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ABSTRACT

A Study of Relationships among Teachers’ Perceptions of Leadership Practices and Teachers’ Perceptions of Teacher Efficacy

The purpose of the study was to determine if significant relationships existed among measures of elementary principals’ leadership practices and measures of teacher self-efficacy as perceived by rural elementary teachers. Teachers' sense of efficacy has been related to teacher performance and student achievement. Teachers who have a strong sense of efficacy tend to demonstrate greater effort, persist longer in working with students who have problems, and have greater success in reform initiatives.

Consistently, principal leadership behaviors have been linked to teachers' sense of efficacy; however, the results of this study were not consistent with such research findings. Teachers’ perceptions of principals’ behaviors were not correlated with teachers’ efficacy. Specifically, based on the responses of 221 rural teachers, the five measures of the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) were not correlated to subscales of the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES). It was posited that the lack of correlations could be associated with the relatively short tenure of the rural principals in the study; all principals had been in their current position less than three years at the time of the study.

Grouping of teacher responses were established using selected demographic variables. The results of MANOVAs were mixed. Significant differences across groups were established for Number of Years Teaching and Teachers Level of Education. Teachers were asked to describe their involvement in decision-making in their schools. Their descriptions indicated that their involvement was primarily associated with participation in committee work and involvement in various building level teams. However, over one-half of the teachers indicated
that they were only involved within their classrooms or that they were not involved in
decision-making. Again, it was posited that these finding could be associated with the nature
and character of small rural schools and with the relatively short tenure of the principals.
DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. They have endured all of the course work, trainings and experiences I have been involved in to get to this point. They have also tolerated all of those classes, trainings, and experiences that I have inflicted on them. I want to thank them, because no one does this by them self. We have accomplished this.

Thank you.

LD
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Bill Thornton, my dissertation advisor, thank you for all of the patience and time you have given me. Without your dedication, advice, and patience, I do not believe I would have completed this degree. Thank you for taking on the bureaucracy of the University system in my support. A professor in another department was correct when he said, “they really care about their students up there”. Thank you.

Next, Dr. George “Gus” Hill, one of my dissertation advisors, thank you for taking your time to provide me guidance. Even after your retirement and moving away, you continued to be a support. I realize you were under no obligation to help me finish my degree. There were times when you had the opportunity to refer me to another professor, but you did not. You are truly an educator and your hard work and talent should be acknowledged. Your patience and support will always be appreciated.

Dr. Janet Usinger, I have appreciated our conversation about the difference between a practitioner and a researcher. Thank you for your IRB assistance, and your red pen.

Dr. Mary Sedwick, who always gave me positive support and sound advice. You were always very encouraging about my project. You gave it credibility. Thank you for being the example of what we should strive to be in education.

Dr. Tom Harrison, thank you for the advice and encouragement during our meetings. You have shared important knowledge about my topic with me. I have a greater depth of information from being able to converse with you. Thank you.

Mrs. Mary Wilkerson, my 8th and 9th grade English teacher, who never gave up on me; thank you so much. The students, faculty, and staff of the schools that I was privileged to be a part of, thank you. I have learned so much from all of you, and will always be grateful.
I would be remiss, if I did not acknowledge and thank the superintendents, principals, and teachers who participated in the study.
# Table of Contents

1. **ABSTRACT** .......................................................................................................................... i
2. **DEDICATION** ...................................................................................................................... iii
3. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** ...................................................................................................... iv
4. **LIST OF TABLES** ................................................................................................................ xi
5. **LIST OF FIGURES** ............................................................................................................. xii
6. **CHAPTER ONE** .................................................................................................................. 1
    8. **Introduction** .................................................................................................................. 1
    9. **Statement of the Problem** ........................................................................................... 2
   10. **Purpose of the Study** ................................................................................................... 3
   11. **Research on Leadership** ............................................................................................. 3
   12. **Research on Efficacy** .................................................................................................. 4
   13. **Research Questions** .................................................................................................... 6
   14. **Significance of Study** .................................................................................................. 7
   15. **Assumptions** ................................................................................................................ 7
   16. **Limitations of the Study** ............................................................................................. 8
   17. **Delimitations of the Study** .......................................................................................... 8
   18. **Definitions** .................................................................................................................. 9
   19. **Summary** ..................................................................................................................... 11
CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

Leadership Theories

Scientific Management Theory

Theory X and Theory Y

Transformational Leadership Theory

Transactional Leadership Theory

Situational Leadership Theory

Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Model

Model the Way

Inspire a Shared Vision

Challenge the Process

Enable Others to Act

Encourage the Heart

Self-Efficacy Theory

Mastery Experience

Social Modeling

Improving Physical and Emotional States

Verbal Persuasion
Chapter One: Teachers and Self-Efficacy ................................................................. 29

Chapter Two: The Impact of Principal Leadership .................................................. 32

Chapter Three: Summary ....................................................................................... 36

Chapter THREE .................................................................................................. 37

Methodology ........................................................................................................ 37

Research Questions ............................................................................................. 37

Research Design .................................................................................................. 38

School District Characteristics .......................................................................... 38

Study Participants ............................................................................................... 38

Instrumentation .................................................................................................... 39

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) ................................................................. 39

Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) .............................................................................. 41

Data Collection .................................................................................................. 42

Data Analysis ...................................................................................................... 43

Summary .............................................................................................................. 47

Chapter FOUR .................................................................................................. 48

Results and Findings ......................................................................................... 48

Data Collected for the Study .............................................................................. 48

Descriptive Statistics ......................................................................................... 48
Summary of Demographic Variables ........................................................................................................50

Results by Research Question ..................................................................................................................53

Research Question 1 ....................................................................................................................................52

Research Question 2 ....................................................................................................................................57

Research Question 3 ....................................................................................................................................57

Research Question 4 ....................................................................................................................................58

Independent Variable of Teacher's Age ......................................................................................................58

Independent Variable of Number of Years Teaching ...............................................................................59

Independent Variable of Years with Current Principal ...........................................................................62

Independent Variable of Teacher's Educational Level ............................................................................63

Additional Analysis ....................................................................................................................................66

Open-Ended Question ................................................................................................................................68

Summary .....................................................................................................................................................71

CHAPTER FIVE ...........................................................................................................................................72

Summary, Implications for Practice, Recommendations ...........................................................................72

Summary of Findings ...................................................................................................................................72

Discussion ..................................................................................................................................................78

Recommendations for Further Study .........................................................................................................80

Implications for Practice .............................................................................................................................80
Conclusion

REFERENCES

APPENDIX A: LPI Observer

APPENDIX B: TES Short Form

APPENDIX C: Demographic Survey and Open-Ended Survey

APPENDIX D: Permission to use LPI

APPENDIX E: Permission to use TES Short Form

APPENDIX F: Permission to survey school district #1

APPENDIX G: Permission to survey school district #2

APPENDIX H: Letter of Approval from University of Nevada, Reno Internal Review Board

APPENDIX I: Principal Script

APPENDIX J: Script for Teacher Survey Delivery
LIST OF TABLES

92 Table 1. Reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha) Coefficient for each Subscale of the LPI .............. 40
93 Table 2. LPI Leadership Traits and Related Questions ....................................................... 41
94 Table 3. Reliability of TES Long and Short Forms ................................................................. 42
95 Table 4. TES Subscale and Related Questions ................................................................. 42
96 Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for Teacher Efficacy Scale and Leadership Practices Inventory. 49
97 Table 6. Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient Reliability for TES Short Form ................................. 50
98 Table 7. Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient Reliability for Each Subscale of the LPI ................. 50
99 Table 8. Summary of the Person Product-Moment Correlations for the five LPI Subscales .... 56
100 Table 9. Summary of the Person Product-Moment Correlations for the TES and LPI Subscales ................................................................. 57
101 Table 10. Summary for the Group Means for Independent Variable Age ....................... 59
102 Table 11. Summary for the Group Means and Standard Deviations for Independent Variable Number of Years Teaching ................................................................. 62
103 Table 12. Summary for the Group Means and Standard Deviation for Independent Variable Educational Level ................................................................. 65
104 Table 13. Summary for the Study Means, Study Standard Deviation | Normative Means, and t-tests for Subscales ................................................................. 67
105 Table 14. Summary for Frequencies for the Global Classifications of Responses for the Open-ended Question ................................................................. 69
106 Table 15. Summary of Educational Job Experiences for Principals ................................. 75
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Means for this study and Means Reported by Survey Developers .................. 68
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

A concerted effort has been made to reform schools in the United States. Though many reforms have focused on teaching, some have taken a different approach and concentrated on educational leadership. Now school leaders are being called to make schools more effective and efficient (Marzano, 2000). Policymakers are demanding principals and teachers be held to higher standards and that schools demonstrate characteristics like successful business organizations (i.e. effectiveness, organizational efficiency, and accountability) (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2002). Other suggested improvements include demanding school leaders, especially principals, demonstrate strong educational leadership, improve students’ academic skills, and provide a safe and secure environment. Frase and Hertzel (1990) stressed the importance of awareness as a leadership trait, saying that “none is more critical to building excellence than knowledge of current research on teaching, learning, and leadership. Strong leaders exhibit a commitment to the improvement ethic: that competency is a lifelong journey” (p. 7). This is in addition to tasks principals currently perform, such as regularly assessing student progress, adjusting instruction, and involving parents in the educational process (Coyle & Witcher, 1992). Research suggests that effective leadership is the key to school improvement (Marzano, 2000).

Understanding of relationships among principals’ and teachers’ activities is critical. Specifically, teachers’ beliefs about principal behaviors may be linked to student achievement. A chain of logic exists; principals have direct impacts on teachers and teachers have direct impacts on students. However, the direct connection between a school leader and students is the teacher.
Leadership has been studied about how: (a) people learn; (b) people acquire the ability to lead; (c) organizational structures help or hinder the process, and (d) individuals become leaders (Bass, 1982; Bennis, 1989; Peters, 1987; Peters & Waterman, 1982). Concerns for student achievement have inspired yet another interest, that of effective educational leadership and related teacher efficacy (Walker & Slear, 2011). Policymakers and key school stakeholders are concerned about student achievement, and they are intent on improving educational leadership abilities because it is considered the fundamental force behind successful organizations (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). Because of the theoretical connections among leadership and teacher beliefs and behavior additional empirical studies are key (Bennis & Nanus, 1985).

**Statement of the Problem**

Limited literature was found on how the leadership practices of school principals are related to teachers’ perceptions of teacher efficacy in rural elementary schools. Past research on teachers’ efficacy beliefs focused primarily on relations to student achievement (Bandura, 1993; Goddard, 2001, 2002; Goddard, Hoy & Hoy, 2002; Goddard, LoGerfo, & Hoy, 2004). While these studies have established the basis for understanding the potentially powerful nature of teachers’ efficacy beliefs, more research is needed to determine if there are connections between teacher efficacy and principal leadership behaviors. Teachers in many small rural schools do not have the amount of resources available to them as teachers in larger schools. Teachers in small rural schools have fewer peers and administrators with whom to interact, and can be more independent than teachers in larger schools. Leaders in small rural schools have limited access to professional development, mentoring, and often funding. Additionally, the amount of research available on teachers’ perceptions about their principals’ leadership behaviors and how those
behaviors affect teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy is limited. The lack of research on teacher efficacy in small, rural schools is also of concern and is therefore addressed in this study.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore if there are significant relationships among teachers’ perceptions about principal leadership practices, and teacher’s perceptions of their own efficacy. Teachers’ perceptions of the leadership practices of principals as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) (Kouzes & Posner, 2007) was considered. Additionally, teachers’ perceptions about their own efficacy was measured using the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). The study considered possible relationships among leadership practices and teachers’ efficacy as measured by the described instruments. Understanding factors that might enhance or hinder teachers’ efficacy is essential given the salience of these factors on teacher instructional behavior and student learning outcomes (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2002).

**Research on Leadership**

Leadership in general is a popular topic of study; there is no shortage of literature on the subject. Kouzes and Posner, two researchers who write frequently on leadership, described five traits as the behaviors a leader must exhibit to successfully lead an organization. Those five traits are: (1) Model the Way; (2) Inspire a Shared Vision; (3) Challenge the Process; (4) Enable Others to Act; and (5) Encourage the Heart (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). While Kouzes and Posner (2003) argued each of these behaviors is essential for effective leadership, there is an overarching theme as well important: relationships. Kouzes and Posner (2003) explained: “In talking to leaders and reading their cases, there was a very clear message that wove itself
throughout every situation and every action: leadership is a relationship. Leadership is a relationship between those who aspire to lead and those who choose to follow” (p. 82).

Frase and Hertzl (1990) and Kouzes and Posner (2003) contributed greatly to the leadership literature, but research that is more narrowly focused and concerns schools and learning is the focus of this study. Cotton’s (2003) meta-analysis revealed the importance of leadership in the educational system, explaining that effective principals develop strong relationships, give quality feedback, and involve others in decision-making. Researchers have consistently found that positive relationships exist between principal behavior and student academic achievement (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998; Walker & Slear, 2011). As Cotton (2003) stated, “[i]t would be difficult to find an educational researcher or practitioner who does not believe that school principals are critically important to school success” (p. 1).

**Research on Efficacy**

Bandura (1977) developed Social Learning Theory, which explains that learning within a social context depends upon the roles of modeling and observations. Cognition, observed behavior, and the environment contribute as major factors to the development of self-efficacy in a reciprocal, triadic relationship. Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as the belief of one’s ability to effectively perform specific tasks. Social Learning Theory describes how the imitation of an observed behavior is influenced by the interaction of three determinants:

1. **Personal:** Whether an individual has high or low self-efficacy toward a behavior.

   Getting a learner to believe in his or her personal abilities, which allows him or her to correctly complete a behavior, is an example.
2. Behavioral: The response an individual receives after he or she performs a behavior. Providing chances for a learner to experience successful learning as a result of performing a behavior correctly is an example of a behavioral determinant.

3. Environmental: Aspects of the environment or setting that influence an individual’s ability to complete a behavior successfully. (Bandura, 1986, p. 21)

According to Bandura (1997), these three determinants interact and govern an individual’s motivation levels, emotional states, and actions. Bandura also argued that efficacy beliefs play a crucial role in individual and group functioning because people act upon these determinants. The connection between social learning and self-efficacy of the observer as explained by Bandura (1997) is useful for the purposes of this study. Bandura argued that efficacy beliefs are connected to an individual’s ability to perform difficult tasks. This argument can be extended to teachers. If teachers have high levels of self-efficacy, they are more likely to master difficult challenges in the classroom. A question follows, are efficacy beliefs of teachers related to leadership?

In 1986, Bandura published his Social Cognitive Theory. Social Cognitive Theory is based on four key components: observational learning, retention and context, motivation and rewards, and state of mind. A key component in the development of an individual’s self-efficacy is observed behaviors; that is, people can develop self-efficacy by watching others. Theoretically, principals can teach general rules, strategies, and expectations they believe are effective for their schools through modeling and action. Teachers’ observations of principal behaviors could, therefore, be very significant. Bandura (1995) contended self-efficacy could be enhanced by the following experiences:
• **Mastery experience:** The method that helps an individual attain simple tasks that lead to more complex objectives and skills.

• **Social modeling:** Provides a recognizable model that demonstrates the procedures to accomplish a behavior.

• **Improving physical and emotional states:** Refers to ensuring a person is rested and relaxed prior to trying a new behavior. A stressed individual is more likely to be impatient and therefore less likely to attain a desired behavior.

• **Verbal persuasion:** To provide encouragement to complete an assignment or attain a certain behavior.

As school leaders, principals can positively influence and empower educators (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). Principals’ actions are a reflection of their leadership capabilities and therefore, essentially their actions shape the tone, culture, and climate of the learning environment. Leithwood and Riehl (2003) argued that principal leadership is the single most important ingredient in the formula for school success. It is for these reasons that the relationships between principal leadership and teacher efficacy were explored in this study.

**Research Questions**

Four questions guided this research study. These queries were structured to determine if significant relationships existed among teachers’ perceptions of principals’ leadership practices and teachers’ perceived self-efficacy. The guiding research questions were as follows:

1. Were there significant relationships among the Leadership Practices Inventory subscales?

2. Was there a significant relationship between the two Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales?
3. Were there significant relationships among the Leadership Practices Inventory and Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales?

4. When groups were established using selected demographic variables, were there significant differences among groups based on the Leadership Practices Inventory and Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales?

**Significance of Study**

Research based on the relationships among leadership practices (as measured by the LPI) and efficacy of the teachers (as measured by the TES) is scarce. Additionally, the amount of research available on teachers’ perceptions of their principal’s leadership behaviors and corresponding teachers’ perceptions of their efficacy is limited.

This research study may add to the knowledge of what teachers perceive, and if there is a relationship among their perceptions of leadership behaviors and their own efficacy. Educational organizations are continually seeking to improve their systems to increase student achievement; conducting research on teacher perceptions of school leadership is vital for school and school district improvement. The information contained herein is important because it may be used by universities, school boards, and superintendents when developing school, district, or state improvement strategies.

**Assumptions**

The following is assumed in this study:

1. The LPI survey provides valid and reliable data of leadership behaviors of elementary school principals, as perceived by respondents.

2. The TES survey provides valid and reliable data of teacher efficacy, as perceived by teachers.
3. Teachers and principals responded truthfully and impartially on the LPI, TES, demographic survey, and open-ended question.

4. The LPI is a valid instrument for measuring leadership behaviors.

5. The TES is a valid instrument for assessing teacher efficacy.

6. Respondents understood the intent and meaning of all questions.

**Limitations of the Study**

The following limitations exist in this study:

1. The study is limited to the perceptions of elementary teachers in the selected rural school districts.

2. The research is limited to teachers’ perceptions of selected leadership practices and teacher efficacy.

3. The only information gathered came from the LPI, TES, demographic survey, and open-ended question.

4. Present teachers who elected to participate in the study determined the number of respondents in the study.

5. Only teacher perceptions of leadership behaviors were reported in this study. Other factors could influence teacher efficacy but were not included.

6. The results of this study represent the districts and schools studied during the time of research.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The delimitations of this study are:

1. This study is limited to elementary schools in two rural school districts.

2. This study was conducted during the 2016-2017 school year.
3. The subjects in this study were teachers in public schools in the state of Nevada who were employed at least half-time in one of the two selected school districts.

4. Teachers in charter schools were not included in this study.

**Definitions**

*Agency* (also known as *agency dilemma* or theory of agency): When one person or entity is able to make decisions on behalf of, or that impact, another person or entity; agency is the intentional pursuit of courses of action (Bandura 1977, 1997).

*Analysis of Variance:* (ANOVA) is a statistical test of whether or not the means of several groups are equal (Crow, Davis, & Maxfield, 2011).

*Conventional Academic Press:* “Academic press focuses on the extent to which school members, including teachers and students, experience a normative emphasis on academic success and conformity to specific standards of achievement” (McDill, Natriello, & Pallas, 1986, p. 94). As a facet of the cultural system of a school, academic press is a school-wide, not individual, characteristic (Hoy, Sweetland, & Smith, 2002). In a school characterized by a high level of academic press, teachers and administrators set high but achievable goals, create an orderly and serious learning environment, and believe in students’ abilities (Hoy & Hannum, 1997).

*Human agency:* A belief that humans serve as entirely independent agents of their own actions (Bandura, 1989).

*Instructional Leadership:* The definition of instructional leadership has been expanded to include deeper involvement in the core business of schooling, which is teaching and learning (DuFour, 2002).

*Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI):* A questionnaire designed by Kouzes and Posner to measure school leadership.
**Locus of control:** The belief that one’s actions affect the outcomes (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998)

**Meaningful Significance:** For the purpose of this study, a Pearson’s correlation of 0.70 or greater was considered meaningful.

**Pearson Product-Moment Correlation:** is a measure of the strength of a linear association between two variables and is denoted by $r$.

**Perception:** In this study, perception refers to teachers’ views about their principals and work environment.

**Perceived Self-Efficacy:** Peoples’ beliefs about their capabilities to produce desired effects (Bandura, 1994).

**Personal Efficacy:** The confidence that teachers have adequate training and experience to develop approaches to overcome difficulties to student learning (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

**Principal:** The individual who is responsible for the planning and operation of a school as well as all aspects of education related to student achievement.

**Self-efficacy:** A person’s belief in his or her capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given outcome (Bandura, 1997).

**Significance as Related to this Study:** For the purpose of this study, an alpha score of less than or equal to 0.05 was considered significant.

**Social Cognitive Theory:** assumes that people are capable of human agency, or intentional pursuit of courses of action, and that such agency operates in a process called triadic reciprocal causation (Bandura, 1977, 1997).
Teacher: In this study, a teacher was an individual who was licensed to teach in the state of Nevada and had at least a half-time contract to teach in one of the two school districts selected for the study.

Teacher self-efficacy: This refers to the belief by individual teachers that he or she can help a student learn no matter the socioeconomic level of the student. It is an expansion of Bandura’s concept of each person’s beliefs in his or her own ability to effect positive results no matter what extrinsic problems the children face (Bandura, 1997).

Teaching Efficacy: The extent a teacher believes that student motivation and learning are in the hands of the teacher (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998).

Tukey’s test: compares the means of every treatment to the means of every other treatment; that is, it applies simultaneously to the set of all pairwise comparisons (Newton & Rudestam, 2013).

Variance: The percent of variance in one variable that can be attributed to another variable in a correlation by squaring the Pearson correlation or r value (Crow, Davis, & Maxfield, 2011).

Summary

Chapter One served as an introduction to this study, highlighting the need for research in this area while also providing essential background information. Chapter Two is a review of the literature as it pertains to leadership and teacher efficacy. Chapter Three describes the methodology, research design, and study participants as well as reviews the research questions. Instrumentation, data collection, and analysis are also discussed. Chapter Four presents the results of the conducted research as it relates to the six questions and open-ended query posed for study. Chapter Five is a discussion of the study’s significant findings and implications and offers recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study was to explore if relationships existed among teachers’ perceptions of principal leadership behaviors and teachers’ perceptions of their own efficacy. The Wallace Foundation (2012) contended that when a principal exhibits appropriate leadership behavior and serves as a motivational tool for others, teachers are empowered and the staff can unite to accomplish shared goals. This report extended the current body of knowledge on teacher efficacy by explaining ways in which principal behaviors might influence teachers’ efficacy beliefs.

Chapter Two summarizes current literature on principal leadership and teacher efficacy. Five important theories of leadership, including transformational and situational leadership, are discussed. The chapter concludes with a summary of Bandura’s Self-Efficacy Theory and a review of the impact of principal leadership behaviors.

Leadership Theories

While there have been numerous management and leadership theories to evolve in the past, five were reviewed for this study: Scientific Management Theory, Theory X and Theory Y, Transformational Leadership Theory, Transactional Leadership Theory, and Situational Leadership Theory. These theories were chosen because they represent the diverse spectrum of leadership theories that have been developed and utilized by management over the past century.

Scientific Management Theory

Scientific Management Theory came to fruition after Frederick Winslow Taylor realized that by studying the behaviors and actions of employees, management could improve worker efficiency and thus, increase productivity. Organizations that implemented this concept were
able to translate the skills of craftsmen to simple tasks that could be performed by unskilled workers.

Scientific Management Theory emphasizes the standardization of work through the division of labor, time and motion studies, work measurement, and piece-rate wages. Taylor (1912) argued that employees were motivated by money, so “a fair day’s pay for a fair day’s work” was exercised. When an employee did not accomplish enough in a day, he or she was paid less.

A basic assumption of Scientific Management Theory is that employees are not highly educated and are unable to do anything but the simplest of tasks. This contrasts with contemporary thinking, which assumes employees have knowledge of current job conditions and are able to positively contribute to the work environment. Despite these differing views regarding education and knowledge, Taylor (1912) supported worker development and argued that unskilled workers could be trained to perform necessary tasks. The most important object of both the employee and employer should be individual training and growth so that high-quality work could be performed (Taylor, 1912).

Scientific Management can be dehumanizing. Work is broken into smaller and smaller units in an effort to maximize efficiency without giving thought to the job satisfaction of workers. Employee morale may fall and existing conflicts between labor and management may be exacerbated when Scientific Management is used. Though the goal of this leadership style was to increase productivity, unintended consequences resulting in decreased productivity occurred. Furthermore, Scientific Management inadvertently reinforced the development of labor unions and their bargaining power in labor disagreements (Drury, Horace, & Bookwalter, 1915). Often the net benefit in productivity was quite small, even negative at times.
Regardless of the disadvantages, Taylor’s Scientific Management Theory was widely practiced. It encouraged some level of cooperation between employees and management; it ultimately evolved into the relationships seen between labor and management today. While Scientific Management Theory is not often used in the modern era, it did contribute significantly to the development of current management practices. Scientific Management Theory evolved over time and now greatly influences employee selection, personnel evaluation and training, as well as workplace efficiency.

Theory X and Theory Y

McGregor (1960) developed the theoretical basis for the Contrastive Theory X and Theory Y approaches to management. Theory X stresses the importance of strict supervision, external rewards, and penalties. It assumes that the average employee dislikes work and avoids it if possible. Therefore, most employees must be forced to work towards organizational objective under the threat of punishment. The presumption is that the average person prefers direction, seeks to avoid responsibility, and desires security above all else (Wallgren, 2013).

Theory X is most effective when the prevailing goal of management is the standardization of work tasks; it tends to benefit environments that utilize assembly lines or manual labor (Sager, 2008). Supervisors control the flow of work, which produces a more uniform product as well as more orderly work patterns. Theory X leadership allows an employee to concentrate on one aspect of the job and excel in that area. This approach assists the organization in producing quick results and a higher quality product, which in turn helps to meet objectives.

According to McGregor (1960), there are two ways of implementing Theory X: the hard approach and the soft approach. The hard approach hinges on close supervision, intimidation,
and imminent punishment for non-compliance. This approach can lead to a hostile and minimally cooperative employee, which may result in resentment towards leadership. The soft approach is characterized by compassion and fewer rules in anticipation of higher organizational morale and cooperative employees. However, there is danger in implementing a system that is too soft. It could result in entitled or low-output employees. McGregor (1960) argued that both ends of the spectrum are too extreme for efficient application and instead suggested finding middle ground between the two.

Theory Y differs greatly from Theory X because its focus is on motivating employees through job satisfaction and encouraging them to approach tasks without direct supervision. Employees use self-discipline to pursue organizational objectives and have no need for external control or threats of punishment. Employees often seek, and usually accept, responsibility within the organization (McGregor, 1960). Those who subscribe to Theory Y are committed to reaching goals set forth by management because successes in the workplace are linked to their personal achievement and function as rewards.

Avolio (2007) concluded that leaders who follow Theory Y are some of the most valuable assets to companies and truly drive the internal workings of corporations. This is because, in addition to the qualities noted above, they thrive on challenges and are constantly seeking to better themselves and their performance (Wallgren, 2013). Those who embody Theory Y genuinely enjoy what they do and work to better themselves without a direct "reward" in return (Aydin, 2012). Theory Y employees take full responsibility for their work and do not require constant supervision to create quality products (Sager, 2008). This may result in better employee – supervisor relationships and has the potential to create a healthy work atmosphere (Sager, 2008).
However, Theory Y seems to be the better approach when compared to Theory X; there are clear disadvantages. Having a more personal and individualistic feel is beneficial in some respects but leaves the potential for error in consistency and uniformity (Net-MBA, 2016). A workplace that subscribes to Theory Y may lack reliable rules and practices. This could result in an inconsistent product and would be detrimental to the strict guidelines and quality standards set forth by a company (Sorenson & Yeager, 2015).

Under Theory X assumptions, employees are primarily concerned with their personal goals, prefer to be directed, and avoid job responsibilities (Sorenson, 2015). Employees who work with managers that subscribe to Theory Y are internally motivated and may be regarded as some of the most important assets of an organization (Aydin, 2012). Though these two theories are different, McGregor (1960) suggested that Theory X and Theory Y were not on opposite ends of the spectrum, but rather represent two different constructs. A combination of both may be appropriate to achieve the most efficient environment (McGregor, 1960).

**Transformational Leadership Theory**

Bass (1985) described a transformational leader as someone who can develop creative solutions by involving subordinates and working collaboratively. Transformational leaders can sense when something is missing or needs modification and assume responsibility for changing and enhancing organizations (Bennis, 2001). As a result, transformational leaders identify needed changes and subsequently create and execute a vision alongside committed members of a group (Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Sorenson, 2015).

Transformational leadership can increase the motivation, morale, and job performance of followers through a variety of mechanisms. Leaders first get to know their supporters, learning about their strengths and weaknesses as well as their belief systems and needs. This is beneficial
as an individual can then be assigned to tasks that boost a sense of identity, which increases productivity and assists them in seeing how their work contributes to the bigger picture (Yukl, 2002). Transformational Leadership Theory suggests that followers may begin to believe that they can, and are, helping their organizations progress and grow. Motivation is developed because following a transformational leader and contributing to his or her vision allows supporters to feel challenged and find meaning in their work (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). For example, it is important for educational leaders to motivate their teachers and help them understand that what they do is vital to the success of their students. Sergiovanni (2001) explained the effect of transformational leadership on educators: “When teachers find their practice to be meaningful, teaching not only takes on special significance, but also provides teachers with feelings of intrinsic satisfaction” (p. 118).

Admiration, loyalty, respect, and trust are just a few of the emotions and thoughts employees might associate with transformational leadership. These feelings occur because the leader works hard, models the change, and offers followers something deeper than personal gains: an identity and purpose within an inspiring mission and vision (Sager, 2008). Transformational leaders change and motivate employees because they are charismatic, engage in intellectual stimulation, and treat each person as a unique and special individual (Bass, 1985). They encourage employees to challenge the status quo and improve their environments so they may be successful and feel fulfilled at the same time. Leaders also serve as role models and encourage transformational behavior (Hoy & Miskel, 1996); they inspire and assist others in finding projects that genuinely interest and excite them. This may result in supporters evolving into transformational leaders themselves (Burns, 1978).
Bass (1985) conducted research on transformational leadership and found subordinates’ evaluations of their managers could be grouped into four behaviors, known as the Four I’s: idealized influence (charismatic leadership), inspirational motivation (leadership), intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Although transformational and transactional (discussed below) leadership are on opposite ends of the spectrum (Burns, 1978), the Four I’s can be used to influence subordinates and convey organizational expectations (Bass, 1985).

It is important to note that it takes time before transformational leadership actually has an effect on employees. Additionally, it is not just the one trailblazer that makes an impact but the collective effort of everyone in the organization. Employees play an important role in the transformational process and must support one another to increase commitment and buy-in (Bass, 1985). Other factors such as organizational structure, ongoing change, leadership behaviors, work conditions as well as their perceptions about personal power must also be taken into account.

Schunk (1981) discovered that such positive feelings can be found in environments other than the workplace. Elementary school children who were given effort attributional feedback (e.g., “You’ve been working hard.”) experienced greater self-efficacy and this, at least in part, was responsible for their increased ability in solving subtraction problems.

**Transactional Leadership Theory**

Transactional Theory was developed by Max Weber in 1947 and involves appealing to employees’ self-interests to direct and motivate them. An individual becomes a leader because of his or her position and holds significant power due to formal authority. Transactional leaders threaten punishment or promise rewards to persuade employees to follow instructions and reach goals. Many times, “transactional leaders approach followers with an eye to exchanging one
thing for another: jobs for votes, or subsidies for campaign contributions. Such transactions comprise the bulk of the relationships among leaders and followers, especially in groups, legislatures, and parties” (Burns, 1978, p. 23). In general, individuals who subscribe to this style of leadership want to personally benefit from relationships or exchanges and assume others desire the same.

Anticipated performance and outcomes are clearly communicated by transactional leaders to subordinates. Transactional Leadership Theory suggests that supporters agree with and accept expected behavior requirements because praise and recognition will follow if duties and assignments are carried out in accordance with the supervisors’ demands (Podsakoff, Todor, & Skov, 1982). Research has shown that followers of this style of leadership are dedicated, satisfied, and feel connected to their organizations (Goodwin, Wofford, & Whittington, 2001). Subordinates experience increased levels of confidence and motivation (Leithwood, 1994).

Burns (1978) explained the concept of transactional leaders. Transactional leaders have rigid expectations of their employees, believing their purpose is to do as they are told. Supervisors expect subordinates to understand their place and not question authority. A transactional leader is averse to ideas that do not subscribe to traditional organizational structures. This reliance on a single approach, as well as an unwillingness to discuss or consider other options, limits creativity and flexibility in the workplace.

When a project turns out poorly, the transactional leader does not accept responsibility. This is because once a task is assigned, successful completion is the responsibility of the employee. Subordinates are expected to be fully accountable for problems that arise. Even though an issue may be the fault of a supervisor, transactional leaders quickly place the blame on employees (Lai, 2011). As a result, subordinates may become unhappy and disgruntled.
Employee dissatisfaction is unlikely to be a concern so long as tasks are completed because transactional leaders are rarely worried about feelings.

Supervisors and subordinates may be put at odds with one another when transactional leadership is utilized. Trust is not characteristic of these relationships because leaders are often present while employees work so they can ensure tasks are executed properly. Unfortunately, this may lead to employees not feeling inclined to work unless their supervisor is present.

Overall, the transactional style of leadership has the potential to create conflict between supervisors and employees. Transactional leadership is not all negative, but it is certainly deficient in some areas. This leadership style can and may lead to the development of an environment that is exclusively concerned with position, power, and politics.

**Situational Leadership Theory**

Hersey and Blanchard (1982) hypothesized that leaders’ behaviors are determined by the situations they find themselves addressing. Formally referred to as Situational Leadership, this theory is “based on the amount of directional and the socio-emotional support a leader must provide given the situation and the level of maturity of the followers or group in relationship to a specific task” (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982, p. 150). Essentially, one must consider current circumstances as well as employees’ ability levels and then adjust his or her leadership style to effectively resolve issues. Those who practice situational leadership disagree with the “one-size-fits-all” approach. As Hersey (1985) stated: “For every job, there is an appropriate tool” (p. 22). That is, for every situation there is an appropriate leadership response.

Situational leaders realize that it is their responsibility to adjust and modify their management methods based on employees’ skills and needs. Due to the fact that organizations and the workers within them change, as do employee wants and capabilities, the approaches
taken by a leader will vary accordingly. Hersey and Blanchard (1982) developed an extensive model to guide leadership responses based on employee’s skills and development level.

Leadership that is based on employees’ needs creates a motivating and positive environment. When personnel receive the coaching and support needed to perform tasks, the result is an increase in morale and feelings of success. Employees, who have their needs met and are motivated by leaders, will not only be more productive, but choose to continue working within an organization because conditions are favorable (Yukl, 1989). Since the recruitment, hiring, and training of individuals is a costly endeavor, it is in the leaders’ best interests to take personnel needs and feedback into consideration.

Since the nature of situational leadership is to modify organizational approaches based on employees needs and circumstances, leadership styles frequently change. With so much variability, results may be perceived as erratic and confusing. When a leader works with individuals who are motivated to meet managerial expectations, consistency is crucial (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). Without it, employees will be unsure of what is required or even what they should expect from leaders. Situational leadership can be perceived as inauthentic and may eventually cause a leader to lose credibility. This inconsistency and reduction in trust has the potential to create an environment of fear and uncertainty (Hersey, 1985). While responding to unique situations in different ways can be an appropriate and intelligent response, it may not be the best long-term solution as the leader can be perceived as unreliable.

Effective leadership is vital to the success of an organization. Leaders delegate tasks, motivate employees to meet specific goals, and communicate organizational values. Their management approach and use of a particular leadership style is dependent upon their personality as well as employees’ ability levels. Additionally, situations themselves can greatly influence
leadership styles and overall effectiveness (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). However, limiting leadership research to just situations is too narrow and counterproductive as more than just situations impact a leaders’ behavior (Clark, Clark, & Campbell, 1993).

**Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Model**

Kouzes and Posner developed a theory of leadership that reflects many of the other theories. Kouzes and Posner have been writing about leadership for nearly three decades and are considered two of the leading experts on the topic. They conducted research which involved interviewing individuals and gathering information regarding leadership qualities. Kouzes and Posner (2007) found that transformational leaders’ behaviors could be classified into five groups: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart. Their survey, the Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI), was created to assess individuals’ leadership abilities in each of these five areas. Kouzes and Posner (2002) argued that leadership involves action; therefore, the leadership practices categories always begin with a verb. Following is a summary of each of the five behaviors.

**Model the Way**

Effective leaders model the way by ensuring that the beliefs and messages they communicate align with their actions. Gayle Hamilton, a director with Pacific Gas & Electric Company, said the following about putting this leadership behavior into practice on the job: “I would never ask anyone to do anything I was unwilling to do first” (Kouzes & Posner, 2002, p. 14). To truly be transformational in the workplace, leaders must be examples to others.

**Inspire a Shared Vision**

Excitement about the future is created when leaders internally construct and then express a vision for their followers and then share it with them. It is important that leaders first visualize
how they want an organization to look and subsequently communicate that message to others (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). This ensures subordinates have clear understandings of their roles, which leads to increases in enthusiasm and other favorable shifts in behavior. Individuals support changes, as well as endure hardships and make sacrifices, if they believe in a leader’s vision and the positive impact it will have on an organization (Yukl, 2002). Deal and Peterson (2000) elaborated on this leadership practice and its potential impact in an educational environment: “Developing a shared vision for a school can motivate students, staff, and community. It is not simply for the leader; it is for the common good” (p. 205). Once an organizational vision has been conveyed and is understood, subordinates are much more likely to cooperate with leaders in working towards accomplishing it.

**Challenge the Process**

Kouzes and Posner (2002) cited contesting current practices and procedures as the third behavior of effective leaders. Those who aspire to make things happen or change behaviors must analyze the current situation and then initiate processes that will improve conditions and lead to positive outcomes (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Leaders who challenge processes in the workplace listen to the thoughts and concerns of customers, clients, vendors, and employees. Though challenging and changing processes involves the risk of failure, leaders may ultimately benefit from the experience, regardless of the outcome (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Followers who witness their leader challenging the process could inspire the employees and lead to positive changes in the work environment.

**Enable Others to Act**

Although successful leadership is largely dependent upon the individual leader being followed, it is important to recognize that it takes multiple people, sometimes large groups, to
achieve lofty goals and greatness. Kouzes and Posner (2002) discovered just how important working as a team and supporting others was during their research, noting that participants used the term we more often than I. Hoyle’s (2002) research supported Kouzes and Posner’s; it revealed that effective leaders focus on teamwork, trust, and enabling others. When leaders seek to engage and empower, their followers gain confidence and feel competent in their skills and abilities, which leads them to success.

**Encourage the Heart**

While monetary rewards can be utilized, expressing compassion and concern for others generally is more meaningful than possessions or financial bonuses. Encouraging the heart involves showing appreciation for followers, creating a stimulating environment, and celebrating often. Ceremonies that genuinely honor individuals and commemorate organizations reaching significant milestones help to build a strong sense of collective identity and group spirit that is sustainable (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Authenticity is important when engaging in this behavior because peoples’ feelings are involved. Leaders must ensure their encouragement and praise is sincere so followers’ confidence levels are not adversely affected (Evans, 2009). Evans (2009) stated that “… the more believable the source, the more probable efficacy judgments are likely to change.” (p. 70)

While Kouzes and Posners’ (2002) leadership model focuses on the five behaviors, they did note an additional concept for leaders to consider: that leadership is a relationship. Leaders must seek to understand and connect with their supporters. Kouzes and Posner (2002) summed it up in the following way:

We’re even more convinced of this [relationship piece] today than we were twenty years ago. *Success* in leading will be *wholly dependent upon the capacity to build and sustain*
those human relationships that enable people to get extraordinary things done on a
regular basis. (italics added, p. 21)

Followers need to have a working and positive relationship with their leader. If rapport is not
established, there may be a lack of trust and individuals may not feel connected to the person
leading nor to the organization of which they are a part. There is no benefit to absent or negative
relationships in the workplace or within groups because individuals either feel distant and
disengaged or discouraged and pessimistic (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). In negative relationships,
success is not achieved and the environment is undesirable. Leaders can become
transformational and develop positive relationships by communicating, being honest, and
actively listening to others (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

**Self-Efficacy Theory**

Self-efficacy is a person’s belief that he or she can perform a behavior which yields a
wanted outcome at a specific level (Bandura, 1997). Individuals’ perceptions regarding their
efficacy greatly impact how they approach goals and carry out tasks (Bandura, 1977). People
with high levels of self-efficacy are more likely to believe that they can master challenging
problems and recover quickly from disappointments or setbacks. Individuals with low self-
efficacy are generally less confident and do not believe they can perform well, which leads to the
avoidance of challenging tasks.

An individual’s beliefs regarding the execution of a specific behavior shape his or her actions
and influence outcomes. To summarize, Pajares (1997) argued that self-efficacy expectations are
impacted by the following:
Variations in magnitude of motivation exist because different individuals perceive tasks to be ordered by three levels of difficulty: easy, moderate, or hard. Perceptions of task difficulty contribute to one’s efficacy beliefs.

Differences in generality occur because some experiences may lead to a sense of efficacy that extends to other situations while others are limited to the task at hand.

The strength of the efficacy belief determines how long individuals persist or if they are able to overcome obstacles.

These three elements affect how self-efficacy beliefs translate into action. Bandura’s (1986) Triadic Reciprocal Causation Theory argues that self-efficacy impacts behaviors; it also explains the influence of the environment and behavior responses of others. Three determinants; cognition, behavior, and the environment, interact with one another and impact peoples’ actions (Wood & Bandura, 1989).

According to Bandura (1982), self-efficacy is a future-oriented construct that identifies how successful individuals perceive that they will behave when dealing with a situation or completing a task. Persistence, the willingness to put forth effort, and degree to which someone exerts control over his or her life are all affected by an individual’s self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1986, 1993, 1997). Bandura (1986, 1997) revealed mastery experience, social modeling, improving physical and emotional states, and verbal persuasion could enhance self-efficacy.

Mastery Experience

When an individual completes a task successfully, self-efficacy is enhanced. Tschannen-Moran, Hoy and Hoy (1998) stated that “[t]he perception that a performance has been successful raises efficacy beliefs, which contributes to the expectation that performance will be proficient in
the future” (p. 211). Mastery experiences are satisfying and may help individuals accomplish more complex objectives and skills in the future. If a success is attributed to internal or controllable causes such as ability or effort, then self-efficacy is enhanced. However, if success is attributed to luck or the intervention of others, then self-efficacy may not be strengthened (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy & Hoy, 1998). When a teacher successfully promotes student learning, the teacher has had a mastery experience.

Social Modeling

Bandura (1995) explained: “The impact of modeling on beliefs of personal efficacy is strongly influenced by perceived similarity to the models. The greater the assumed similarity the more persuasive are the models’ successes and failures” (p. 3). The greater the emotional attachment or commonalities between the two people, the more likely the behavior would be learned and subsequently reenacted by the viewer. Thus, it is critical for principals to build positive connections with their teachers and to be exemplary models who think carefully about the impact of their actions and words. To assist teachers in succeeding in the classroom, principals can model behaviors, such as reflection, effective communication, and cooperation. Teachers can also benefit from the knowledge of other accomplished individuals in the field or professionals who specialize in their areas of expertise. Professional development workshops and conferences provide teachers with the opportunity to learn and expand their content and pedagogical knowledge (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Improving Physical and Emotional States

According to Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998), “[t]he level of arousal, either of anxiety or excitement, adds to the feeling of mastery or incompetence” (p. 211). Before an individual attempts an unfamiliar and new task, he or she may take the time to assess his or her physical and
emotional wellness; it is ideal to be rested and relaxed. A person that is not calm or comfortable will be stressed and impatient, making it more likely, that he or she will not complete a desired behavior. Bandura (1986) explained the more a person is relaxed and rested the more likely he or she is to attain the desired behavior.

A principal can assist teachers in raising their efficacy levels through deliberate actions and behaviors. For example, when school leaders evaluate teachers, they should provide constructive and timely feedback, so the teachers know where they are excelling and what areas need improvement (Tcschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Principals that praise proficiencies and emphasize the development of skills rather than a lack thereof may help educators improve the perceptions they hold about themselves. Perceived and real issues that may mitigate success should be worked through together in a supportive manner.

It is important for individuals to reflect internally and assess the state they are in prior to taking on a new challenge. School principals can assist in improving their teachers’ physical and emotional states by offering support and wellness resources as well as building a culture of celebration. When efforts are genuinely and sincerely recognized and appreciated, a strong sense of shared identity is created (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) and educators may experience increased levels of self-efficacy.

**Verbal Persuasion**

Verbal persuasion is a communication technique used to provide someone with the encouragement needed to complete an assignment or task. These conversations, generally known as pep-talks could be between fellow teachers, principals, or other educators (Tcschannen-Moran et al., 1998). As discussed, the expression of honest gratitude has the power to improve an individual’s feelings and thus, his or her ability to accomplish a goal. When the
practice of honest gratitude is combined with positive and sincere reinforcement, trust and empowerment result, leading to enhanced self-efficacy.

Kouzes and Posner (2002) indicated that effective leaders proudly discuss teamwork, trust, and empowerment. In a school, the principal can enhance self-efficacy by using verbal persuasion opportunities to encourage the staff to move in the desired direction for self and school improvement.

**Teachers and Self-Efficacy**

A high level of self-efficacy has been linked to improved performance, which affects how individuals think and behave when faced with difficult tasks (Bandura, 1994). One’s efficacy beliefs influence thought patterns, emotions, and behaviors used to achieve goals (Bandura, 1994). High levels of self-efficacy help individuals persist when facing adversity and assist them in maintaining control over difficult circumstances. Self-Efficacy Theory implies that teachers who believe in their abilities and think they are capable are more likely to persist, perform better, and take on behaviors that result in student accomplishments.

Early research found significant correlations between teacher self-efficacy and student achievement (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Moore & Esselman, 1994; Ross, 1992, 1994; Ross & Cousins, 1993; Ross, Cousins and Gadalla, 1996). Tschannen-Moran and McMaster (2009) had similar results and stated that “[t]eachers’ self-efficacy has…been related to student outcomes such as students’ self-efficacy beliefs and student engagement, motivation, and achievement” (p. 229). Other studies have confirmed this relationship and specifically highlight the connection between student achievement and efficacy beliefs. Teachers’ judgments about their own efficacy as instructors, teachers’ judgments about the collective efficacy of their school, and principals’ sense of efficacy have been linked to student achievement (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998,
Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2002; Goddard, LoGerfo, & Hoy, 2004). These connections may exist because teachers’ self-efficacy influence their thoughts and feelings, which in turn impacts their behaviors and how they act and teach. Educators’ perceptions about themselves also affect the amount of energy that they put into achieving specific goals and tasks, as well as their level of persistence when dealing with challenges and failures (Bandura, 1986, 1997; Gibson & Dembo, 1984; Looney, 2004).

In a study of sixth grade students, Pajares (1996) reported that self-efficacy mediated the role of skill training and attributional feedback, and had a direct effect on the performance of division problems of sixth graders who had learned helplessness. Pajares (1996) argued that “students with similar previous performance attainments and cognitive skills may differ in subsequent performance as a result of differing self-efficacy perceptions” (p. 20). Pajares (1996) suggested that these perceptions mediate between previous achievements and academic success. He further argued that as a consequence, such successes are usually better predicted by self-efficacy than by the prior achievements.

Various researchers have demonstrated that high teacher self-efficacy beliefs are positively correlated with a number of effective instructor behaviors. Educators who believe in themselves and their abilities tend to be creative in the classroom, incorporating technology (Paraskeva, Bouta, & Papagianni, 2008) as well as other innovative instructional methods into their teaching. Teachers are also more willing to work with students who are culturally and ability-diverse (Tucker, Porter, Reinke, Herman, Ivery, Mack, & Jackson, 2005) and remain committed to learners and their achievement despite dealing with challenges (Ware & Kitsantas, 2007).
Although teacher self-efficacy has been heavily researched and a reliable correlation established between it and student achievement, debates and disagreements still occur. A controversy developed concerning two diverse conceptual strands that have informed teacher-efficacy research. Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) suggested that one aspect of self-efficacy centered on Rotter’s (1966) Locus of Control Theory. Rotter’s Locus of Control Theory “conceptualizing teacher efficacy as teachers’ beliefs that factors under their control ultimately have greater impact on the results of teaching than do factors in the environment or in the student—factors beyond the influence of teachers” (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998, p. 206). When this philosophy was used as the foundation of teacher efficacy, teacher efficacy became “the extent to which teachers believed that they could control the reinforcement of their actions” (Goddard et al., 2002, p. 481). Student motivation and performance are regarded as important causes of teacher reinforcement. Teachers who believe that they can control these outcomes are regarded as having high levels of efficacy (Goddard, et al., 2002).

In contrast, Bandura (1997) concluded that teacher efficacy is a form of self-efficacy where individuals mentally process and develop beliefs about their ability to complete tasks at specific levels. Bandura (1986) argued that the two approaches, locus of control and self-efficacy, needed to remain separated. It is possible to believe an action will produce certain results (locus of control), but if an individual does not think he or she is capable of performing the behavior, he or she may not even attempt it. For example, an educator may confidently believe technology-based lessons will engage learners and lead to increases in students’ performance. However, if that teacher thinks he or she is not capable of creating such an educational experience, Bandura’s theory suggests he or she are not likely to try. Bandura (1997)
argued that the two approaches have minimal or no relationship to each other and that teacher-self efficacy is a good predictor of behavior, not locus of control.

Tschannen-Moran et al. (1998) subsequently suggested a combined approach using both methods to predict teacher self-efficacy and behaviors more accurately. These researchers acknowledged Bandura’s (1986, 1997) four self-efficacy enhancers (mastery experience, social modeling, improved physical and emotional states, and verbal persuasion) and encouraged their use to increase teacher self-efficacy levels. Elevated educator efficacy will in turn help teachers to feel confident in their ability to control outcomes (locus of control) which may lead to engaging in behaviors that are more desirable and can lead to increased student achievements.

The Impact of Principal Leadership

School leadership is important as it impacts all areas of a school environment and the individuals that occupy it. Research has shown there are connections between leadership behaviors and student achievement (Sergiovanni, 2001; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004; Robinson, Llloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Ovando & Cavazos, 2004) as well as school success and principal and staff relationships (Price, 2012). For principals to be effective and positively influence schools, teachers, and students, their leadership characteristics, subordinates’ behaviors, and the organization itself must be considered.

In 2012, the Wallace Foundation released a report that detailed five actions principals should practice to be effective leaders and improve student achievement. These include:

1. Shaping a vision of academic success for all students, one based on high standards.
2. Creating a climate hospitable to education in order that safety, a cooperative spirit, and other foundations of fruitful interaction prevail.
3. Cultivating leadership in others so that teachers and other adults assume their part in realizing the school vision.

4. Improving instruction to enable teachers to teach at their best and students to learn at their utmost.

5. Managing people, data and processes to foster school improvement. (The Wallace Foundation, 2012, p. 4)

Principals must execute each of the five responsibilities simultaneously and continually to positively impact student success.

In a meta-analysis of 81 studies, Cotton (2003) identified similar principal leadership behaviors that led to effective schools. The first group of actions align with those outlined by the Wallace Foundation and include creating a vision as well as supportive learning environments, setting high student expectations, and ensuring school safety. These are the most basic practices principals should perform to lead successful schools. Cotton (2003) also identified personal traits principals must possess. Principals need to direct attention inward and self-reflect to confirm their personal actions are positively affecting their schools. Leaders must possess excellent communication skills and be responsible and persistent in their pursuit of organizational success.

Classroom instruction is improved and student achievement increased when principals provide quality leadership to teachers (Blasé & Blasé, 2000; Cotton, 2003). School leaders need to evaluate teachers often (Cotton, 2003) and assist them in engaging in critical reflection (Blasé & Blasé, 2000). Principals can support educators by giving instructional feedback (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008) as well as advice, modeling best practices, and praising as appropriate (Blasé & Blasé, 2000). These behaviors support building goals and an effective learning environment.
Teachers benefit from supervisory advice, and may receive encouraging comments about their teaching, which in turn may boost their self-confidence (Cotton, 2003). Effective principals also encourage their teachers to participate in professional development (Blasé & Blasé, 2000; Soehner & Ryan, 2011). Professional development should focus on topics such as teaching and learning, collaboration, academic coaching, school reform, and current research (Blasé & Blasé, 2000). When principals apply these concepts, teachers’ perceptions of their work environments improve, which is linked to increases in student achievement (Blasé & Blasé, 2000).

Brown, Finch, MacGregor, and Watson (2012) asked teachers from eight Missouri high schools what they believed were the most important leadership characteristics of a principal. The researchers found that educators wanted school leaders to be open communicators and engage in transformational, participatory, and shared leadership practices. However, they found that leadership in the larger schools was often regarded as dictatorial, top-down, and overly bureaucratic. The investigators concluded that principals have the ability to turn their schools into successful schools and should take their teachers’ needs and perceptions seriously. Educators in their study wanted to be treated with respect and involved in decisions that concerned them and their students.

Another meta-analysis, compiled by Leithwood, Lewis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) identified essential behaviors that a leader must exhibit to be successful. Setting the course for the organization and his or her vision accounted for the highest percentage of a leader’s impact (Leithwood et al., 2004). This leadership behavior assists employees in understanding the trajectory of their organization. Leaders should communicate effectively and frequently, set high expectations, regularly assess progress, help individuals understand their workplace, and goals so the organizational vision becomes clear and everyone can contribute to its manifestation.
Discussions about the future may lead to another successful behavior: initiating change to reshape the organization (Leithwood et al., 2004). Leithwood et al. (2004) explained that during a restructuring process, a leader could take the opportunity to propose ideas that could become part of the direction of the organization.

The final successful leadership behavior presented by Leithwood et al. (2004) was the development of employees. As was discussed in previous research (Blasé & Blasé, 2000; Brown et al., 2012; Cotton, 2003; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008) workers’ (i.e. teachers) needs, wants, and perceptions must be recognized and addressed to have effective organizations (i.e. schools). Leithwood et al. (2004) recommended that leaders model best practices, work to develop common values, personalize support, and intellectually motivate supporters. The growth of individuals in an organization is crucial to maintaining a positive work environment and improving overall performance, so leaders must show the importance of these actions.

Principal leadership has been reported to impact overall school success. However, each organization is unique and the leadership style used at one school may not produce positive results at another. Recent research has focused on identifying what the most promising leadership models have in common that may assist principals in transforming their schools (Bierly & Smith, 2016). The most effective leadership styles may create and strengthen leadership capacity, improve teaching and learning, form teams with a shared mission, empower others, and improve leadership models themselves (Bierly & Smith, 2016). Regardless of what style a leader chooses to embrace, he or she should try to incorporate the above principles to increase chances of success.
Summary

This chapter included a review of the literature focused on leadership practices, perceptions of those leadership practices, and teacher efficacy. Three chapters follow this conclusion. Chapter Three describes the methodology, research design, and study participants as well as reviews the research questions. Instrumentation, data collection, and analysis are also discussed. Chapter Four presents the results of the conducted research as it relates to the six questions and open-ended query posed for study. Chapter Five is a discussion of the study’s significant findings and implications and offers recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to explore if significant relationships existed among teachers’ perceptions about principal leadership practices and teachers’ perceptions of their own efficacy in selected rural public elementary schools. The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and Teacher Efficacy Scale short form (TES) were used to measure teachers’ perceptions. This study only included teachers from two rural school districts.

This chapter restates the research questions then describes the design, schools and study participants, as well as the instruments used. A description of analysis process is presented.

Research Questions

Four research questions guided this study:

1. Were there significant relationships among the Leadership Practices Inventory subscales? Pearson Product Moment correlations were computed across the five subscales.

2. Were there significant relationships between the two Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales? Pearson Product Moment correlations were computed across the two subscales.

3. Were there significant relationships among the Leadership Practices Inventory and Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales? Pearson Product Moment correlations were computed.

4. When groups were established using selected demographic variables, were there significant differences among groups based on the Leadership Practices Inventory and Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales? Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to determine possible significances differences.
One open-ended question designed to help develop a broad understanding of teachers’ perceptions of principal leadership was also included in this study. This question was: Describe how you are involved in school decision-making.

**Research Design**

Three surveys were used to collect data at two rural school districts. Teachers were asked to complete two Likert-type surveys and a demographic survey, which includes an open-ended question.

**School District Characteristics**

At the time of the study, one school district served seven communities and had approximately 9,900 students who were educated in 20 different schools. There were three comprehensive high schools, six multi-level schools, three middle schools, and seven elementary schools in the district. According to the State Report Card (2014), there were approximately 620 teachers in the district. In the other school district, there was one comprehensive high school, one multi-level school, two middle schools, and three elementary schools in the district. Approximately 3,500 students lived in six communities and attended 14 different schools in the school district. There were approximately 210 teachers in the district (State Report Card, 2014).

**Study Participants**

Study participants in both districts were licensed teachers who worked in elementary schools with a minimum of a half-time contract. There are several other multi-level schools in outlying areas of the counties; that were not considered. The roles of the teachers in these schools is often significantly different from the roles traditional elementary schools. Of the total teaching staff in one of the districts, 195 elementary school teachers were included in this study, which is approximately 67% of the teachers in the district. Of the total teaching staff in the other
district, 74 elementary school teachers were included in this study, which is approximately 64% of the teachers in the district.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used to collect data for this study. The Leadership Profile Inventory (Appendix A) and Teacher Efficacy Scale (short form) (Appendix B) were selected because previous research found them to be reliable and valid instruments for studies of this design (Calik, Sezgin, Kavgaci, & Kilinc, 2012; Dessault, Payette, & Leroux, 2008; Fancera & Bliss 2011; Ross & Gray, 2006). A demographic survey (Appendix C) was used to gather specific information on the teachers. Permission was requested and given by the authors of the LPI (Appendix D) and TES (Appendix E) survey forms.

Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)

The LPI (Kouzes & Posner, 2002) measures “five leadership practices that are common to personal-best leadership experiences” (Kouzes & Posner, 2011, p. 73). The LPI survey is designed for the observer (teacher) to evaluate the leadership practices as defined by Kouzes and Posner (2002). The LPI provided data regarding teacher perceptions of principal leadership practices. The observer form of the LPI consists of 30 items which Kouzes and Posner (2002) divided into five factors, or practices, of leadership: (1) Model the Way, (2) Inspire a Shared Vision, (3) Challenge the Process, (4) Enable Others to Act, and (5) Encouraging the Heart. The instrument has demonstrated acceptable internal reliability; coefficients for the LPI-Observer range from 0.88 and 0.92 and (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Internal reliabilities for the LPI, as measured by Cronbach’s Alpha, are strong for all five subscales. Table 1 summarizes the reliability coefficients for the 5 subscales of the LPI.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPI* Subscales</th>
<th>Observers (All)</th>
<th>Items on Subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note*. Copyright © 2003 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved. Used with permission.

The 30 questions on the LPI were grouped into the five leadership subscales. Table 2 lists the subscales as well as their corresponding questions on the LPI Survey. Kouzes and Posner (2003) argued that to be valid an instrument must produce meaningful information for the user. Validity refers to how well an instrument measures what it is purported to measure. The LPI has produced valid results for the five subscales: Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart, from an ongoing study that includes responses from over 1.4 million observers from the online version of the LPI from 2005 through the end of 2011 (Kouzes & Posner, 2011). The LPI has demonstrated valid results when used on a wide range of individuals, occupations, and across different demographics.
Table 2
LPI Leadership Traits and Related Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPI Leadership Trait</th>
<th>Related Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES)**

The Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) Short Form instrument was used to assess teacher efficacy. Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) created the 10-item TES Short Form instrument, basing it on the original 21-item collective teacher efficacy instrument. The Teacher Efficacy long form has high internal reliability (alpha = 0.94) and, when matched with the Teacher Efficacy Scale (TES) Short Form, it is valid (Goddard, 2001). The 10-item short form has high internal consistency (alpha = 0.90). Though there is a considerable length difference between the two instruments, they remain highly correlated (r = 0.983) (Goddard, 2002). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2001) found the reliability to be high between the long and short forms. The TES (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993) is a reliable instrument for measuring the efficacy of licensed teachers.

The TES (short form) has produced valid results for the two subscales: Teacher- Efficacy, and Personal-Efficacy (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). The TES (short form) has demonstrated valid results when used on a wide range of individuals, occupations, and across different demographics (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). The mean (7.1) of the long form is calculated from the 24 items on the form; the mean (7.1) of the short form is calculated from the 10 items on the form. This is reported below in Table 3.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TES-Long Form</th>
<th>TES-Short Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both the 24-item and 10-item Teach Efficacy Scales are appropriate to use in this research as they are valid and reliable for studying the construct of teacher efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). However, the short form was used as it has been demonstrated to be nearly as reliable as the longer form, and it takes less time for participants (teachers) to complete.

Table 4 lists the subscales of the TES (short form) as well as their related questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TES Subscales and Related Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy Traits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Efficacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection**

Permission was received to survey school district # 1 (Appendix F) and school district # 2 (Appendix G). This study was conducted under the auspices of the University Institutional Review Board (IRB) (Appendix H). Following IRB approval, district superintendents were contacted to obtain permission to conduct this research in their districts (Appendices F and G). After superintendent permission was given, school principals were contacted by telephone to set a date and time for data collection. In addition to describing the study, principals were supplied with copies of the surveys and IRB notice of approval (Appendix H). To introduce the
researcher to the teachers, principals read from a provided script (Appendix I) during a school faculty meeting. To help alleviate the possibility of intimidation and increase valid responses, principals left the room during survey administration.

As soon as the principal left the room, the researcher read a script (Appendix J) to teacher participants and then left the room as well. Teachers were instructed to not place their names or any personal identifiers on surveys; this helped to ensure participant confidentiality. Administration of the LPI, TES, demographic survey, and open-ended question took approximately 15 to 20 minutes

Data Analysis

The data from the LPI, TES, demographic survey, and open-ended question were entered into an Excel spreadsheet then an IBM SPSS (version 24) program was used to perform the calculations for the statistical portion of this study. Qualitative data gathered from the open-ended question was incorporated at a later time into the analysis.

Individual responses were examined to identify surveys with incomplete data. Surveys that were missing no more than two responses had item specific school averages inserted for omitted data point(s). Surveys were excluded if three or more responses were missing, in agreement with Newton and Rudestam (2013).

Teacher perceptions of leadership traits were assessed through the administration of the LPI. There are 10 possible responses (1 through 10) for each of the questions on the LPI. Each of the five subscales were scored individually, and an average was computed for each subscale. Teacher efficacy was assessed through the administration of the TES. Responses were grouped into two subscales and each subscale means was computed to assess the perceptions of teachers. Scores for both subscales followed a Likert-type format with Teacher Efficacy ranging from (1)
strongly agree to (6) strongly disagree and Personal Efficacy the reverse with (1) strongly disagree to (6) strongly agree. For the Personal Efficacy subscales, all values were reversed scored (e.g. 1=6, 2=5, 3=4, 4=3, 5=2, 6=1). The average score of each subscale fell between 1 and 6.

Standard descriptive statistics were calculated using IBM SPSS analytic software. Means, standard deviations, and ranges were computed for each of the subscales on the TES and LPI surveys to determine teacher perceptions. The SPSS program performed calculations to determine what relationships, if any, existed among teachers’ perceptions about principal leadership practices and teachers’ perceptions of their own efficacy.

Pearson’s correlations were computed to answer research questions one, two, and three: questions concerned with determining if relationships existed among and between the LPI and TES subscales. For the purpose of this study, the five LPI subscale scores as well as the two TES subscale scores were considered continuous variables, which have an infinite number of values between two data points.

Pearson’s correlation coefficient measures the relationship between two variables and has a range of -1.00 to +1.00. A value of +1.00 implies that a linear equation describes the relationship between two variables perfectly and that there is a direct relationship because as one values increases, so does the other. When there is a value of -1.00, a negative and inverse relationship exists since one variable decreases as the other increases. No correlation exists when the coefficient is 0.00. A Pearson’s correlation coefficient is considered weak when it falls in the 0.00 to +/-0.20 range, moderate when in the +/-0.30 to +/-0.60 range, and strong when in the +/-0.80 to +/-1.00 range (Salkind, 2011).
For the demographic question, responses were grouped based on the following demographic variables: Teacher’s Age, Number of Years Teaching, Number of Years Teaching Under the Current Principal, and Teacher’s Educational Level. A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was calculated for each of the independent demographic variables (Teacher’s Age, Number of Years Teaching, and Teacher’s Educational Level) using the dependent variables (Personal Efficacy, Teaching Efficacy, Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart). A MANOVA was used because it calculates a holistic difference in the groups. A MANOVA was computed for each grouping and then used to compare each group mean to the TES and LPI subscales. If the MANOVA was significant at p < 0.05, then ANOVAs, which compare the means of groups, were computed for each subscale. An ANOVA was conducted for each subscale when more than two groups were involved. If the ANOVA produced a significant difference, a Tukey post-hoc analysis was used to determine where the differences were between the groups.

One open-ended question, designed to help develop a broad understanding of teachers’ perceptions, at a global level, of their involvement in school decision, making was included in this study. This question was: Describe how you are involved in school decision-making. To analyze this question, the responses were transcribed verbatim. Any response that identify a district, school, or individual was redacted. The responses were read several times to get an understanding of the feeling of the teachers and to develop major themes from their responses.

The responses to the open-ended question were analyzed and provided beneficial supplemental information by supporting teacher responses to the LPI survey. Teacher responses were categorized based on similarity and reported in the data results. This information provided a more enhanced understanding of the responses from the LPI and the TES surveys.
The procedures, as described in *Advanced and Multivariate Statistical Methods* 3rd by Mertler and Vannatta (2005), were used to interpret the results of the SPSS output. The SPSS programs were used to compute a multivariate of analysis (MANOVA) with the appropriate data. The SPSS program for MANOVA produces several different statistical results.

One of the results of MANOVA is Box’s Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices. Box’s test determines if the observed covariance of the dependent variables are equal across groups. If Box’s test is not significant, then the Wilks’ Lambda is the appropriate test. Wilks’ Lambda determined if the groups are equal or not equal based on a combination of the seven dependent variables (Personal Efficacy, Teaching Efficacy, Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart). If the Wilks’ Lambda was not significant, then the groups were judged to be statistically the same. If Wilks’ Lambda is significant, then the groups were judged to be different and some type of post hoc analysis was required. As the first post hoc analysis, a series of Analysis of Variances (ANOVA) was computed to determine which dependent variables contributed to the significant MANOVA. Thus, for significant MANOVAs, seven ANOVAs were computed to identify which dependent variables contributed to the significant MANOVA. For each ANOVA, the computer program produced a level of significance for the dependent variable and other related statistics. The results were evaluated based on the predetermined alpha of 0.05. For all of the significant ANOVAs, a Tukey HSD was computed if the number of groups was greater than two. If only two groups were considered, then the means were inspected to assess the differences. The Tukey post hoc procedures produced a pair-wise comparison to determine which group scored differently than the others.
If Box’s Test was significant, the appropriate test is Pillai’s Trace (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). If Pillai’s Trace was used, the above described procedures for post hoc analysis were followed. That is, the subsequent post hoc procedures are the same for Pillai’s Trace as those for Wilks’ Lambda. The results were evaluated based on the predetermined alpha of 0.05.

**Summary**

Chapter Three described the various elements of this study, including the design, participants, and instruments used. Data collection as well as an analysis of that information is provided. Chapter Four presents the results of this study as they relate to the four research questions and single open-ended query. Chapter Five discusses the study’s significant findings as well as implications and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER FOUR
Results and Findings

The results of this study are reported in this chapter as they relate to the research questions. The purpose of this study was to explore if significant relationships existed among teachers’ perceptions about principal leadership practices and teachers’ perceptions of their own efficacy in selected rural public elementary schools. The Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI) and Teacher Efficacy Scale short form (TES) were used to measure teachers’ perceptions.

The first section of this chapter presents the analysis of the data as it relates to the research questions. The final section of this chapter provides a brief summary of the results.

Data Collected for the Study

The data were collected, cleaned, and analyzed using the procedures previously described in Chapter Three. There was a potential of 247 teachers participating in the study; 224 of all possible teachers elected to participate. Of these, three teachers elected to not complete the surveys. This resulted in 221 teachers who participated in the study. This is a 91.5% teacher response rate. A total of 162 teachers responded to the open-ended question. This resulted in a 73.3% participation rate for the open-ended question.

Descriptive Statistics

Standard descriptive statistics were calculated using IBM SPSS analytic software. Means, standard deviations, and ranges were computed for each of the subscales on the TES and LPI surveys to provide descriptive statistics. For the TES, the means were 19.81 for Teaching Efficacy and 25.24 for Personal Efficacy and respective standard deviations were 4.6. and 3.63. The possible range for both subscales was 25, and the actual range was 21.00 for Personal Efficacy and 22.00 for Teaching Efficacy. For the LPI, the means ranged from 41.57 (Inspire a Shared Vision and Challenge the Process) to 46.36 (Enable Others to Act), and the standard
deviations ranged from 10.78 (Model the Way) to 12.05 (Inspire a Shared Vision). The possible range for the LPI subscales was 54.00, and the actual ranges varied from 47.00 (Model the Way) to 52.00 (Inspire a Shared Vision and Encourage the Heart). These statistics are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5.

Descriptive statistics for Teacher Efficacy Scale and Leadership Practices Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD*</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Efficacy</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Efficacy</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>42.29</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>46.36</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>42.66</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard Deviation

The test developers reported Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients for the TES Short Form as 0.77 for Personal Efficacy and 0.72 for Teaching Efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998). The Cronbach’s Alpha was computed for both of the TES subscales for this study. The Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient was 0.76 for Personal Efficacy and 0.74 for Teaching Efficacy. The subscale reliabilities are similar to those for reported by the test developers for the TES. The TES reliabilities for this study are summarized in Table 6.
Table 6
Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient Reliability for TES Short Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TES Subscale</th>
<th>Observers (All)**</th>
<th>This Study*</th>
<th>Items on Subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Efficacy</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Efficacy</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* n = 221

Kouzes and Posner (2003) reported that the Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients for the LPI ranged from 0.88 to 0.92. The Cronbach’s Alpha was computed for each of the LPI subscales. The computed values for this study for Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients ranged from 0.877 to 0.917. The subscale reliabilities for this study are similar to those reported by Kouzes and Posner (2003) for the LPI. The LPI reliabilities for this study are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7
Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient Reliability for Each Subscale of the LPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPI Practice</th>
<th>Observers (All)*</th>
<th>This Study</th>
<th>Items on Subscale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 221

Summary of Demographic Variables.

The demographic survey had four questions that requested information about the Teacher’s Age, Number of Years Teaching, Years Teaching with the Current Principal, and the Teacher’s Education Level. The Teacher’s Age was listed in three categories: 20 to 30 Years, 31 to 40 Years, and 41 + Years. The Number of Years Teaching was listed in four categories: 1 to 5
Years, 6 to 10 Years, 11 to 20 Years, and 21 + Years. The Teacher’s Educational Level was reported in four groups: Bachelor’s, Some Graduate Course Work, Master’s, and Master’s Plus. One teacher who responded to the TES and LPI surveys did not respond to the demographic survey. Of the teachers who participated in the demographic survey, one teacher did not indicate the number of years teaching.

Initially, the demographic of Teacher’s Age had three categories: 20 to 30 years, 31 to 40 years, and 41+ years. Category 20 to 30 years had 27 respondents (11.8%), category 30 to 40 years had 60 respondents (27.3%), and category 41+ years had 133 respondents (60.9%). For the purpose of analysis, the categories of 20 to 30 years and 31 to 40 years were combined so that the groups were closer in the number of participants. This resulted in two Teacher’s Age categories with frequencies of \( n = 87 \) (39.5%) for ages 20 to 40 years, and \( n = 133 \) (60.5%) for ages 41+ years. One person did not respond. Thus, for this variable for analysis the \( n \) was 220.

For the variable, Number of Years Teaching, initially, there were four categories: 1 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and 21+ years. Category 1 to 5 years had 53 respondents (24.2%), category 6 to 10 years had 33 respondents (15.1%), category 11 to 20 years had 58 respondents (26.5%), and category 21+ years had 75 respondents (34.2%). For the purpose of analysis, the categories of 1 to 5 years and 6 to 10 years were combined so that the groups were closer in the number of participants. This resulted in three Number of Years Teaching categories with frequencies of \( n = 86 \) (39.3%) for 1 to 10 years, \( n = 58 \) (26.5%) for 11 to 20 years, and \( n = 75 \) (34.2%) for 21+ years. Two teachers did not respond to this item. Thus, for this variable \( n \) was 219.

Initially, the variable, Number of Years Teaching with Current Principal, had three categories: 1 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years, and 11+ years. Category 1 to 5 years had 220 respondents
(100%). Category 6 to 10 years had 0 respondents (0%). Category 11+ years had 0 respondents (0%). Thus, for this variable n was 220. That is, all respondents were in the 1 to 5 Years category.

Initially, Teacher’s Educational Level had four categories: Bachelor’s, Some Graduate Course Work, Master’s, and Master’s Plus. Category Bachelor’s had 78 respondents (35.5%), category Some Graduate Course Work had 63 respondents (28.6%), category Master’s had 42 respondents (19.1%), and category Master’s Plus had 37 respondents (16.8%). One teacher did not respond thus, for this variable the n was 220. For the purpose of analysis, the categories of Master’s and Master’s Plus were combined so that the groups were closer in the number of participants. This resulted in three Teacher’s Educational Level categories with respective frequencies of n = 78 (35.5%) for Bachelors, n = 63 (28.6%) for Some Graduate Work, and n = 79 (35.9%) for Master’s and Master’s Plus, respectively.

**Results by Research Question.**

This section provides a summary of results related to the research questions. Pearson’s product moment correlations and MANOVAs were used to evaluate the data.

The four research questions that guided this study were:

1. Were there significant relationships among the Leadership Practices Inventory subscales?

   Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed across the five subscales.

2. Were there significant relationships between the two Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales?

   Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed across the two subscales.
3. Were there significant relationships among the Leadership Practices Inventory and Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales? Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were computed.

4. When groups were established using selected demographic variables, were there significant differences among groups based on the Leadership Practices Inventory and Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales? Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to determine significances.

**Research Question 1**

Were there significant relationships among the five LPI subscales? To address research question 1, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to determine the relationships among the LPI subscales. There was a strong, positive correlation between Model the Way and Inspire a Shared Vision, which was statistically significant ($r = 0.818$, $n = 221$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, Model the Way accounted for 66.9% of variance of Inspire a Shared Vision. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between Model the Way and Challenge the Process. There was a strong, positive correlation between Model the Way and Challenge the Process, which was statistically significant ($r = 0.843$, $n = 221$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, Model the Way accounted for 71.1% of variance of Challenge the Process. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between Model the Way and Enable Others to Act. There was a strong, positive correlation between Model the Way and Enable Others to Act, which was statistically significant ($r = 0.758$, $n = 221$, $p < 0.001$). Thus, Model the Way accounted for 57.5% of variance of Enable Others to Act. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between Model the Way and Encourage the Heart. There was a
strong, positive correlation between Model the Way and Encourage the Hart, which was statistically significant \( (r = 0.770, \ n = 221, \ p < 0.001) \). Thus, Model the Way accounted for 59.3% of variance of Encourage the Heart.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between Inspire a Shared Vision and Challenge the Process. There was a strong, positive correlation between Inspire a Shared Vision and Challenge the Process, which was statistically significant \( (r = 0.898, \ n = 221, \ p < 0.001) \). Thus, Inspire a Shared Vision accounted for 80.6% of variance of Challenge the Process. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between Inspire a Shared Vision and Enable Others to Act. There was a positive correlation between Inspire a Shared Vision and Enable Others to Act, which was statistically significant \( (r = 0.679, \ n = 221, \ p < 0.001) \). Thus, Inspire a Shared Vision accounted for 46.1% of variance of Enable Others to Act. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between Inspire a Shared Vision and Encourage the Heart. There was a positive correlation between Inspire a Shared Vision and Encourage the Heart, which was statistically significant \( (r = 0.683, \ n = 221, \ p < 0.001) \). Thus, Inspire a Shared Vison accounted for 46.6% of variance of Encourage the Heart.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between Challenge the Process and Enable Others to Act. There was a positive correlation between Challenge the Process and Enable Others to Act, which was statistically significant \( (r = 0.706, \ n = 221, \ p < 0.001) \). Thus, Challenge the Heart accounted for 49.8% of variance of Enable Others to Act. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between Challenge the Process and Encourage the Heart. There was a positive correlation between Challenge the Process and Encourage the Heart, which
was statistically significant \( r = 0.716, n = 221, p < 0.001 \). Thus, Challenge the Process accounted for 51.3% of variance of Encourage the Heart.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship between Enable the Process and Encourage the Heart. There was a strong, positive correlation between Enable the Process and Encourage the Heart, which was statistically significant \( r = 0.706, n = 221, p < 0.001 \). Thus, Enable the Process accounted for 49.8% of variance of Encourage the Heart.

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients are summarized in Table 8. In summary, all correlations among the LPI subscales were positive and significant. This finding is parallel to the results published by the developers of the survey. The variance accounted for by these correlations ranged from 46.1% to 80.6%.
Table 8
Summary of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlations for the five LPI subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model the Way</th>
<th>Inspire a Shared Vision</th>
<th>Challenge the Process</th>
<th>Enable Others to Act</th>
<th>Encourage the Heart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.818**</td>
<td>0.843**</td>
<td>0.758**</td>
<td>0.770**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.898**</td>
<td>0.679**</td>
<td>0.683**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.706**</td>
<td>0.716**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.706**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
n = 221
Research Question 2

Was there a significant relationship between the two TES subscales? To address research question 2, a Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated to determine the relationship between Personal Efficacy and Teaching Efficacy. There was a positive correlation between Personal Efficacy and Teaching Efficacy subscales; this value was statistically significant (r = 0.278, n = 221, p < 0.001). Thus, a 7.73% variance was accounted for between the TES subscales. Significance was predetermined to be at an alpha of 0.05.

Research Question 3

Were there significant relationships among the LPI and TES subscales? To address research question 3, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine if there were relationships among the TES and the LPI subscales. The calculations revealed that the TES subscales and the LPI subscales were positively and negatively correlated at very low levels; that is, the results were not statistically significant. There were not empirical relationships among the subscales of the LPI and the TES. The results of the Pearson product-moment correlations computations are summarized in Table 9.

Table 9  
Summary of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlations for the TES and LPI Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Efficacy</th>
<th>Teaching Efficacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vison</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 221
Research Question 4

When groups were established using selected demographic variables, were there significant differences among groups based on the LPI and TES subscales? To address research question 4, a MANOVA was calculated for each of the independent demographic variables (Teacher’s Age, Number of Years Teaching, Years with Current Principal, and Teacher’s Educational Level) using the dependent variables (Personal Efficacy, Teaching Efficacy, Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart). A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used because it calculates a holistic difference among the groups.

Independent variable of teacher’s age. When groups were established using the independent demographic variable of Teacher’s Age, were there significant differences among groups based on the LPI and TES subscales? To address this question, a MANOVA was calculated to determine if there was a difference between groups based on the seven dependent variables. Groups were established using the independent variable Teacher’s Age. For the purpose of analysis, the categories of 20 to 30 and 31 to 40 were combined so that the groups were closer in the number of participants. This resulted in two Teacher’s Age categories of n = 87 (39.5%) for teachers’ ages 20 to 40, and n = 133 (60.5%) for teachers’ ages 40+. There was one person who did not respond. Thus, for this variable, the analysis used an n of 220. The Box’s test indicated that equal variances could be assumed (F (28, 115465.621) = 1.386, p < 0.084). Therefore, Wilks’ Lambda was the appropriate test. Wilks’ Lambda (F (7.000, 212.00) = 1.216, p < 0.295) indicated that the groups were not significantly different based on the seven dependent variables. The group means are summarized in Table 10.
Table 10
Summary of Group Means for Independent Variable Teacher’s Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>25.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 + years</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>24.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>19.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 + years</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 + years</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>43.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>42.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 + years</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>41.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>41.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 + years</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>41.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>45.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 + years</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>46.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40 years</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 + years</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>35.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 220

**Independent variable of number of years teaching.** When groups were established, using the demographic variable of Number of Years Teaching; were there significant differences among groups based on the LPI and TES subscales? To address this research question, a MANOVA was calculated to determine if there were differences among the groups based on the seven dependent variables. Groups were established using the independent variable Number of Years Teaching. The Box’s test indicated that equal variances could not be assumed (F (56.00, 109563.429) = 1.396, p < 0.027); therefore, the appropriate test was Pillai’s Trace (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). Pillai’s Traces was calculated (F (14.000, 420.000) = 1.930, p < 0.022). The groups were judged to be different based on the seven dependent variables. That is, the results indicated that for the groups established, at least one the dependent variable(s) was different across the groups.

An ANOVA was computed for each dependent variable to analyze differences among the groups based on the seven dependent variables. The ANOVA results indicated that significant
differences existed for two dependent variables. For Personal Efficacy (F (2, 216) = 3.269, p < 0.040) and Inspire a Shared Vision (F (2, 216) = 3.52 p < 0.031), the groups were significantly different. The ANOVA results for the other five dependent variables indicated that the groups were not significantly different. Therefore, the groups established by the independent variable of Number of Years Teaching were different based on the dependent variables of Personal Efficacy and Inspire a Shared Vision. For these two significant ANOVAs, a Tukey post-hoc analysis was calculated to determine which sets of pair-wise means were different. As discussed above, there were three groups for the independent variable Number of Years Teaching: 1 to 10 Years, 11 to 20 Years, and 21+ Years.

The results of the Tukey analysis for Personal Efficacy indicated that the teachers who had taught for 1 to 10 years were different from teachers who had taught for 21 + years. The teachers teaching for 1 to 10 years were the same as teachers who had been teaching for 11 to 20 years. Teachers who have been teaching for 11 to 20 years were the same as teachers who have been teaching for 21+ years. The Tukey analysis for Personal Efficacy revealed that teachers who had been teaching for 21 + years (M = 25.96) rated themselves higher than teachers who had been teaching for 1 to 10 years (M = 24.51) rated themselves.

The results of the Tukey analysis for Inspire a Shared Vision indicated that the teachers who had been teaching for 1 to 10 years rated their principals differently than teachers who had been teaching for 11 to 20 years rated their principals. Teachers who had been teaching for 1 to 10 years rated their principals the same as teachers who had been teaching for 21 + years rated their principals. Teachers who had been teaching for 11 to 20 years rated their principals the same as teachers who had been teaching for 21+ years rated their principals.
The Tukey analysis for Inspire a Shared Vision revealed that the teachers’ mean who had been teaching for 1 to 10 years (M = 44.29) was higher than teachers’ mean who had been teaching for 11 to 20 years (M = 39.53). Thus, teachers who had been teaching for 1 to 10 years rated their principals higher on Inspire a Shared Vision than did teachers who had been teaching for 11 to 20 years. The group means and standard deviations for dependent variables grouped by Number of Years Teaching are summarized in Table 11.
Table 11
Summary of Group Means and Standard Deviations for Independent Variable Number of Years Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Efficacy*</td>
<td>1 to 10 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24.51**</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25.29</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.96**</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Efficacy</td>
<td>1 to 10 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20.29</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>1 to 10 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44.42</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>11.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42.09</td>
<td>10.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision*</td>
<td>1 to 10 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44.29**</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39.53**</td>
<td>11.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40.37</td>
<td>11.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>1 to 10 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43.48</td>
<td>11.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>39.90</td>
<td>11.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40.89</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>1 to 10 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td>11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44.43</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>45.64</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>1 to 10 years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44.50</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 to 20 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21+ years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40.39</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 219
*Indicates a significant ANOVA.
** Indicates a significant Tukey.

Independent variable of years with current principal. When groups were established using the demographic variable of Years with Current Principal, were there significant differences among groups based on the LPI and TES subscales? To address this research question, a MANOVA calculation was planned to determine if there were differences among the groups based on the seven dependent variables. However, when groups were established using the independent variable Years with Current Principal, all of the teachers indicated category 1 on the survey. The category 1 to 5 had 220 respondents (100%). Category 6 to 10 had 0
respondents (0%). Category 11+ had 0 respondents (0%). A MANOVA cannot be calculated with only one group. Therefore, this research question was not addressed; the MANOVA could not be conducted because there is only one group. All of the principals in the study group had been in their current position for five or less years.

**Independent variable of teacher’s educational level.** When groups were established using the demographic variable of Number of Years Teaching, are there significant differences among groups based on the LPI and TES subscales? To address this research question, a MANOVA was calculated to determine if there if there were differences among the groups based on the seven dependent variables. Groups were established using the independent variable Teacher’s Educational Level. The Box’s test ($F (56, 123799.385) = 1.405, p < 0.024$) indicated that equal variances could not be assumed. Therefore, Pillai’s Trace was the appropriate statistic (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005). Pillai’s Trace was computed ($F (14.000, 424.000) = 2.012, p < 0.016$). This result indicated that based on the groups established, at least one the dependent variable(s) was different across the groups.

An ANOVA was computed for each dependent variable to identify possible differences among the groups based on the seven dependent variables. The ANOVA tests indicated that two dependent variables were significant. For Personal Efficacy ($F (2, 217) = 5.073, p < 0.007$) and Teaching Efficacy ($F (2, 217) = 4.684, p < 0.010$), groups were significantly different. The ANOVAs for other five dependent variables were not significantly different. Therefore, the groups established by the independent variable of Number of Years Teaching were different based on the dependent variables Personal Efficacy and Teaching Efficacy.

For the two significant ANOVAs, a Tukey post-hoc analysis was calculated to determine which sets of pair-wise means were different. There were three groups for the independent
variable Teacher’s Educational Level: Bachelors, Some Graduate Course Work, and Master’s and Master’s Plus. The results of the Tukey analysis for Personal Efficacy indicated that the teachers with a Bachelors were different from teachers with a Master’s and a Master’s Plus. The teachers with a Bachelors were the same as teachers with Some Graduate Course Work. Teachers who have Some Graduate Course Work were the same as teachers who have a Master’s and a Master’s Plus.

The Tukey analysis for Personal Efficacy revealed that teachers who had a Master’s and Master’s Plus (M = 26.16) rated themselves higher than did the teachers who had a Bachelors (M = 24.36). Thus, teachers who had a Master’s and a Master’s Plus scored themselves higher than teachers who had a Bachelors on the dependent variable Personal Efficacy. The group means and standard deviations for Personal Efficacy are summarized in Table 12.

The results of the Tukey analysis for Teaching Efficacy indicated that the teachers with a Bachelors were different from teachers who had Some Graduate Course Work, and teachers who had a Bachelors were different from teachers who had a Master’s and a Master’s Plus. Teachers who had Some Graduate Course Work were the same as teachers who had a Master’s and a Master’s Plus.

The analysis for Teaching Efficacy revealed that the mean for teachers who had Some Graduate Course Work (M = 20.73) was higher than teachers who had a Bachelors (M = 18.55). The analysis for Teaching Efficacy revealed that mean for teachers who had a Master’s and Master’s Plus (M = 20.33) was higher than teachers who had a Bachelors (M = 18.55). Thus, teachers who had Some Graduate Course Work and teachers with a Master’s and Master’s Plus rated themselves higher on Teacher Efficacy than teachers who had a Bachelors rated themselves
on the dependent variable Teaching Efficacy. The group means and standard deviations for Teacher’s Educational Level are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12
The Group Means and Standard Deviations for Group for Teacher’s Educational Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Efficacy</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24.36**</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Graduate Work</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.13**</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s and Master’s Plus</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Efficacy</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18.55**</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Graduate Work</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>20.73**</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s and Master’s Plus</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.33**</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model the Way</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42.49</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Graduate Work</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41.48</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s and Master’s Plus</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspire a Shared Vision</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>10.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Graduate Work</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40.87</td>
<td>13.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s and Master’s Plus</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>41.22</td>
<td>12.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge the Process</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42.53</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Graduate Work</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>41.56</td>
<td>12.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s and Master’s Plus</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>40.86</td>
<td>11.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enable Others to Act</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Graduate Work</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45.22</td>
<td>12.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s and Master’s Plus</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47.08</td>
<td>10.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage the Heart</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some Graduate Work</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42.48</td>
<td>12.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s and Master’s Plus</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>43.13</td>
<td>11.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates a significant ANOVA.
**Indicates significant Tukey.
Additional Analysis

An inspection of the descriptive statistics and the above results suggested that additional analysis could be meaningful. Because the TES and LPI did not have strong correlations, it became important to compare the means of the study to the normative means of the TES and LPI as reported by the authors of the survey instruments. For this study, the mean for Personal Efficacy ($M = 25.24$) was higher than the mean ($M = 23.38$) reported by the authors of the TES. For this study, the mean for Teaching Efficacy ($M = 19.81$) was slightly higher than the mean ($M = 19.12$) reported by the author of the TES (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). The study means for the TES were higher than the corresponding TES reported normative means. The study means for the LPI were lower than the corresponding reported LPI means. To compare the means, a t-test was computed for each of the study subscale means and the appropriate normative (LPI, 2011) mean. The results of the subscale t-tests were all significant. The study means, standard deviation, normative means, and t-tests for this study are summarized in Table 13. In addition, a graphic representation of the normative means and the Study means is presented in Figure 1.
Table 13
Summary of Study Means, Study Standard Deviations, Normative Means, and t – test for subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Study Mean</th>
<th>Study SD*</th>
<th>Norn Mean</th>
<th>t-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Efficacy</td>
<td>25.24</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>t (1, 220) = 7.600, p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Efficacy</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>t (1, 220) = 2.200, p &lt; 0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>42.29</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>46.89</td>
<td>t (1, 220) = -6.340, p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>43.83</td>
<td>t (1, 220) = -2.790 p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>41.57</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>44.90</td>
<td>t (1, 220) = -4.470, p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>46.36</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>49.39</td>
<td>t (1, 220) = -3.980, p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>42.66</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>46.02</td>
<td>t (1, 220) = -4.78, p &lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Standard deviation
The means for this study, and the means reported by the authors of the TES and the LPI are summarized in Figure 1.

**Open-Ended Question**

One open-ended question, designed to help develop a broad understanding of teachers’ perceptions, at a global level, of their involvement in school decision making, was included in this study. This question was: Describe how you are involved in school decision-making. To analyze this question, the responses were transcribed verbatim. Any response that identify a district, school, or individual was redacted. The responses were read several times to get an understanding of the feeling of the teachers and to develop major themes from their responses.

General grouping evolved from the responses. First, when the responses were considered in a holistic manner, five general groupings were identified. These groupings were No Response, Committee Level Involvement, Classroom Decision Making Only, Attendance at
Meetings, No Involvement, and No Response. Based on this review, frequencies for the groupings were calculated. There was a total of 221 respondents to the surveys.

The frequencies based on the holistic review provide general information. Sixty-two (62) teachers indicated No response to the open-ended question; this represented 28.1% of the participants. Ninety-five (95) teachers indicated Committee Level Involvement, which represented 43.0% of the respondents. Thirteen (13) teachers were grouped into Classroom Decision Making Only, which represented 5.9% of the respondents. Thirty-five (35) teachers indicated that their involvement in decision-making was Attendance at Meetings, which represented 15.8% of the respondents. Sixteen (16) teachers indicated that they had No Involvement in school decision making which represented 7.2% of the respondents. Frequencies based on the global classification of the open-ended question responses are summarized in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Level Involvement</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Decision Making Only</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance at Meetings</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Involvement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that No Response (62 / 28.1%), and No Involvement (n=16 / 7.2%) comprised 35.3% of the respondents. If the teachers who indicated they only attended meetings (n=35 / 15.8%) is included with the other two groupings the resulting 51.1% of the teachers were not involved or marginally involved in the school decision making.

Many of the responses provided information related to multiple types of involvement in school level decision making. Therefore, the next step in the analysis of the data was to carefully
read the responses to consider such information. Responses to the open-ended question fell into three general categories: high, medium, and low involvement. For many of the respondents, there were clear indications of being involved in school decision-making. Twenty-eight (28) respondents described being on some type of Leadership or Lighthouse team; another eight (8) indicated they were on the School Improvement Team. Seven respondents referenced being on a team related to Curriculum and Instruction at the school. Another thirty-one (31) respondents described being either on a Professional Learning Community (PLC) or grade-level team; these statements suggested that their input at that level influenced school-wide decision-making.

Thirty-nine (39) respondents mentioned specific teams (e.g., Reading by Grade 3, Response to Intervention, Parent Teacher Association, etc.). Twenty-seven (27) respondents indicated that they served on “several” or “various” committees or teams, but did not provide specific names. Another four (4) indicated that their “voices mattered” at the school.

Twenty-eight (28) responses provided indications of being involved in school decision-making, but there was no indication that the respondents actually were involved on a team. Rather, there was a sense that it was possible to provide input, which some respondents did when they felt it important, but they were not active in actual decision-making. Thirteen (13) respondents specifically mentioned staff meetings as their decision-making involvement. Three (3) indicated that they completed surveys when asked.

There were a number of respondents who indicated that they were not involved in school-wide decision-making. Ten (10) respondents indicated that they were focused on their students and classrooms, rather than school-level decision-making. For eleven (11) of the respondents, there was a feeling that the principal/school leader made decisions and was not interested in input, or had a select group of people who were part of the decision-making. There was a sense
of feeling insignificant and sometimes fear of speaking in front of the principal and/or rest of the
group. Eleven (11) indicated they simply were not involved. One respondent indicated that
despite input, follow-through on decisions was a challenge.

Summary

The results of the analysis of the data indicated that for the group of teachers in this
study, there was a positive, strong relationship between the two subscales of the Teacher Self-
Efficacy Scale. In addition, there were positive pair-wise correlations among all of the subscales
of the Leadership Practices Inventory. However, there were not significant correlations between
the subscales of the TES and the subscales of the LPI.

The results of testing if the independent variables had an effect on the dependent
variables was mixed. For Teacher’s Age, there was not a difference on the dependent variables.
Number of Years Teaching did have an effect on the dependent variables Personal Efficacy and
Inspire a Shared Vision. Years with the current principal only had one group and could not be
compared; all of the teachers indicated that they had worked with the current principal for five or
less years. The teachers Level of Education did have an effect on the dependent variables
Personal Efficacy and Teaching Efficacy.

The results of the open-ended question seemed to indicate that those who were involved
in school decision making were primarily involved by participating in committees or teams.
Some of the teachers indicated that they were on multiple committees or teams. A number of the
teachers indicated that they were only involved in their classroom or not involved at all.

This chapter presented the results of this study as they relate to the four research
questions and single open-ended query. Chapter Five discusses the study’s significant findings
as well as implications and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Implications for Practitioners, Recommendations

The purpose of this study was to explore if there were significant relationships among teachers’ perceptions about principal leadership practices, and teacher’s perceptions of their own efficacy. The study was conducted in two rural school districts in a western state. The study focused on elementary teachers in the two districts. Appointments were made and schedules were coordinated with each of the principals so the survey instruments could be administered in person by the researcher. This chapter provides a Summary of Key Findings related to the four research questions, Discussion, Recommendations for Future Research, Implications for Practitioners, and Conclusions.

Summary of the Findings

A total of 221 usable responses provided the data for this study. A summary of findings from the analysis of the data is presented in the order of the research questions.

Research Question 1. Are there relationships among responses for the Leadership Practices Inventory subscales? Using Pearson Product-Moment correlations, strong, positive correlations were established on a pair-wise basis for all the subscales of LPI (Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart). All pair-wise correlations among the subscales were positive and statistically significant. The percentage of variance accounted for by these correlations ranged from 46.2% to 79.9%. These values were consistent to corresponding values published by the test developers.

Research Question 2. Is there a relationship between the two Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales? Using Pearson Product-Moment correlations, a positive correlation was established between Personal Efficacy and Teaching Efficacy subscales; however, this value only accounted approximately eight percent of the variance between the two variables (r = 0.278, n = 221, p <
Thus, although the correlation was statistically significant, the value was not judged to be very meaningful.

Research Question 3. Are there relationships among the Leadership Practices Inventory and Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales? To evaluate this research question, Pearson Product-Moment correlations were computed. Of the five correlations among the Personal Efficacy subscale and the five LPI subscales four were positively correlated, and one was negatively correlated. However, these correlations were not statistically significant. Of the five correlations among the Teaching Efficacy subscale and the five LPI subscales one was positively correlated, and four were negatively correlated. These correlations were not statistically significant. Thus, the empirical data from this study indicated that the teacher self-efficacy measures and the LPI subscales were not correlated.

Research Question 4. When groups are established using selected demographic variables, are there significant differences among groups based on the Leadership Practices Inventory and Teacher Efficacy Scale subscales? To address research question 4, a MANOVA was calculated for each of the independent demographic variables (Teacher’s Age, Number of Years Teaching, Years with Current Principal, and Teacher’s Educational Level) using the dependent variables (Personal Efficacy, Teaching Efficacy, Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act, and Encourage the Heart).

For the independent variable Teacher’s Age, there were no significant differences in the established groups. For the independent variable, Years with the Current Principal, the question could not be evaluated because there was only one group; that is, all teachers indicated that they had been with their current principal five years or less. Indeed, all of the principals in this study had been at their current school for less than three years.
Seven elementary schools were involved in this study. Subsequent investigation revealed that all of the corresponding principals associated with this study had prior teaching experience. Their years of teaching ranged from 2 years to 17 years. Five of the principals had prior experience as vice-principals in other districts before employment in their current district. Before assuming their principalship, four principals had vice-principal experience within their current district. That is, some had moved from a vice principal position outside their district to a vice principal position within their current district. One principal had 13 years of experience outside of the current district and four years within the district; however, this principal had been in her current principalship for only six months at the time of the study. These principals have prior administrative experience; however, their tenure in their respective current principalships was six months to three years. It is noteworthy that all of the principals had less than three years of experience as principal in their current principalship at the time of the study. Relatively “new” principals may not have been able to develop support and/or support systems that related to Personal Efficacy of their teachers. Bandura (1986, 1997) indicated mastery experience, social modeling, improving physical and emotional states, and verbal persuasion could enhance self-efficacy. However, because all of the principals were relatively new to their positions, they may not have had sufficient time to impact the areas identified by Bandura.

For the independent variable Number of Years Teaching, the groups were significantly different based on two independent variables: Personal Efficacy and Inspire a Shared Vision. For the subscale Personal Efficacy, the difference was between the groups of teachers who had been teaching for 1 to 10 years and those teaching for 21+ years. The teachers, who had been teaching for 21+ years, rated their Personal Efficacy higher than did those who had been teaching for 1 to 10 years. This may be because of the confidence, skills, and experiences that the
teachers with greater longevity had developed over time. These skills and experiences most likely do not relate to the tenure of their current principals. The educational job experiences for the principals is summarized in Table 15.

Table 15
Summary of Educational Job Experience for Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS TEACHING</th>
<th>PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INSIDE DISTRICT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANGE (YRS)</td>
<td>2 - 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Range of experience in current position

For the subscale Inspire a Shared Vision, the difference was between the group of teachers who had been teaching for 1 to 10 years and those teaching for 11 to 20 years. The teachers, who had been teaching for 1 to 10 years rated the principal higher than did those who had been teaching for 11 to 20 years. This finding could be associated with several things. For example, the teachers with greater longevity may have had several different principals and made comparisons across those principals. They could have compared the different principals with the current principal. The less experienced teachers may have found interactions with their principals more supportive than did teachers with more longevity. Leithwood et al. (2004) recommended that leaders model best practices, work to develop common values, personalize support, and intellectually motivate people. The growth of individuals in an organization is crucial to maintaining a positive work environment and improving overall performance, so leaders must know the importance of these actions. Principals, with limited experience may not have developed or may not have been aware of the leadership traits, practices, and supports that help teachers with longevity continue to grow and develop. The teachers with 1 to 10 years’ experience may have had their current principal as their only supervisor, and did not have any
one to compare with the current principal. The teachers with 1 to 10 years of experience maybe
more focused on their performance aligned with the opinions of the principal than the teachers
who had been teaching for 11 to 20 years.

For the independent variable Teacher’s Educational Level, three groups were established
and two significant differences were identified. There were differences in the dependent variable
of Personal Efficacy and Teaching Efficacy. For the subscale Personal Efficacy, differences
were identified between the groups of teachers who had a Bachelors and teachers with Some
Graduate Course Work. The teachers who had Some Graduate Course Work rated themselves
higher than the teachers who had a Bachelors. This may be as a result of the experience and
confidence the teachers with more education and training have. The teachers with a Bachelors
may be just learning the craft of teaching and not feel as comfortable as those with more
education and training.

For the subscale Teaching Efficacy, differences were identified between the groups of
teachers who had a Bachelors and teachers who had Some Graduate Course Work and teachers
who had a Master’s and Master’s Plus. The teachers who had Some Graduate Course Work and
teachers with a Master’s and Master’s Plus rated themselves higher than those with a Bachelors
rated themselves. Again, this may be because of the experiences and confidence the teachers
with more education and training had than those with a Bachelors. The teachers with a
Bachelors may be just learning the craft of teaching and not feel as comfortable teaching as those
with more education and training. In summary, teachers with more experience rated themselves
higher than did the teachers with the less experience on both the efficacy subscales.

To develop a better understanding of the results, the observed means for each subscale,
for this study, were compared to the corresponding normative means as reported by the
developers of the survey instruments. To compare the means, a t-test was computed for each pairwise set of means: that is, each of the study means was compared to the appropriate normative mean. The results of the subscale t-tests were all significant.

For the TES subscales, the study means were higher than the reported normative means. The difference between the means of the study TES and the normative TES means were very small. However, the results indicate that for the study population, both TES subscales were above the normative values as reported by the test developers.

The study means for the LPI were significantly lower than corresponding normative means reported by the survey developers. These values were consistently lower for all subscales. That is, the teachers’ perceptions of their principals’ leadership behaviors were significantly lower than the corresponding norms reported by the test developers. Again, the relatively low rating of the principals by their teachers may have been associated with the fact that all principals had less than three years in their current positions. Indeed, the actual range of tenure of the principals in their current positions was from six months to three years.

The Open-Ended Question asked teachers: Describe how you are involved in school decision-making. The responses for this question fell into somewhat of a continuum; that is, the responses could be grouped into high, medium, and low levels of involvement in decision making at their respective schools. The majority of the teachers who responded to the question indicated that they were involved by serving on committees or by working on teams. It was interesting to note that the teachers who indicated No Involvement, or No Response, or Only Attend Meetings comprised over half of the teachers. This may indicate that they did not believe their input was considered, or of value. Alternatively, it may relate to their interest in their classrooms or minimal interest in the school decision making. Many of the teachers indicated
they were on several committees or teams. In summary, one group of teachers indicated a high level of involvement, another group indicated a medium level of involvement, and the third group indicated a relatively low level on involvement.

**Discussion**

Other studies have found significant relationships between principal behaviors and teacher self-efficacy (e.g., Bellibas & Liu, 2007; Mehdinezhad & Mansouri, 2016; Prachae, Nambudiri, & Mishra, 2017; Walker & Slear, 2011). Mehdinezhad and Mansouri (2016) concluded that there is a significant relationship between the principals’ leadership behaviors and teachers’ perceptions of self-efficacy. They concluded that two of the components of principals’ leadership behaviors, idealized influence and intellectual stimulation, could predict changes in teachers’ perception of self-efficacy.

Bellibas and Liu (2007) reported a significance and positive correlation between perceived principal instructional leadership behaviors and teacher self-efficacy. They found the principal’s proactive involvement in instructional leadership was related to teachers’ self-efficacy in teaching and student engagement.

Walker and Slear (2011) found a positive relationship between high levels of teacher efficacy and increased student achievement, and a positive relationship between principal behavior and teacher efficacy. Their findings suggested that teacher efficacy could be affected by principal behaviors. Walker and Slear (2011) found that for teachers with three years of experience or less, Modeling Instructional Expectations was the only leadership behavior that affected teacher self-efficacy. For teachers with four to seven years of experience, teacher self-efficacy was affected by two leadership behaviors: Modeling Instructional Expectations and Communication. They found, for teachers with 8 to 14 years of experience, the leadership behaviors that affected teacher self-efficacy included Communication, Consideration, and
Modeling Instructional Expectations. Of these principal behaviors, the most important leadership behavior was Communication. For teachers with more than 15 years of experience, the single leadership behavior that affected teacher self-efficacy was Inspiring Group Purpose. Thus, Walker and Slear (2011) found that the needs of groups of teachers was related in part to their respective years of experience. Prachae, Nambudiri, and Mishra (2017) confirmed that collaboration and principal leadership behaviors were positively related to teacher self-efficacy.

In contrast, findings from this study indicated no relationship between the TES subscales and the LPI subscales. It must be noted, however, that all of the teachers had been with the current principal for less than five years. Further inquiry revealed that the range of tenure of the principals was from six months to three years. A possible reason for the lack of correlation between measures of efficacy and measures of principals’ behaviors may be the relatively short tenure of the principals in their current roles. The teachers and corresponding principals may not have developed relationships that associate the principal’s leadership behaviors to their perception of their self-efficacy. Teachers may not have had enough exposure to the principal leadership behaviors to be able to recognize their practices as presented by the LPI survey.

A second possible factor is related to length of the tenure of the teachers in the study. The data from the study indicated that 39.5% of the teachers had been teaching for 10 years or less, 26.5% of the teachers had been teaching for 11 to 20 years, and 34.2% of the teachers had been teaching for 21 + years. That is, the teachers as a group had much more experience as teachers than the principals had experience in leadership. The teachers indicated that their involvement in decision-making primarily related to committee participation and team activities. This finding which may also reflect the relative short tenure of the principals, and/or the teachers’ belief of the value of their input into the decision making process.
Recommendations for Further Study

A number of recommendations for further research can be made as a result of this study: Research on the correlations of effective leadership behaviors and teacher self-efficacy needs to continue. There needs to be a continuing body of research that explains the connections between leadership effectiveness and teacher self-efficacy, especially in small rural schools.

A study should be considered between leadership effectiveness and teacher self-efficacy. If leadership effectiveness is related to teacher self-efficacy as previous research has demonstrated, discovering if this relationship is causal would be very beneficial. Determining principal practices that relate to improved teacher self-efficacy would be helpful to current and prospective principals.

The results of this study may have been impacted by the short tenure of the principals associated with the study group. Further research could be conducted with expanded groups of rural districts or same similar districts with a consideration that principals have a tenure of more than five years. However, this could be a challenging requirement because many rural principals have relatively short tenure for a variety of reasons. A similar study could be conducted with the same schools in five years to see if the length of tenure of principals had changed or if tenure was a factor. Such studies could provide information related to teacher’s perceptions of the leadership practices.

Implications for Practice

The key finding, a lack of correlations between measure of teacher self-efficacy and measures of teachers’ perceptions related to principal leadership behaviors, has implications for professional development. That is, this finding is not consistent with most related research;
therefore, appropriate professional development could provide meaningful dividends for such rural districts.

Most principals in this study were relatively new to the role of leadership. The tenure of the principals in their respective current positions ranged from six months to three years. For most, this was their first principalship; seven of the eight principals were in their first principalship. Developing relationships is an important requirement (Kouzes & Posner, 2003) for any new principal, and maybe more important for rural principals. “Effective leadership is a process that begins when a principal assumes his or her new role. The implication of this concept, for a new rural principal, is the importance to act and work in the present, while at the same time developing a vision and understanding of effective rural school leadership…” (Ashton & Duncan, 2012, p. 10).

According to Bryant, King, and Wilson (2016), beginning principals struggle with the complexity of the position, the limitations of their impacts, the loneliness of the leadership position, and the resistance to change. Ashton and Duncan (2012) concluded that before new principals can focus on being instructional leaders, they need to have confidence and competence with respect to their ability to accomplish managerial responsibilities. Professional development maybe beneficial for such rural principals. New rural principals do not have ready access to a large group of peers. Thus, additional support for such principals could be very beneficial.

Mehdinezhad and Mansouri (2016) conducted a review of research related to school leadership and beginning teachers. They concluded there were four recurring themes: relationships, expectation, perceptions, and teacher development. However, the needs of relatively new teachers are different from more experienced teachers with respect to the principal
leadership behaviors and efficacy. The development of teacher efficacy is related, to a large degree, to teachers’ characteristics, experiences, and past successes.

Walker and Slear (2011) found that self-efficacy among less experienced teachers may be enhanced by providing clear guidance related to the principal’s expectations. For more experienced teachers, the modeling of instructional expectations is important, but is less important than communication and building relationships between teachers and the principal. They found that inspiring common purpose through the development of a group and community perspective appears to be the most effective approach for developing teacher self-efficacy for the most experienced teachers. It is important that principals learn and develop a thorough understanding of the development of teacher self-efficacy. Professional development related to the development of teacher efficacy may be beneficial to rural principals.

As discussed in the review of literature, self-efficacy is a future-oriented construct that identifies how successful individuals perceive that they will behave when dealing with a situation or completing a task. Bandura (1986, 1997) indicated that mastery experience, social modeling, improving physical and emotional states, and verbal persuasion could enhance self-efficacy. That is, Bandura suggested that a principal could influence teachers’ self-efficacy in four general methods. However, when each method is considered, time, relationships, and learning are involved. That is, in ideal conditions, relatively new principals would be expected to influence teachers’ efficacy over time.

Relationships between teacher self-efficacy and student achievement have been established (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Moore & Esselman, 1994; Ross, 1992, 1994; Ross & Cousins, 1993; Ross, Cousins & Gadalla, 1996; Tschannen-Moran & McMaster 2009; Walker & Slear, 2011. An important implication for practice is related to professional development for
rural principals. Principals need to understand the significant relationships between teacher efficacy and student achievement; Wolken-Autry (2010) concluded that principals need to develop a better understanding of the relationships of efficacy, teacher performance, and student achievement either through professional development or during pre-service. It is critical for principals to understand and learn how to affect the efficacy of the teachers with whom they work.

Walker and Slear (2011) identified very specific principal behaviors and characteristics that can positively influence teacher self-efficacy. These include communication, consideration, discipline, empowering staff, flexibility influence with supervisors, inspiring group purpose, modeling instructional expectations, providing contingent rewards, and situational awareness. Such information could be included in professional development for rural principals. Rural elementary principals need more opportunities to grow, innovate, and improve; these abilities require highly effective ongoing professional development.

**Conclusion**

This study contributes to the research literature by adding evidence about relationships among teachers’ perceptions of leadership practices and teachers’ perceptions about efficacy. It provides some insight into leadership practices and teacher self-efficacy. Data were collected from two rural school districts, using the LPI and TES survey instruments and a demographic questionnaire that included one open-ended question.

The correlations among the LPI subscales were positive, significant, and consistent with other research. The correlations between the LPI subscales and the TES subscales were not significant. This finding was not consistent with other research that indicated that such
correlations are expected to be positive and significant. This finding may be related to the fact
that the principals participating in this study were all relatively new in their positions.

A t-test was computed for each of the study subscale means and the appropriate
normative mean. The additional analysis of the relationships of the study TES and the
corresponding normative TES means revealed that the study TES means were higher, but not
meaningful, than the normative TES means. The Study LPI means were lower than the
corresponding normative means and somewhat meaningful. The results of the subscale t-tests
were that all corresponding differences were significant. The relatively low rating by teachers
may relate to the short tenure of the principals. That is, teachers had limited experience with
their current principal at the time of the study.

Research question 4 was analyzed using a MANOVA and subsequent appropriate steps to
determine significant relationships between the four independent variables and the seven
dependent variables. Through the analysis, it was found that there was no significant difference
in the groups formed for the independent variable Teacher’s Age. For the independent variable
Number of Years Teaching did have an effect on the dependent variables Personal Efficacy and
Inspire a Shared Vision. Years with the Current Principal could not be evaluated because there
was only one group; all of the responding teachers indicated they had been with the current
principal less than five years. The teachers Level of Education did have an effect on the
dependent variables Personal Efficacy and Teaching Efficacy. The results indicated that teachers
with more experience and/or more education rated themselves higher on the efficacy subscales
than did teachers with less experience and less education.

The results of the open-ended question indicated that those who were involved in school
decision making were primarily involved by participating in committees or teams. Those who
were participating in teams and/or committees comprised less than 49% of the teachers participating in the study. Some of the teachers indicated that they are on multiple committees or teams. A number of the teachers indicated that they were only involved in their classroom, not involved at all, or just attended meetings. This total comprised over 51% of the respondents. It appears that teachers who responded to the open-ended question, considered their participation in the various committees and teams to be their participating in the school decision making.

There is limited research on teachers’ perceptions in small, rural elementary schools related to leadership practices of principals and teachers’ perceptions of their self-efficacy. Due to the limited amount of literature on small rural schools and school systems, any research that contributes to the knowledge base may be beneficial to the teachers and principals. It is hoped that this research adds to the body of research that contributes to leadership practices that increase teacher-efficacy and student achievement.
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APPENDIX A

LPI Observer

BY JAMES M. KOUZES & BARRY Z. POSNER

INSTRUCTIONS

You are being asked by the person whose name appears at the top of the next page to assess his or her leadership behaviors. Below the person’s name you will find thirty statements describing various leadership behaviors. Please read each statement carefully, and using the rating scale below, ask yourself:

“How frequently does this person engage in the behavior described?”

When selecting your response to each statement:

- Be realistic about the extent to which this person actually engages in the behavior.
- Be as honest and accurate as you can be.
- DO NOT answer in terms of how you would like to see this person behave or in terms of how you think he or she should behave.
- DO answer in terms of how this person typically behaves on most days, on most projects, and with most people.
- Be thoughtful about your responses. For example, giving this person 10s on all items is most likely not an accurate description of his or her behavior. Similarly, giving someone all 1s or all 5s is most likely not an accurate description either. Most people will do some things more or less often than they do other things.
- If you feel that a statement does not apply, it’s probably because you don’t see or experience the behavior. That means this person does not frequently engage in the behavior, at least around you. In that case, assign a rating of 3 or lower.

For each statement, decide on a response and then record the corresponding number in the box to the right of the statement. After you have responded to all thirty statements, go back through the LPI one more time to make sure you have responded to each statement. Every statement must have a rating.

The Rating Scale runs from 1 to 10. Choose the number that best applies to each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING SCALE</th>
<th>1—Almost Never</th>
<th>2—Rarely</th>
<th>3—Seldom</th>
<th>4—Occasionally</th>
<th>5—Sometimes</th>
<th>6—Usually</th>
<th>7—Fairly Often</th>
<th>8—Very Frequently</th>
<th>9—Very Frequently</th>
<th>10—Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When you have completed the LPI-Observer, please return it to:


Thank you.

Copyright © 2018 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. All rights reserved.

LPI: LEADERSHIP PRACTICES INVENTORY OBSERVER
I (the Observer) am this leader’s (check one): □ Manager □ Direct Report □ Co-Worker □ Other

To what extent does this leader engage in the following behaviors? Choose the response number that best applies to each statement and record it in the box to the right of that statement. He or she:

1. Sets a personal example of what he/she expects of others.
2. Talks about future trends that will influence how our work gets done.
3. Seeks out challenging opportunities that test his/her own skills and abilities.
4. Develops cooperative relationships among the people he/she works with.
5. Praises people for a job well done.
6. Spends time and energy making certain that the people he/she works with adhere to the principles and standards that we have agreed on.
7. Describes a compelling image of what our future could be like.
8. Challenges people to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.
9. Actively listens to diverse points of view.
10. Makes it a point to let people know about his/her confidence in their abilities.
11. Follows through on the promises and commitments he/she makes.
12. Appeals to others to share an exciting dream of the future.
13. Searches outside the formal boundaries of his/her organization for innovative ways to improve what we do.
14. Treats others with dignity and respect.
15. Makes sure that people are creatively rewarded for their contributions to the success of projects.
16. Asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect other people’s performance.
17. Shows others how their long-term interests can be realized by enlisting in a common vision.
18. Asks “What can we learn?” when things don’t go as expected.
19. Supports the decisions that people make on their own.
20. Publicly recognizes who exemplify commitment to shared values.
21. Builds consensus around a common set of values for running our organization.
22. Paints the “big picture” of what we aspire to accomplish.
23. Makes certain that we set achievable goals, make concrete plans, and establish measurable milestones for the projects and programs that we work on.
24. Gives people a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work.
25. Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.
26. Is clear about his/her philosophy of leadership.
27. Speaks with genuine conviction about the higher meaning and purpose of our work.
28. Experiments and takes risks, even when there is a chance of failure.
29. Ensures that people grow in their jobs by learning new skills and developing themselves.
30. Gives the members of the team lots of appreciation and support for their contributions.
APPENDIX B

TES Short Form

Teacher Efficacy Scale (Short Form)*

A number of statements about organizations, people, and teaching are presented below. The purpose is to gather information regarding the actual attitudes of educators concerning these statements. There are no correct or incorrect answers. We are interested only in your frank opinions. Your responses will remain confidential.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of each statement.

KEY: 1 = Strongly Agree  2 = Moderately Agree  3 = Agree slightly more than disagree  4 = Disagree slightly more than agree  5 = Moderately Disagree  6 = Strongly Disagree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The amount a student can learn is primarily related to family background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If students aren't disciplined at home, they aren't likely to accept any discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A teacher is very limited in what he/she can achieve because a student's home environment is a large influence on his/her achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If parents would do more for their children, I could do more.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him/her quickly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If one of my students couldn't do a class assignment, I would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When it comes right down to it, a teacher really can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C

Demographic survey and open-ended question

Demographic Questions (Teacher)

Age: ___ 20-30 ___ 31-40 ___ 41+

How many years of teaching experience do you have?
___ 1-5 ___ 6-10 ___11-20 ___21+

How many years have you been teaching with your current principal?
___ 1-5 ___ 6-10 ___ 11+

What level of education do you have?
___ Bachelors ___ Some Graduate Course Work ___ Master’s ___ Master’s Plus

Please provide a brief response to the following question:

Describe how you are involved in school decision making.
APPENDIX D

Permission to use LPI

April 12, 2016

Ben Zunino

Dear Mr. Zunino:

Thank you for your request to use the LPI®: Leadership Practices Inventory® in your dissertation. This letter grants you permission to use either the print or electronic LPI [Self/Observer/Self and Observer] instrument[s] in your research. You may reproduce the instrument in printed form at no charge beyond the discounted one-time cost of purchasing a single copy; however, you may not distribute any photocopies except for specific research purposes. If you prefer to use the electronic distribution of the LPI you will need to separately contact Eli Becker (ebecker@wiley.com) directly for further details regarding product access and payment. Please be sure to review the product information resources before reaching out with pricing questions.

Permission to use either the written or electronic versions is contingent upon the following:
(1) The LPI may be used only for research purposes and may not be sold or used in conjunction with any compensated activities;
(2) Copyright in the LPI, and all derivative works based on the LPI, is retained by James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. The following copyright statement must be included on all reproduced copies of the instrument(s); "Copyright © 2013 James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Inc. All rights reserved. Used with permission";
(3) One (1) electronic copy of your dissertation and one (1) copy of all papers, reports, articles, and the like which make use of the LPI data must be sent promptly to my attention at the address below; and,
(4) We have the right to include the results of your research in publication, promotion, distribution and sale of the LPI and all related products.

Permission is limited to the rights granted in this letter and does not include the right to grant others permission to reproduce the instrument(s) except for versions made by nonprofit organizations for visually or physically handicapped persons. No additions or changes may be made without our prior written consent. You understand that your use of the LPI shall in no way place the LPI in the public domain or in any way compromise our copyright in the LPI. This license is nontransferable. We reserve the right to revoke this permission at any time, effective upon written notice to you, in the event we conclude, in our reasonable judgment, that your use of the LPI is compromising our proprietary rights in the LPI.

Best wishes for every success with your research project.

Cordially,

Ellen Peterson
Permissions Editor, Epeterson4@gmail.com
APPENDIX E

Permission to use TES Short Form

My husband forwarded me your request below:

Dr. Hoy,

I am a doctoral student at the University of Nevada, Reno. You previously gave me permission to use the Collective Teacher Efficacy Scale (Short form). My Committee chair has asked me to change the focus to the individual teacher and not the group. I have permission to use the Leadership Practices Inventory, and am asking for your permission to use the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Short form) as survey instruments for my dissertation. May I have your permission to use the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Short form) in my research.

Do you have a web site that I might access the reliability and validity data information?

Thank you for your consideration.

Ben Zunino

You are welcome to use the Teacher Efficacy Scale in your research, though I would recommend the Teachers Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) instead. See the website below for both.
APPENDIX F

Permission to survey school district # 1

Ben,

That sounds good, and I have no problem with you naming our district. Thanks

On Wed, May 18, 2016 at 12:14 PM, <ColiZunino@aol.com> wrote:

This is the follow-up from our conversation about me coming to your district this fall to survey the elementary principals and teachers for my dissertation. If it is ok with you, please respond to this survey with an ok.

Thx

Z

--

[Name], Superintendent

Elko County School District
APPENDIX G

Permission to survey school district #2

Hi Ben,

Sorry about the delay! Looks like we have a connection with this e-mail address. Please accept this as an OK to proceed. In terms of how to represent [Redacted] in the dissertation, you are welcome to reference us by name, or for sake of consistency, refer to us as every other district.

Thanks!

On Mon, Jul 11, 2016 at 1:41 PM, <> wrote:

[Redacted],

Thank you for the help with this. Gus and Bill want to know if you want me to use the name of the school district in the dissertation, or do you want me to refer to the district as a small district in [Redacted]?

Thx
Z

-----Original Message-----
Sent: Thu, May 19, 2016 11:55 am
Subject: Permission to survey

[Redacted],

This is the follow-up from our conversation about me coming to your district this fall to survey the elementary principals and teachers for my dissertation. Dr. Hill asked that I do a test run of the system as well. If it is ok with you, I would like to do the test run with [Redacted]. If this is ok with you, please respond to this survey with an ok.

Thx
Z

---

[Redacted], Superintendent
Humboldt County School District
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Letter of approval from the University of Nevada, Reno Internal Review Board

DATE: March 31, 2017
TO: Bill Thornton, Ph.D.
FROM: University of Nevada, Reno Institutional Review Board (IRB)

PROJECT TITLE: [045743-1] A study of relationships among teacher’s perceptions of leadership practices and teacher’s perceptions of teacher efficacy.

REFERENCE #: Social Behavioral
SUBMISSION TYPE: New Project
ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: March 31, 2017
REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption Category # 2

The Research Integrity Office, or the IRB reviewed this project and has determined that it is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations. Please note, the federal government has identified certain categories of research involving human subjects that qualify for exemption from federal regulations.

Only the Research Integrity Office and the IRB have been given authority by the University to make a determination that a study is exempt from federal regulations. The above-referenced protocol was reviewed and the research deemed eligible to proceed in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Federal Regulations on the Protection of Human Subjects (45 CFR 46.101 paragraph [b]).

Reviewed Documents

- Application Form - Exempt #2 Form 16 MAR 17.docx (UPDATED: 03/16/2017)
- Consent Form - NARRATIVE TO TEACHERS (2).docx (UPDATED: 03/16/2017)
- Letter - PERMISSION TO SURVEY HCSD.docx (UPDATED: 03/16/2017)
- Letter - PERMISSION TO SURVEY ECSU.docx (UPDATED: 03/16/2017)
- Other - PRINCIPAL’S INTRO OF Z.docx (UPDATED: 03/16/2017)
- Questionnaire/Survey - TEACHER DEMO and OPEN-ENDED RESPONSE.docx (UPDATED: 03/16/2017)
- Questionnaire/Survey - TFS SHORT FORM.pdf (UPDATED: 03/16/2017)
- Questionnaire/Survey - LPI OBSERVER.pdf (UPDATED: 03/16/2017)
- University of Nevada, Reno - Part I, Cover Sheet - University of Nevada, Reno - Part I, Cover Sheet (UPDATED: 03/29/2017)

If you have any questions, please contact Raymond Avansino at (775) 327-2372 or at ravansino@unr.edu.

NOTE for VA Researchers: You are not approved to begin this research until you receive an approval letter from the VASNHCS Associate Chief of Staff for Research stating that your research has been approved by the Research and Development Committee.

Sincerely,
Richard Bjur, PhD  
Co-Chair, UNR IRB  
University of Nevada Reno

Janet Usinger, PhD  
Co-Chair, UNR IRB  
University of Nevada Reno

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within University of Nevada, Reno IRB's record.
This is Ben Zunino. He is a doctoral student at the University of Nevada, Reno. He has asked and received permission from the University and the School District to conduct his research in our elementary schools. With that, I will turn this meeting over to him to explain the process.
APPENDIX J

Script for teacher survey delivery

TITLE OF STUDY: A Study of Relationships among Teachers’ Perceptions of Leadership Practices and Teachers’ Perception of Teacher Efficacy

INVESTIGATOR(S): Bill Thornton, Ph.D., and Ben Zunino

You are being asked to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to determine if there are significant relationships between teachers’ perceptions of leadership practices and teachers’ perceptions of teacher efficacy. This is a minimal risk study with no personal identifiers that can link your responses to you; thus, ensuring confidentiality.

Participation in the study is strictly voluntary.

This is a one-time administration and completing the survey will take approximately 15 minutes. The survey is comprised of three parts. The first part is the Leadership Practices Inventory instrument. The second part is the Teacher Efficacy Scale (Short Form). The third part consists of one open-ended response question and five demographic questions. Please read the directions carefully and respond to each of the items. Please do not collaborate during the administration of the survey; the accuracy and value of the survey data depends upon individual responses. Please do not write your name or any identifying information on any of the surveys.

Once you have finished the surveys put them in the provided envelope, and place the envelope in the box at the front of the room.

If you choose not to participate, please place the surveys in the envelope, and then place the envelope in the box at the front of the room. The last person completing the surveys, please shuffle/mix the envelopes in the box.
Thank you for your time, participation, and what you do every day to help students.