in highly visible displays in the school (e.g., posters or bulletin boards emphasizing academic progress) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. | Refer to the school's goals or mission in forums with students (e.g., in assemblies or discussions) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

III. SUPERVISE & EVALUATE INSTRUCTION

11.	Ensure that the classroom priorities of teachers are consistent with the goals and direction of the school	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Review student work products when evaluating classroom instruction	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Conduct informal observations in classrooms on a regular basis (informal observations are unscheduled, last at least 5 minutes, and may or may not involve written feedback or a formal conference)	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Point out specific strengths in teacher's instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Point out specific weaknesses in teacher instructional practices in post-observation feedback (e.g., in conferences or written evaluations)	1	2	3	4	5

IV. COORDINATE THE CURRICULUM

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

(Appendix B Continued)

ALMOST
NEVER

ALMOST
ALWAYS

V. MONITOR STUDENT PROGRESS

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21. | Meet individually with teachers to discuss student progress | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. | Discuss academic performance results with the faculty to identify curricular strengths and weaknesses | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. | Use tests and other performance measure to assess progress toward school goals | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. | Inform teachers of the school's performance results in written form (e.g., in a memo or newsletter) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. | Inform students of school's academic progress | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

VI. PROTECT INSTRUCTIONAL TIME

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

VII. MAINTAIN HIGH VISIBILITY

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31. | Take time to talk informally with students and teachers during recess and breaks | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. | Visit classrooms to discuss school issues with teachers and students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. | Attend/participate in extra- and co-curricular activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34. | Cover classes for teachers until a late or substitute teacher arrives | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35. | Tutor students or provide direct instruction to classes | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

VIII. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR TEACHERS

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 36. | Reinforce superior performance by teachers in staff meetings, newsletters, and/or memos | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 37. | Compliment teachers privately for their efforts or performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 38. | Acknowledge teachers' exceptional performance by writing memos for their personnel files | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 39. | Reward special efforts by teachers with opportunities for professional recognition | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 40. | Create professional growth opportunities for teachers as a reward for special contributions to the school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

IX. PROMOTE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

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

X. PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR LEARNING

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

(Appendix B Continued)

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

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

The *PIMRS* was developed with the cooperation of the Milpitas (California) Unified School District, Richard P. Mesa, Superintendent. As a research instrument, it meets professional standards of reliability and validity and has been used in over 150 studies of principal leadership in the United States, Canada, Australia, Europe, and Asia.

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

The *PIMRS* is copyrighted and may not be reproduced without the written permission of the author. Additional information on the development of the *PIMRS* and the rights to its use may be obtained from the publisher (see cover page).

Appendix C

Open-Ended Principal Questions

1. What do you believe is the role of the building administrator?
2. What do you think influences how well the building administrator is able to fulfill that role?
3. What do you think distinguishes an exemplary educational leader?

Appendix D

March 25, 2015

Dr. Karen Larwin, Principal Investigator
Ms. Linda Lorei, Co-investigator
Department of Educational Foundations, Research, Technology & Leadership
UNIVERSITY

RE: HSRC Protocol Number: 121-2015
Title: Perceptions of Leadership: Visions of Integration

Dear Dr. Larwin and Ms. Lorei:

The Institutional Review Board has reviewed the abovementioned protocol and determined that it is exempt from full committee review based on a DHHS Category 3 exemption.

Any changes in your research activity should be promptly reported to the Institutional Review Board and may not be initiated without IRB approval except where necessary to eliminate hazard to human subjects. Any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects should also be promptly reported to the IRB.

The IRB would like to extend its best wishes to you in the conduct of this study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Scott C. Martin
Interim Associate Dean for Research
Authorized Institutional Official

SCM:cc

c: Dr. Mary Lou DiPillo, Chair
Department of Educational Foundations, Research, Technology & Leadership

Appendix E

April 3, 2015

Dr. Karen Larwin, Principal Investigator
Ms. Linda Lorei, Co-investigator
Department of Educational Foundations, Research, Technology & Leadership
UNIVERSITY

RE: HSRC PROTOCOL NUMBER: MI21-2015
TITLE: Perceptions of Leadership: Visions of Integration

Dear Dr. Larwin and Ms. Lorei:

The Human Subjects Research Committee has reviewed the modifications you have requested to the above-mentioned protocol. The expansion of recruitment area for this project does not change the risk associated with it. Therefore, your project continues to meet the condition of minimal risk and is fully approved.

Any other changes in your research activity should be promptly reported to the Institutional Review Board and may not be initiated without IRB approval except where necessary to eliminate hazard to human subjects. Any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects should also be promptly reported to the IRB.

The IRB would like to extend its best wishes to you in the conduct of this study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Scott Martin
Interim Associate Dean for Research
Authorized Institutional Official

SCM:ec

c: Dr. Mary Lou DiPillo, Chair
Department of Educational Foundations, Research, Technology & Leadership