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ABSTRACT

A RESEARCH STUDY OF TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP COMPARING LEADERSHIP STYLES OF THE PRINCIPAL

By
Kathleen A. Luft
May 2012

Dissertation supervised by James E. Henderson

This study investigated the relationship between two elementary building administrators and their teaching faculty with regard to leadership styles of the principal. Leadership analysis determined that one principal had a transformational leadership and one principal who had a transactional leadership style.

A survey assessed the perceptions of elementary teachers regarding each school’s climate, and their own empowerment resulting in teacher efficacy. Results were not congruent with the review of literature.

The school led by the transactional principal underwent an intervention for a twelve-week period during which changes were made based on the data from the pre-tests administered. These interventions reflected a more transformational leadership approach. The results of a second administration of surveys after interventions by the
principal showed limited results in improving teacher efficacy and school climate. The researcher also gained insights as to future studies and implications for practice such as replication of the study using a longer intervention period and a larger sample within one school or more schools in the study.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Education today is at the forefront of global conversation and decisions. It is impacted upon by politics, the economy, and technology. Keeping pace with a challenging world and preparing students for the work force is daunting. Educators must prepare students locally to become citizens in a global world. There are a myriad of factors, which enter this arena including the content taught, the teachers who deliver the curriculum, and the leaders who work with teachers, students, and the community. Leadership is at the forefront of education because it is a search for understanding the thoughts and actions of leaders and investigations into the improvement of the performance and motivation of individuals and groups. Looking at the leaders who work with teachers provides a view on leadership and the link to teacher efficacy and school health and what role they play in student achievement. What is known and must be done remains simply stated, yet it is a complex endeavor for educational leadership in the 21st century (Bartee, 2010). The what is known of leadership is grounded in theoretical constructs that offer frameworks for understanding multi-faceted dynamics of educational leadership (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Howell & Costley, 2006). Theoretical constructs of educational leadership are based upon historical and contemporary perspectives, demonstrations of how leadership functions within institutional roles and relationships, as well as individual behaviors and boundaries (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Howell & Costley, 2006). What we do in educational leadership is practical, evidence-based approaches used to address emerging issues of imminent challenges in school contexts (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Howell & Costley, 2006). Given the era of No Child Left behind (NCLB)
Act of 2001 (PL 107-110, 115 of tat.1425) educational leaders subscribe to empirically-based practices for achieving desired student outcomes. The focus of NCLB is on accountability and created a high stakes educational environment. While accountability is important, guidance on how schools build capacity to accomplish that goal was not part of the legislation. Therefore, it is necessary to go about building balanced leadership styles to meet the expectations of accountability (Pepper, 2010).

**Transformational and Transactional Leadership**

In many ways, the successful integration of theory and practice is exemplary in transformational leadership, given its capacity to foster selfless commitment toward a collective cause irrespective of critical differences between the stakeholders and the cause being served. The transferable currency or embodied capital of transformational leadership, in essence, demonstrates how educational leaders go beyond the bounded organizational context and extends into the wider social context within which schools are located and from which our students come. (Shields, 2006)

Current accountability policies place responsibility for students’ learning on building principals and to a lesser degree on teachers. These policies suggest principals and teachers work collaboratively, their progress is usually judged by student achievement on standardized tests, and the means to bring about collaboration is uncertain (Printy, Marks, & Bowers (2009)

Most quantitative studies conclude that principals exert influence on student achievement through teachers and school culture; principals establish conditions so that
teachers make the direct effort toward improving student outcomes (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

Hoy and Miskel (2005) state school leadership and traditional (transactional) models of leadership inhibit the capacity for change, while transformational leadership uses resources and relationships as a successful model for educational leaders. Transformational leadership is defined as a social process in which a member or members of a group or organization influence the interpretation of internal and external events, the choice of goals or desired outcomes, the organization of work activities, the individual motivation and abilities, the power relations, and the shared orientations.

Fundamental assumptions of transactional leadership theorize leadership as an organizational function which is both rational and technical in its conception and projection (Hoy & Miskel, 2005; Shields, 2006; Cline & Necochea, 2000; Fullan, 1999). Specifically, Day (2000) indicates how “power with versus power over” becomes a challenge for top-down approaches of leadership. This thought process does not allow for the impact of organizational or institutional factors upon individual attainment or performance outcomes. Other fundamental assumptions of traditional leadership focus on inherited values and human nature (Gorton & Alston, 2009; Fairholm, 2000). These assumptions emphasize leadership driven by personality and not the responsibilities of the position.

This leads to the question about leadership practices for the 21st century. What is the leader’s role? How should 21st century schools look? The role of the 21st century schools is to prepare students holistically in cognitive, affective, and social ways to meet societal demands in their future (Helm, Turckes, & Hinton, 2010; Rotherham &
Willingham, 2009; Manthey, 2008; Hardy, 2007). A thematic, holistic approach to achieve desired outcomes, Bassett (2005) sees future schools as espousing a leadership vision for proficiency, fluency, multicultural literacy, and high-quality performance for students in various areas. He reports proficiency is represented in the type of curriculum; fluency is represented in areas beyond technical competencies into the non-technical areas of leadership, decision making and ethics; multicultural literacy is inclusive of those individuals who are familiar with the history and experiences of diverse groups; and high-quality performance involves a commitment to extra curricular activities.

In viewing transformational leadership in light of the aforementioned premises, Elmore (2004) suggests five parameters in order to attain a shared approach toward leadership among system-level administrators to address all levels of school improvement:

1) Internal accountability precedes external accountability; educators are usually people to whom things happen, not people who make things happen.

2) Improvement is a developmental process that progresses in stages; it is not a linear process. Teachers, leaders, and students learn in part by tearing down old preconceptions, trying out new ideas and practices, and working hard to incorporate these new ideas and practices into our operating model of the world.

3) Leadership is a cultural practice. Leaders understand that improving school performance requires transforming a fundamentally weak instructional core and the culture that surrounds it into a strong body of
knowledge about powerful teaching and learning that is accessible to those who are willing to learn it.

4) Powerful leadership is distributed because the work of instructional improvements is distributed. Schools that are improving seldom, if ever, engage exclusively in role-based professional development, that is, professional learning in which people in different roles are segregated from one another. Instead, learning takes place across roles. Improving schools pay attention to who knows what and how that knowledge can strengthen the organization.

5) Knowledge is not necessarily where you think it is. Most of the knowledge about improvement is in the schools where improvement is occurring, and most of those schools are, by definition, schools with a history of low performance.

Schools in the 21st century are unique in that they focus on knowledge and the inherent value it possesses. Knowledge is academically generated (school) or non-academically generated (experience). Whatever the source, acquired knowledge informs capacities to think, reason, analyze and decide. Sanchez 2003; and Wagner et al, 2006 clearly believe transformational leaders understand the need for diversified curricula, because such knowledge becomes a resource of culture capital for students and currency valued within the exchange of educational leadership. Sanchez (2003) goes on to assert

   Academic programs must compel students to go beyond memorizing a hodgepodge of facts. Schools must help students become independent learners
who think, apply their knowledge and reflect on their learning. Schools must help our children create, and find overwhelming amounts of knowledge and information.

In viewing school structure for 21st century, schools can no longer teach all that is necessary for students to learn; rather educators must teach the value of knowing where and how to find resources which supply the information to students.

Bass and Riggio (2006) share the view that transformational leadership is intellectual stimulation that encourages the delivery of content for teaching and learning. “Transformational leaders stimulate followers to be innovative and creative by questioning old assumptions, traditions, and beliefs; reframing problems; and approaching old situations in new ways” (Hoy & Miskel, 2005)

This approach to leadership authenticates experiences students obtain from diverse backgrounds and context. Bass and Riggio (2006) offer a second dimension of transformational leadership that promotes individualized consideration with a focus on the holistic needs of students. Hoy and Miskel (2005) support this finding when they state: “Individualized consideration means that transformational leaders pay particular attention to each individual’s need for achievement and growth.” Zhu, Avolio, and Walumbwa (2009) indicated transformational leadership has a more positive effect on the follower work engagement when follower characteristics are more positive. Implications of the findings for theory, research, and practice are significant.

Transformational leadership has important foci: First, relationships between the institution and individuals. The quality of the relationship is built on the perception that
the task is important to the stakeholder. This is based on the quality of the relationship between leaders and followers. Transformational leaders recognize the need for establishing relationships with multiple stakeholders who may or may not fit the current situation (Hoyle, 2001; Wagner, 2006).

Second, relationships successfully established between educational leaders and stakeholders afford more opportunities for students (Hoyle, 2001; Wagner, 2006).

Castro, Perinan, and Bueno (2008) suggest strong evidence that transformational leadership substantially influences work attitudes and behaviors of followers. They contend research is needed to study how transformational leadership promotes job satisfaction among employees and affective commitment for the organization.

Next, extra-curricular activities developed from these relationships also help students to establish social capital and provide students with different skill sets to prepare them for life (Hoyle, 2001; Wagner, 2006).

Sanchez (2003) asserts schools must also help children develop into well-adjusted individuals who can thrive in a world that is increasing characterized by difference, diversity, and rapid change. Children must be able to navigate this world of difference if they are to succeed in life. For children to succeed in this 21st century world, in fact, to transform it into a good place in which to live and work, they must be both socially and environmentally responsible. Children must grow into adults to be team players of communities and society. Educators must help children develop the communication, interaction, and civic skills to live in a world that is high touch as well as high tech: a world that is characterized as much by interdependency as by diversity.
There are several implications for transformational leadership in 21st century schools. Transformational leadership offers a rich perspective on non-traditional ways to approach what is known and what tasks students must be able to do. Influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration need to be integrated within the context of our schools in order to create a learning environment where all students succeed. When leaders broaden and elevate the interests of employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and the mission of the group, all stakeholders benefit and this is passed on to students.

*Collective Efficacy*

Collective efficacy is based on social cognition theory proposed by Bandura (1993). Teacher efficacy refers to “the perceptions of teachers in a school that the efforts of the faculty as a whole will have a positive effect on the students” (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000). Bandura (1993) reports collective efficacy is positively related to achievement at the school level. He also espouses the stronger the faculty’s shared belief in the instructional efficacy, the better students perform academically. High levels of perceived efficacy are associated with a robust sense of purpose that helps groups see setbacks as temporary obstacles to be overcome rather than evidence confirming their inefficacy (Goddard & Skrla, 2006). From this, it can be determined that those teacher populations which perceive a high sense of efficacy will endure working until the task is successfully completed.

Variance in teachers’ school cultural perceptions might be a predictor of school effectiveness (Dumay, 2009).
Collective efficacy stems from the effects of mastery and vicarious learning experiences, social pressure, and the emotional tone of the school organization (Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004). Ross and Gray (2006) report that transformational leadership might contribute to collective teacher efficacy through each of four mechanisms identified as efficacy information. As a transformational leader, it is important to develop collective self-efficacy in order to set feasible goals, clarify standards, develop a collaborative culture, and link these actions of teachers to student outcomes. Transformational leadership contributes to efficacy beliefs through working together in a collaborative culture.

Bandura (1997) defines self-efficacy as beliefs in one’s capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required in managing prospective situations. It does not indicate a need for control, but rather requires an individual understanding of what skill set is needed to perform the task. Ross and Gray (2006) define teacher efficacy as a set of personal efficacy beliefs that refer to the specific domain of the teacher’s professional behavior.

Self-efficacy has been the subject of much research. Employees who perceive themselves with high self-efficacy will make efforts to produce successful outcomes, while those teachers who have a low self-efficacy will not make similar efforts to produce successful outcomes (Flores, 2004).

Collective efficacy differs from teachers’ individual sense of efficacy in that collective efficacy is a descriptor of the school but stems from self-efficacy (Bandura, 2000). Goddard, Hoy, and Hoy (2000) found that teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs are based on perceptions of individual performance, whereas collective teacher efficacy beliefs are
social perceptions based on the assessment of the capability of the school faculty as a whole. Goddard (2000) also found teachers’ collective efficacy was related positively to their self-efficacy.

Flores (2004) discussed collective efficacy and collaboration of school culture referring to working relationships which are spontaneous, voluntary, evolutionary, and developmentally oriented. Friedman (2004) reports that schools should be places where all stakeholders share purpose and vision, subscribe to norms of collegiality and hard work through professional development, celebrate success, and learn from the rich social history and stories that cultural diversity provides.

Increases in teachers’ perceptions of leader effectiveness; successful implementation of innovations; boosts in teachers’ behaviors, emotions, and job satisfaction; increased commitment to school improvement’ and greater teacher motivation to implement accountability policies under transformational leadership were found by Geijsel, Sleegers, Leithwood, and Jantzi, (2003); Leithwood, Steinbach, and Jantzi, (2006), (see also Bandura, 1997). These perceptions confirm the leader as the key in creating the culture of collaboration. Geijsel et al. (2003) view the transformational leader possessing the vision to work with all stakeholders to invite them to be involved in decision-making, to work together to contribute ideas, to share successes and work on areas for improvement, and to reflect together on the art of teaching. Leaders who exhibit those characteristics of transformational leadership have the power to aid teachers to reach to the highest levels of teacher efficacy.

Goddard, Hoy, and Hoy (2000) discuss teacher efficacy, its meaning and impact on student achievement. They found a direct correlation between school administration
initiating structure and providing both consideration and leadership for teachers. Structure refers to the extent administrators provide staff and materials necessary for effective instruction and student learning. Consideration refers to the extent administrators develop mutual trust and respect, and shared norms and values among school staff necessary for positive and productive social relations. Administrators who provide structure and consideration have teachers who hold greater efficacy in their role as teachers. The challenge for every organization is to build on a feeling of oneness through dependence on one another because the goal is principals and teachers who work together to achieve organizational goals.

The leader is the key in creating the culture of collaboration (Bandura, 1997). The transformational leader has the vision to work with all stakeholders to invite them to be involved in decision-making, to work together to contribute ideas, to share successes and to work on areas for improvement, and to reflect together on the art of teaching. Leaders who exhibit those characteristics of transformational leadership have the power to aid teachers to reach to the highest levels of self-efficacy.

The structure in schools and the role of the administrator has changed since 1978. Beginning in 1978 and continuing through 1985, theories grew discussing different leadership styles. The studies described types of leadership and how they affected those with whom the administrator worked (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Ethical leaders are ultimately responsible for developing a strong and sustainable climate in each organization. Transformational leaders make a significant impact on the ethical behavior of the people in organizations. In order to create and develop ethical
leaders, upper level management must be committed to a clear code of ethics, which is found in every pore of the community (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

In order to develop and promote a strong and sustainable climate, leaders have to develop certain practices. First is reaching proactively to teachers to aid them in professional development. Successful leaders promote understanding and encourage responsibility in teachers. Second, if the leader offers the opportunity of choice, has teachers as active participants in problem solving, and conflict resolution, the result is empowerment and leadership. Finally, if leaders promote self-reflection as a tool, teachers alter their approach to student learning (Marshal, 2005).

If the organization values teachers, it will feel ownership in the mission of the organization and will perform beyond expectations in order to aid in the creation and sustenance of a positive school climate. Tashakkori and Taylor (1995) found that a principal is integral in the development of a strong, healthy environment, which creates and promotes a positive school community. Leadership influences teachers. Teachers who feel valued in the organization and supported by the building administrator have higher teacher efficacy beliefs (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). In attempting to show a link between a healthy school, transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and teacher efficacy, this study found teacher efficacy results in more open, involved staffs who feel empowered in the mission and the responsibility for all learners.

Tashakkori and Taylor (1995) reveal the connection between a transformational leader, teacher efficacy, and outcomes related to student achievement. Those administrators who eliminated perceived obstacles for teachers were associated with strong leadership. Under the auspices of the transformation leader, teachers are provided
growth opportunities, which enhance teaching and student achievement. The teacher who believes s/he is a valuable stakeholder in the academic community will take risks, which lead to discoveries about teaching and learning.

*Teacher Efficacy*

Teacher efficacy has been defined in many ways not the least of which is the extent to which a teacher believes that s/he has the capacity to affect student performance. Tashakkori and Taylor (1995) report that teacher efficacy is the belief that teachers feel empowered to make an impact on student learning and academic growth.

Bandura (1977) developed the concept of self-efficacy as a part of his social cognitive theory, which is as a person’s belief in the capacity to organize and execute what is needed to produce desired results. Bandura identified four areas which promote self-efficacy: mastery experiences, physiological and emotional states, modeling, and social persuasion. Individuals are influenced by the strength of perception of their efficacy beliefs. When a staff believes they are able to perform successfully through goals, which are attainable and stimulating even while presenting a challenge, they will succeed. It is also true if a staff approaches a goal with lack of self-efficacy, the teachers more likely will be unable to complete the goal successfully, especially in the event of a challenge (Bandura, 1977; 1986; 1997, 2000).

Open and healthy schools provide a better environment for learning and teaching to take place and many administrators are curious about the character of the workplace and welcome a systematic view of what is taking place in their particular school. Health and climate inventories are simple and can measure the climate of the school. The Ohio Health Inventory- Elementary (OHI-E) is one instrument which measures climate and
allows administrators to understand the climate which exists in the school. It is a tool for reflective action and one through which teachers act on their perceptions. The principal, then hopefully, understands the beliefs of the teachers and can act on them to improve the climate of the school.

Statement of the Problem

Transformational leadership is important in promoting and managing school development by influencing teachers both directly and indirectly. Research indicates transformational leadership practices supply a link to teacher outcomes and teacher beliefs regarding their individual and collective ability in addition to their collective capacity (Demir, 2008).

Leadership provides significant differences in the organization, dimensions of leadership, and culture. Leadership and organizational culture do positively affect the operation of a learning environment in addition to providing greater job satisfaction. Transformational leadership provides enhancement of employee skills, encourages innovation, and develops educator’s potential (Chang, & Lee, 2007).

Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) sought a link between transformational leadership, teacher efficacy, and school climate. At the core of leadership lies the premise that administrators chart the course and provide direction to the mission. The successful principal shares those expectations with staff, parents, and students. In conjunction with a warm, welcoming environment in which to work and learn, a stakeholder expects and often demands high academic achievement for students. These researchers found a positive school climate relates directly to, and is necessary for, successful teacher development and student achievement.
School climate creates a culture dedicated to teaching and ensuring the goal that each student will achieve to his/her maximum potential. Positive climate created through teacher efficacy encourages teachers to believe they have the ability to influence student learning in a positive manner (Ashton, 1985). Climate has been a variable in student achievement, student motivation, teachers’ adoption of innovations, superintendents’ ratings of teachers’ competence, and teachers’ classroom management strategies (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). Therefore, it is necessary to study the link between leadership, specifically, transformational and transactional leadership to determine if transformational leadership has an impact on measures of school climate and teacher efficacy.

Hypotheses

The study included two research hypotheses.

H1: There will be a significant increase in teacher efficacy in schools whose leaders are transformational leaders as opposed to transactional leaders.

H2: There will be a significant increase in school climate in schools whose leaders are transformational leaders as opposed to transactional leaders.

These research hypotheses were reduced to null hypotheses.

H10: There will be no statistically significant increase in teacher efficacy in schools whose leaders are transformational leaders as opposed to transactional leaders.

H20: There will be no statistically significant increase in school climate in schools whose leaders are transformational leaders as opposed to transactional leaders.
Variables

There are two dependent variables in this study, teachers’ measure of efficacy and climate as defined in the operational definitions. The independent variable is a set of recommendations to the transactional principal for him/her to incorporate into his/her leadership style. The control variables are the principals of whom one is transformational and the other is transactional. The other control variable is homogeneity of the teacher populations.

Significance of the Problem

The purpose of the study is to investigate the relationship between administrators who practice transformational leadership and school climate and teacher efficacy. The study will attempt to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between transformational leadership and teacher efficacy?

2. Is there a relationship between transformational leadership and a healthy school climate?

A healthy school climate, one with a strong academic emphasis and an administrator who has influence with superiors and is willing to use it on behalf of teachers, is conducive to the development of teachers’ beliefs that they can influence student learning (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). The administrator’s success comes because of the successes of those individuals who look to him/her for leadership.

Lawler, Shi, Walumba, and Wang, (2004) support the idea the administrator is integral to the building of a healthy, strong environment while creating and promoting a positive school community. These researchers also support the idea that transformational
leadership is related positively to work outcomes. If a teacher feels valued in an organization, s/he will accept ownership in the mission of the organization and perform above expectations to aid in the creation of and sustenance of that school climate. This environment provides growth opportunities for teacher enhancement. Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) suggests a need to examine continually those whom are chosen to provide leadership in schools.

In order for organizations to execute their purpose successfully, leadership must be at the helm (Kanungo, 2001). Behaviorists endeavor to identify traits, abilities, behaviors and sources of power for a leader who is competent in the area of moving followers for groups (Sagnak, 2010).

Significance of the Study

Leadership is an attitude. It revolves around behavior, not necessarily around qualities and it belongs to everyone. The role of the leader is to cultivate the leadership potential in everyone. That includes students, staff, and parents (Sergiovanni, 1992). While this research was published almost twenty years ago, it still offers a timely message; strong belief educators can learn leadership skills.

Managing is not leadership. Situations create conditions for leadership effectiveness. In this context, research on leadership effectiveness was based on two concepts: task orientation and relationship orientation (Sagnak, 2010). The orientation of this approach was the idea of the effectiveness of leaders’ conduct (Aronson, 2001). Leadership involves dedication to the process, structure, roles, and indirect forms of communication. It also involves ideas, people, emotions, and direct talk (Phillips, 1992). Leadership is doing the right thing instead of merely doing things right.
Quality leadership involves using the heart, the hand, and the head (Sergiovanni, 1992). The heart of leadership is what the person believes, values, and dreams, and the commitment or personal vision of the leader. Leadership is the person’s interior world and the foundation of reality. The hand of leadership is charting the data-gathering portion. Leadership, in its entirety, is not defined solely by the heart and hand; the head of leadership develops over time with experience, which allows for reflection and development of style.

Educators must be able to talk about leadership practices and share those discussions on leadership practices. These discussions help frame the leader’s views on vision, so that leadership is available to all. Leaders guide the understanding of teaching, learning, and building community.

Leadership is action, not behavior. It has to do with persons and not ideas. It focuses on what drives leadership, not the bureaucratic, or the psychological, but the professional and moral authority (Sergiovanni, 1992). For those reasons, leadership has been a desire on the part of this researcher. Action on the part of leaders is the single most important factor guiding leaders to provide exceptional leadership. Reflection in leadership allows leaders to view how they are perceived through the eyes of those who they lead.

The goal of transformational leadership, according to Covey (2007), is to transform people and organizations in a literal sense, to change them in mind and heart, enlarge vision, insight, and understanding; clarify purpose; make behavior congruent with beliefs, principles, or values; and bring about changes that are permanent, self-perpetuating, and momentum building.
Transformational leadership contains four components: charisma, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Those who identify with charismatic leadership want to identify with the leader. If leadership is charismatic, the leader is one of vision and confidence, and who models high standards for emulation. Inspirational motivation provides followers with challenges and meaning for working on shared goals. The intellectual stimulation helps leaders generate creative solutions to problems by empowering followers to think without risk or worry of criticism. Individual consideration allows each individual growth opportunities, which include mentoring and coaching (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Levine, Muenchen, & Brooks (2010) discuss charisma and the need for it to be measured when investigating transformational leadership. They indicate a need to investigate the communication behaviors of a charismatic leader. The authors indicate a need for the development of a new leadership instrument which measures charismatic communication behaviors in light of both transformational and charismatic theories.

Authentic leadership is characterized by high moral convictions (Kouzes & Posner, 2002). Transformational leadership seeks to redefine the organization with an underlying premise that those who follow will be transformed as well. The followers are the product of transformational leadership. Transformational leaders are charismatic, not narcissistic, and believe their success comes from the success of those who follow (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Teachers’ decision-making, school climate, and sense of efficacy related to job satisfaction have increased in importance. Literature explores relationships and dimension of variables, which included the interrelationship between school climate and
decision-making. Findings in these categories, which faired strongest on final view, were ones dealing with the school. Teachers wanted communication among themselves as well as an administrator who was communicative and supportive. Teachers feel an administrator must protect them from obstacles, which prevent effective teaching (Ciulla, 1995).

Associating strong leadership with school effectiveness, Tashakkori and Taylor (1995) stress the importance of the administrator’s role. Judge and Piccolo (2004) continued study on leadership and its effectiveness indicates teachers were willing to pursue innovative teaching, and how such factors affect school climate and student achievement. School climate relates positively to job satisfaction, yet the literature is inconclusive with regard to the relationship between leadership and teacher efficacy and school climate. Martin, Crossland, and Johnson (2001), found that teachers were more concerned with administrative support of their autonomy than being the decision-makers in a school. Teacher perceptions of the administrator as educational leader have a major impact on school culture.

Leadership has been an interest of study for at least the past forty years in the context of the effects it has upon curriculum, instruction, and student achievement. A growing body of knowledge through meta-analysis of research examined student characteristics and teaching practices, which have been associated with school effectiveness (Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2004).

One of the foci educators have long studied is leadership, because they know what a difference it can make in climate, efficacy, and student achievement. In the 70’s the term used for an effective leader was instructional leader. Instructional leadership was
vague in presentation and presented a myriad of theories and personal perspectives. None of this advice for leaders was derived from a large sample of quantitative data and remained largely theoretical (Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2004).

The research presented by Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2004) was predicated on the notion that effective leadership means more than simply knowing what to do—it is knowing when, how, and why to do it. Effective leaders understand how to obtain a balance pushing for a change, while protecting culture. They know which policies, practices, and resources to align and how to align them with organizational priorities. They also know how to gauge the magnitude of the change they are calling for and how to tailor their leadership strategies accordingly. Finally, and most importantly, they value the people with whom they work. They know how, when, and why to create learning environments that support people, connect them with one another, and provide the knowledge, skills, and resources they need to succeed.

Findings from the meta-analysis indicate a relationship between leadership and student achievement. The focus of the change indicated knowing the right thing to do is central to school improvement. Holding schools accountable for their performance depends on having people in schools with the knowledge, skill, and judgment to make the improvements that will increase student performance (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2004).

Operational Definitions

The operational definitions for the scope of this study are listed below. This author recognizes there are limitations and debate over terms and definitions.
Empowerment:

The process whereby school participants develop the competence to take charge of their own growth and resolve their own problems (Short, 1994).

School Climate:

The set of internal characteristics that distinguish one school from another and influence the behaviors of each school’s members (Hoy & Miskel, 2005).

Teacher Efficacy:

The perceptions on the part of teachers in a school that the efforts of the faculty as a whole will have a positive effect on the students (Goddard, Hoy & Hoy, 2000).

Leadership:

The set of behaviors which define the way decisions are made through the use of power and interaction with followers (Lashway, 2000).

Transactional Leadership:

Leadership which espouses behaviors associated with transactions between leaders and followers. This is often associated with compliance in attaining a certain task or behavior (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003).

Transformational Leadership:

Leadership which increases organizational members’ commitment, capacity, and engagement in attaining goals (Leithwood & Janzi; 2006; Marks & Printy, 2003).

Assumptions

The sample will provide teachers who graduated from various institutions with a variety of educational experiences and their own leadership styles. The school
populations are relatively homogeneous, with little variance among the student population.

Limitations

The limitations for this study include:

1. Operational definitions
2. Precision of the instruments
3. Reliability and validity of the instruments
4. Attitude of the principals with regard to change
5. Additional training of the principal
6. Fidelity to which the interventions were implemented
7. Cooperation in completing the instruments for the Ohio Health Inventory-Elementary and Bandura’s Scale of Teacher Efficacy
8. Snap shot of only two schools
CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Identifying leaders is both complex and confusing. Leadership is a concept that plays a vital role in management and promotion of a school by influencing educators both directly and indirectly. A growing body of literature highlights the role of teaming in organizations. The ability of team members to work together can improve the overall functioning of the organization (Marks & Nance, 2007). Successful teaming is related to relationships between leaders and their followers. Leadership flows from many sources, sometimes springing from the joy of accomplishment, other times from a modest desire to serve others. Leadership takes many forms, sometimes visible and heroic, other times quiet and unassuming. It has a different effect in different environments; a strategy that succeeds brilliantly in one organization may completely fail in another (Demir, 2008).

School administrators sometimes rely on intuition to choose leaders; that can work or fail miserably, so management experts seek those instruments which provide a scientific explanation.

This study examined transformational (Leithwood and Janzi, 2006) and transactional leadership (Antonakis, Avolio & Sivasurbramaniam, 2003) and teacher efficacy (Ross and Gray 2006) and (Bandura, 1977), in light of teacher efficacy and school climate (Hoy and Miskel 2005) and the link between them. This study will examine principal leadership (teacher perceived) behavior and how it relates to teacher efficacy and a healthy school climate.
Leadership

There is a consensus among researchers that leadership is jointly established by leaders and followers (Howell & Shamir, 2005). Since followers directly experience the leader’s model of leadership, they are in the best place to evaluate its effects on the relationship between a leader and his or her followers (Hollander, 1995). Models of leadership should be based on the role of the followers, their knowledge, and psychological states (Ilies, Morgeson and Nahrgang (2005); McCann, Langford and Rawlings, (2006)).

Arif (2009) discusses how much rhetoric has been written about leadership style and behaviors in the context of school leadership. She contends leadership is needed in moments of crisis and organizational development and expansion and therefore, asks does leadership exist or is it cultivated by careful planning.

Derue, Nhargang, Wellman and Humphrey (2011) discussed the lack of integration in leadership by developing an integrative trait-behavioral model of leadership effectiveness and then examined the relative validity of leader traits (gender, intelligence, personality) and behaviors (transformational, transactional, initiating structure-consideration across four leadership effectiveness criteria (leader effectiveness, group performance, follower job satisfaction, satisfaction with the leader). Their findings indicated leader behaviors explain more variance in leadership effectiveness than leader traits.

Blasé and Blasé (2001) discuss what successful principals do and the transformative effects principals have on teachers’ work; work which requires leaders to reflect critically on the differences between controlling and empowering teachers.
According to their work successful principals reflect from the teachers’ point of view which leads to improved motivation, self-esteem, confidence, commitment, innovation, autonomy and reflection.

In the work done by Moolenaar, Daly, & Sleegers the focus was on the link between transformational leadership and the principal’s social network position. The study examined the relationship between principals’ positions in their schools’ social networks in combination with transformational leadership and schools’ innovative climate. Findings indicated transformational leadership was positively associated with schools. Principals’ social network position was related to the innovative climate of their school. The more teachers worked with principals’ and sought their advice both professionally and personally; the stronger the relationship became and established a climate of trust in which teachers were willing to invest in change and the creation of new knowledge.

Bono and Judge (2003) extend theories of transformational leadership to self-confidence in the workplace. They contend much time has been devoted to the study of behaviors of transformational leadership, little time has been given to the study of the processes which transformational leaders have on their followers. They extended research to link self-concordance theory with self-concept theory to understand why followers of transformational leaders showed increased motivation, job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job performance.

Visionary leadership is positively associated with engagement in followers according to Moss (2009). Cultivating a promotion focuses on one facet of transformational leadership which directs followers to attain their aspirations. Visionary
leadership was positively associated with engagement of followers who had a promotion focus. Findings indicated leaders should first foster a sense of security in followers, which evokes a promotion focus and augments receptivity of the followers.

The current high stakes testing environment to demonstrate accountability without building capacity for leadership creates an untenable situation for building administrators. The stress could lead them to use a more authoritative leadership style which forces them solely to make decisions regarding curriculum and activities within their school. Lezotte and McKee (2006) and Glasser (1998) maintain this type of coercive management in which the administration makes decisions without the input from others is ineffective and difficult to sustain for any length of time. Without input from staff that work closely with the students, decisions may be made which are not in the best interest of the students.

According to Popham (2001), the results of uninformed decision-making may be the use of drill and kill test preparation strategies, teaching to the test, and other strategies for the test. Lezotte and McKee (2006) further argue using how to strategies will not make much difference in test scores in the long run. Thompson, Madhuri, and Taylor (2008) research in schools which adopted these test taking strategies or one shot programs to improve test scores and found these schools had little success.

Marks and Nance (2007) support the concept of shared decision-making as a positive force in school improvement efforts. A stronger basis for improving curriculum and instruction would be the implementation of meaningful and sustained professional development for faculty and staff focused on the shared decision-making process in the school (Geijsel, Sleegers, Leithwood & Jantzi, 2003; Shin & Zhou, 2003; Nguni, Sleegers, & Denessen, 2006; Friedman, 2004; Korkmaz, 2007).
Lezotte and McKee (2006) found that in order to create student learning which will improve test scores; effective leaders must create and manage a process for change. Leadership skills are needed to plan and implement the use of effective instructional strategies. These leadership skills, coupled with management skills, are an appropriate environment for learning and student success.

Leadership is a relationship and dance quite elegantly orchestrated by a master leader. Kouzes and Posner (2002) indicate that leadership succeeds when the leader subscribes to the basic tenants. Those tenants include commitment to modeling the way by finding one’s own voice, clarifying personal issues, and setting the example by aligning actions with shared values. The successful leader inspires a shared vision of the future by imagining the possibilities and enlisting others to share that common vision. Leaders accomplish this by appealing to shared interests (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

A leader must always provide challenges to the process by searching for opportunities which make him/her develop as a leader. In tandem, a leader must enable others to act through fostering and promoting cooperation and sharing power. Finally, and probably most importantly, a leader must encourage, recognizing contributions to the organization while celebrating the attainment of goals (Kouzes & Posner, 2002).

Most leaders do not perceive their actions and styles as teachers perceive them. To teachers, perceptions are reality. Teacher’s perceptions of their own level of empowerment and degree of responsibility for student achievement, or lack thereof, become the reality for that school (Martin, Crossland, & Johnson, 2001).

Gooty, Gavin, Johnson, Frazier, and Snow (2009) conducted research on the development and testing of a conceptual model of followers’ perceptions of
transformational leadership. This was used as an antecedent to positive psychological capital which motivates an individual’s perseverance toward goals. This objective, which supported the relationship between followers’ perceptions of transformational leadership and the relationships between positive psychological capital and performance, was noted.

Much of the research on leadership once focused on the biographical or historical sense, but one author (Burns, 1978) in particular delved into the philosophy of leadership. He was the first researchers to examine the philosophy of leadership. In his book on leadership, he discusses several themes. The first dissects the elements of leadership, which Burns defines as power and purpose. The second looks at leadership as a relationship of power for a specific purpose that is consistent with motives, needs, and values of both the leader and the followers. He relies on the ideas of motives and values and their impact on both purpose and behavior.

Burns (1978) uses the theory of moral stages of development to highlight the integration between motives and values in the leader-follower relationship. He maintains that leadership elevates people from lower to higher-level needs and moral development, and true leaders come from self-actualizing individuals who are motivated to grow, to be efficacious, and to achieve.

Leaders seek to work with the values of their followers, but power wielders are intent only on their own agenda. It is of no consequence to power-wielders if their followers share their views, yet leaders strive to unite and support a shared vision. Leaders appeal to higher ideals and values of a person.

The principal’s job is to make known what is important and set the tone for worth, openness, and tolerance. Studies conducted on the effects of different types of leadership
in school found that controlling or manipulative behaviors on the part of a school principal jeopardized both academic and social standards. Controlling tactics on the part of the school principal had negative effects on morale, involvement, communication, and relationships (Blasé, 1982).

Principals of effective schools facilitate teachers as instructional leaders and must shift from solitary decision makers to facilitators. The transformational leader is one who is a facilitator with his/her staff. Moving closer to the facilitative end of the power continuum provides an empowerment of teachers, students, administrators, and parents. Empowerment is essential to school reform. Successful schools are those in which leaders are able to focus the creative energies of teachers on continuous improvements. Teacher empowerment relates positively to increased job satisfaction and an improved sense of teacher efficacy (Tashakkori & Taylor, 1995).

Defining leadership is like defining love: The words on paper never seem to capture the experience (Lashway, 1999). Leadership has many dimensions, which researchers have discussed, defined, and argued. No one single instrument has emerged as the perfect measuring device. Defining leadership is rather like herding cats. It is difficult to do, it can be done, but what satisfaction does it bring? It is so with the myriad of theories, definitions, and volumes of books published on leadership. However, there remains an interest to study it, define it, and search for answers. Lashway (2000) cites Carlyle, (1897) (Volume 5, p.79) who believed leadership came from the great thinkers, and believed “The Great Man.” shaped all human history. He based his philosophy on a simple formula; “The great heart, the clear deep-seeing eye: there it lies.” (p.298)
Leadership comes from personal qualities that rise above the run-of-the-mill humanity (Lashway, 2000).

Waters, Marzano, and McNulty (2004) reported effective school leadership substantially boosts student achievement. School climate, leadership, and quality instruction are frequently associated with effective schools. A meta-analysis of seventy studies on educational leadership established responsibilities that are significantly related to higher levels of higher student achievement. The study integrated popular and behavioral traits and behavioral perspectives of leadership and how different traits and behaviors combine to predict leadership effectiveness criteria.

Research done by Robinson & Rowe (2008) indicates as a finding of their research suggested that the more leaders focus their relationships, work, and learning on the core business of teaching and learning, the greater the influence on student outcomes. There is a need for leadership research and practice to be more closely linked with effective teaching and effective teacher learning.

*Types of Leadership*

Two types of leadership are most widely used in schools today. One is task oriented and the other is relationship oriented. Transactional leadership is task-oriented and stresses getting the job done. These behaviors communicate expectations, evaluate results, and plan projects, while transformational leadership emphasizes involvement in interpersonal dimensions, conveying trust, and resolving conflicts. These leadership styles focus on behavior demonstrated by the leader (Poulson, Smith, Hood, Arthur & Bazemore (2011)).
Transformational leadership is important since it has significant influence on work attitudes and behaviors of followers. It aids in the development of an emotional attachment between leaders and their followers which helps in shaping values, aspirations, and priorities of followers (Yukl, 1999; Antonakis & House, 2002). In transformational leadership, the followers identify with the leader and the team (Kark & Shamir, 2002).

Charbonnier-Voiran, Akremi, & Vandenberghe, (2010) proposed a study that examined individual perceptions of transformational leadership and team-level transformational leadership. They hypothesized climate would relate positively to individual performance and a stronger climate for innovation would enhance the association between transformational leadership and adaptive performance at the individual level.

Sergiovanni (2007) indicates transactional leadership focuses on managerial skills such as rules, procedures, and job descriptions to accomplish expectations. This leadership style takes a direct approach to managing the environment (Friedman, 2004). According to Bass et al. (2003), transactional leadership clarifies expectations and provides recognition when goals are met. Goodwin, Wofford, and Whittington, (2001) found when goals are met; positive reinforcement is effective in strengthening professional dispositions of staff and faculty.

The application of this research comes from the work of Hersey and Blanchard (1993). They emphasized the importance of the match between the leader’s behavior and the follower’s developmental readiness. The theory characterizes followers by commitment and competence (Lashway, 2000). Leaders adapt their style of leadership to
the need of the organization. Employees with high competence and high commitment are best led through delegation while workers with high commitment and little competence respond well to directing (Lashway, 2000). Hersey and Blanchard contend there is no one best style. Their thoughts lie with the situation and leaders with a flexible leadership style.

Hersey and Blanchard (1993) discuss assessments which measure flexibility in leadership styles. They attempted to assess leadership styles through the use of Leader Behavior Analysis II, which uses hypothetical situations to measure leadership. Leaders are asked to choose strategies which fit with predetermined scenarios. Followers are part of the process; leaders have to react to a follower’s perception.

Little extensive research on the validity of the Leadership Behavior Analysis II has been done. The test exhibits content validity but no further tests have been done to measure construct or predictive validity. Other instruments used to assess leadership styles assume that success is dependent on the leader’s behaviors and the demands of the situation. Hersey and Blanchard (1993) argue that leaders should be aware of their own leadership style so they can recognize their strengths and needs. Style generally refers to the characteristic ways leaders make decisions, use power, and interact with others (Lashway, 2000).

Transformational Leadership

Sergiovanni (2007) views the role of the principal as the instructional leader and transformational leadership as the style which best meets the needs of all stakeholders in the academic process. This approach advocates a shared leadership in which school administrators, along with faculty and staff, participate in decision-making focused on
effective curriculum development and instructional practices. His research shows that transformational leaders seek to inspire and empower members of the organization to focus on a common vision and to take ownership of the change process through a collaborative approach. This type of leadership encourages teachers to focus on the organizational purpose, its shared beliefs, and the incorporation of a team. The transformational leader is more concerned with the process of how to get to results, rather than the results. The members of the organization are given the opportunity to determine the best path to take to reach goals, insuring the pathway meshes with the organizational beliefs and purpose. The focus on a shared vision and collaboration builds a strong school culture and commitment of faculty and staff.

Fullan (2001) espouses new ideas, knowledge creation, and sharing is essential to solving problems in an organization that must continuously change to keep up with society. Lezotte and McKee, (2006) state the effective leader must be committed to implementing a collaborative process and must encourage others to participate and take leadership roles based on their knowledge and expertise for effective change to take place.

Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom, (2004) found that school leadership is second only to classroom instruction as the major factor contributing to what students learn in school. They further identified three practices as the core of successful leadership in characterizing a transformational leader: helping staff establish and understand the goals which are the foundation of a shared vision for the school; building the capacity of those within the school and using their strengths in decision-making; and changing
organizational characteristics to strengthen the school culture and build the collaborative process.

Leithwood and Janzi (2006) define transformational leadership in terms of a process which higher levels of commitment to the organization and its goals are attained. Transformational leadership develops the members of the organization to their fullest potential. Wheatley (1999) defines transformation leadership as a leader’s ability to focus those within the organization on the mission and challenges faced by the organization, and how followers perceive the actions of the leader.

Leadership requires an individual to be job-centered as well as people centered. This requires a leader to maintain attention on the managerial aspects of leadership while focusing attention to interpersonal relationships, teacher development, school improvement initiatives, and programs in addition to student achievement, while building capacity within an organization to promote success (Fullan, 2001).

Leadership influences teacher efficacy. Teachers who feel comfortable in an organization, believe they have a share in the mission, and feel supported by their building administrator have a higher sense of self-efficacy. Demir (2008) in discussing transformational leadership and collective efficacy, states that previous research has found that teacher beliefs about their individual and collective capacity and collaborative culture are greatly influenced by transformational leadership.

Fitzgerald and Schutte (2010) discussed their research to examine the intervention of higher emotional intelligence and its increase in self-efficacy for transformational leadership. Their study resulted in more transformational leadership, self-efficacy, and a higher level of transformational leadership after the intervention.
Public schools in developing countries constantly move to make change which reflects on student academic achievement. Challenges abound, not the least of which include community influence, clarification of standards for content as well as performance for all stakeholders, and changes in approaches to learning (Demir (2008). It is not surprising the role leadership plays in developing and sustaining schools. Transformational leadership has been linked to this change and innovation in organizations (Gilley, Dixon & Gilley, 2008). According to Leithwood et al. (1999), transformational leadership is seen to be sensitive to organizational building, developing shared vision, using distributed leadership, and building a school culture which is necessary in restructuring efforts.

Bass (2000) asserts transformational leadership occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of employees, when they generate acceptance and awareness of the mission and purpose of the group, and when they move employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group. Yukl (1998) claims a transformational leader articulates the vision in a clear and appealing manner, explains how to attain the vision, acts confidently and optimistically, expresses confidence in the followers, emphasizes values with symbolic actions, leads by example, and empowers followers to achieve the vision. Transformational leadership is the process of building commitment to organize objectives and then empowering followers to accomplish those objectives.

Bass (2000) found transformational leader refers moving the followers beyond immediate self-interests through idealized influence (charisma), inspiration, intellectual stimulation, or individualized consideration. Transformational leaders may also be characterized as paying attention to the individual subordinate by understanding and
sharing in the subordinate individually (Smith, Montagno & Kuzmenko, 2004; Bass, Waldman, Avolio & Webb, 1999). Leithwood (1992) suggested school leaders are constantly striving for three fundamental goals: helping staff members develop and maintain a collaborative and professional school culture, fostering teacher development, and helping teachers solve problems together more effectively.

Transformational leadership forms the foundation of recent leadership studies. It focuses on the more personal side of organizational interactions. Words such as culture, vision, values, development, teamwork, and service describe transformational leadership. Transformational leadership promotes interpersonal relationships and fosters communication. Transformational leaders meet the needs and wants of their follower’s instead of driving them through the exercise of power. Leaders remain sensitive to their higher purposes (Bass, 2000).

Elmore (2004) advocates shared decision-making (participatory management) as one of the more important components of transformational leadership. Shared decision making focuses on shared leadership. This approach energizes the staff from the bottom up, rather than expectations enforced from the top down. Leadership roles are taken on by the faculty and staff with the most expertise or experience to provide the best guidance to the organization. Elmore (2004) advocates this process, produces a school culture of collegiality and collaboration, in which the school community embraces a shared vision and shared commitment to school change.

Geijsel et al. (2003) believes transformational leadership has a positive impact on teacher perceptions and their willingness to change. He also found the components of transformational leadership, which include vision building and intellectual stimulation,
had significant effect on teacher commitment and extra effort within the context of educational reform.

Friedman (2004) found transformational leadership changes the workplace culture and productivity by appealing to high ideals, by changing attitudes and assumptions, and by building commitment to common goals and objectives.

Korkmaz (2007) found transformational leadership had a positive impact on teacher job satisfaction, which leads to a strong impact on school climate.

The literature examines how leaders think and act; yet it is critical to realize most leadership exists with social interaction as well. A leader cannot lead if s/he has no one who will follow. How do leaders get others to follow them to an unknown place, to try new ventures, predicated on the leader’s vision? Leadership is based on an exchange. Followers follow, but they receive something in exchange. It could be monetary remuneration, recognition, or the opportunity for advancement. However, research discusses the view of leadership, which transcends economics or self-serving activity (Leithwood & Jantzi 1999).

Transformational leadership elicits commitment rather than compliance. It creates a community in which each person has a sense that s/he is a stakeholder in the organization’s mission. Transformational leadership is emotionally charged and empathetic (Martin, Crossland, & Johnson, 2001).

Bass (1985) contends transformation leadership is the effect the leaders have on their followers. A transformational leader makes staff aware of their contribution made to the organization and the importance to the organization. Through establishing respect,
trust, and building relationships, the transformational leader is able to elicit greater productivity for the organization.

Bass and Avolio (1994) contend transformational leaders use four tools to produce results. Individualized attention recognizes the differences among followers and allows for their developmental needs. Intellectual stimulation turns the attention of the followers to goals, aspirations, and new ways of doing things. Inspirational motivation helps followers find meaning in their work. Idealized influence occurs when the leaders serve as living examples and role models for followers.

Transformational leadership serves as a balance, which promotes exchange and elevates the ideas, which encourage followers to transcend their self-interests and develop goals for the good of the order. Transformational leadership promotes empowerment which is attained through participatory management (shared decision-making) (Jung & Avolio, 2000).

Empowerment is enabling experiences, provided within an organization, which fosters autonomy, choice, control, and responsibility. Empowerment is when educators develop the confidence to take charge of their own professional development and resolve problems. Teacher empowerment provides the self-belief and opportunity to act on educational decisions which influence performance. Empowerment is present when power is vested in employees, who then exhibit a sense of ownership and control over their jobs. Empowerment helps employees take a personal interest in improving the organization. The construct of teacher empowerment is viewed by researchers (Leithwood & Janzi, 2006; Marks & Printy, 2003) as holding promise for improving the educational setting for both teachers and students.
Empowerment suggests an overall school philosophy of teamwork, collegiality, participatory decision-making, and problem solving without the constraints of a bureaucratic organization (Short & Greer 1997). Within empowerment, the literature suggests six dimensions: teacher status, autonomy, and impact, opportunities for professional growth, efficacy, and involvement in decision-making. Transformational leadership is reviewed in light of all of these dimensions.

Short and Rinehart (1992) define status as the teachers’ sense of esteem and professional respect accorded to the teacher by parents, students, supervisors, colleagues, and community members. Autonomy as part of an empowerment model refers to the teachers’ beliefs that they control important aspects of their work life. Autonomy is often referred to as internal locus of control. Teacher impact is perception that teachers have influence over their work life. Professional development includes both the opportunities and encouragement to participate in continuous learning experiences or professional growth. Continuous professional growth also serves as modeling for students and provides added dimension for creativity and renewed interest in the profession of teaching.

Transformational leadership forms the foundation of recent leadership studies. It focuses on the more personal side of organizational interactions. Words such as culture, vision, values, development, teamwork, and service describe transformational leadership. Transformational leadership promotes interpersonal relationships and fosters communication. Transformational leaders meet the needs and wants of their follower’s instead of driving them through the exercise of power. Leaders remain sensitive to their higher purposes (Bass, 2000).
The literature examines how leaders think and act; yet it is critical to realize most leadership exists with social interaction as well. A leader cannot lead if s/he has no one who will follow. How do leaders get others to follow them to an unknown place, to try new ventures, predicated on the leader’s vision? Leadership is based on an exchange. Followers follow, but they receive something in exchange. It could be monetary remuneration, recognition, or the opportunity for advancement. However, research discusses the view of leadership, which transcends economics or self-serving activity (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999).

Transformational leadership elicits commitment rather than compliance. It creates a community in which each person has a sense that s/he is a stakeholder in the organization’s mission. Transformational leadership is emotionally charged and empathetic (Martin, Crossland, & Johnson, 2001).

**Transactional Leadership**

Transactional Leadership is oriented by demands, with major emphasis on basic and external satisfaction against demands (Pounder, 2001; Kim & Shim, 2003). It features a reasonable standard of controlling, and means a process of benefit exchange for the purpose of organizational stability. Robbins (2003) contends transactional leadership creates goal setting through role clarification and task request, and it can also lead and encourage subordinates through these activities. Leaders will affirm and reward subordinates’ effort, and satisfy their relevant demands to reach esteem and support from these activities. Bass (1997) adds when subordinates commit any improper behavior, immediate corrective punishment should be given.
Bass (1985) and Lashway (2000) argue that transactional leadership is a cost-benefit exchange process. Transactional leadership theories state that the idea leader-follower relationships are based on a series of exchanges or implicit bargains between leaders and followers. Transactional leadership focuses on rewards or punishments in exchange for performance and is characterized by behaviors and attitudes, which emphasize the quality of exchanges between superiors and followers. The leader clarifies the performance criteria and in return the followers receive rewards for meeting the specific standards set forth. Leaders and followers discuss expectations and agree upon them. Leaders and followers influence each other. With this model, the leader is the authority and has a defined power base. Transactional leaders are considered to be those who focus on the motivation of followers through rewards or discipline, clarifying for their followers, the kinds of rewards that should be expected for various behaviors. The transactional leader actively monitors deviance from standards, observes mistakes and errors, and waits for followers to do something wrong (Bass & Avolio, 1994). The transactional leader does not individualize the needs of subordinates, nor focuses on their personal development. Transactional leaders tend to focus on the short term, physical security needs of subordinates. Such leaders usually operate through an economic exchange mode, transactional leaders are seen as reactive and not proactive (Bass, 1985). The transactional leader gives instructions, clarifies conditions, and retains ultimate control.

At the core of transactional leadership, the leader holds control over employees or followers and provides incentives for followers to do what the leader wants. If an employee does what is desired, a reward will follow, and if the employee does not do
what is desired, denial of the reward will follow (Lashway, 2000). Transactional leaders manage by exceptions, which refer to the idea they are not interested in changing or transforming the work environment or the behavior of employees. Everything remains constant except for problems. This often results in lack of real goal attainment (Lashway, 2000).

While transactional leadership relies on a set of assumptions about human beings and what motivates them in the organization, this style of leadership usually provides limited results. Effects of rewards and punishments tend to require bigger rewards to remain effective. This comes with a higher cost and does not serve to inspire loyalty to the leader. Transactional leadership focuses on management and not leadership (Lashway, 2000).

Self Efficacy

Bandura (1977) launched the term teacher-efficacy in education by establishing a set of behaviors which teachers employ in various settings. He examined beliefs regarding self-efficacy and how those beliefs effect a teacher’s actions. As an individual’s self-efficacy increases, the individual will assume work that is more challenging, thrive on challenge, and find ways to combat challenges that could impede progress. Lindsley, Bass, and Thomas (1995) reveal the role of the leader is to provide the vision, support the mission, emphasize accomplishments, and provide feedback. Transformational leadership is a role to provide success using the mutual relationship between ability and results.

Bandura (1977) developed a social cognitive theory that included self-efficacy and identified a person’s beliefs to organize and fulfill goals to produce expected levels
of success. Bandura identified four sources for achieving self-efficacy, mastery experiences, physiological and emotional states, modeling, and social persuasion. Both organizations and individuals are influenced by the strength of the beliefs in self-efficacy. Bandura further commented on the motivation to complete goals successfully stating that goals are important when the group believes it is capable of completing a task.

Bandura (1977, 1986, and 1997) stated that belief in one’s self and support from a superior was central to accomplish a task. Bandura (2000) said that an individual’s personal efficacy influences behavior through goal setting, successful outcomes, and an individual’s perception in social or stratified difficulties. Individual’s who believe in their capability to succeed are more likely to accept challenges and persist with a task to completion, and adapt to challenges while achieving solutions for success.

Woolfolk, Roseoff, and Hoy (1990) studied efficacy beliefs and their change during teaching experience. These studies found student teachers’ felt a great sense of self-efficacy due to the support provided from colleagues and administration; yet those first year teachers, if not supported, lost the sense of self-efficacy. The importance of a strong induction program, which is followed by continuing support through the initial years of teaching, is critical to building self-efficacy. Hoy and Woolfolk (1993) also studied the importance of the administrator. Teachers thought administrators were effective if they provided support and protected teachers from unnecessary external pressures.

In the research conducted by Thoonen, Sleegers, Oort, Peetsma, & Geijsel (2011), they concluded in order to improve teaching practices, teachers’ need to be involved in professional development, especially in the area of experimentation and reflection.
Teacher sense of self-efficacy appeared to be the most important motivational factor for explaining teacher learning and teacher practices. Transformational leadership practices stimulate teachers’ professional learning and motivation and improve school organizational conditions. These researchers concluded school leaders need to foster learning and improve teaching practices and a combination of transformational leadership behaviors is needed.

Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk, Hoy, and Hoy (1998) conducted a study, which used Bandura’s four sources of efficacy. They developed an integrated model in which teacher efficacy is situational. Tschannen-Moran, Uline, Woolfolk, Hoy, and Mackley (2000) noted setting, subject, and circumstances could bias teacher efficacy. Their work provided knowledge that self-efficacy could be founded on knowledge, skill, and strategies balanced by personal perceptions regarding ability and a skill set.

Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk and Hoy (2001) developed a model using Bandura’s four sources of efficacy and added two more elements, task analysis, and teaching competence. This study provided information to administrators in the areas of teacher efficacy and positive school climate, which could be used with the teaching staff.

Milner (2002) used case studies to examine aspects of self-efficacy beliefs and identified sources of teachers’ perceived efficacy. Done in an urban setting through interviews with experienced teachers and supported by feedback from parents and students, he found more confidence in teacher performance, which in turn provided greater self-efficacy.

Teachers want a sense of ownership and need to be empowered to do their job effectively. People do not trust nor anticipate that the system will change. When leaders
develop a trustworthy system, people then begin to move much faster when the system tries to elicit change (Kouzes & Posner, 1993).

Self-efficacy is a teacher’s perception that s/he possesses the ability to improve student learning and the capacity to affect student performance (Short & Rinehart, 1992).

Blasé (1982) contends that self-efficacy increases as teachers acquire self-knowledge and believe that self-knowledge provides competency for them and affects student knowledge.

Garmston (2009) states that the creation of an emotionally safe environment which encourages teacher decision-making and risk-taking is fundamental to an empowered organization. Individuals who are risk-takers must understand that they control dimensions of context and process, and suggested they are expected to take responsibility for their own actions. He continues to emphasize cognitive coaching which impacts on teacher thinking and reflection allowing teachers to think in more reflective and complex ways.

Kouzes and Posner (1993) added that empowerment involves providing individual’s with choices and motivating individuals to accept the results of their actions.

Leithwood (1992) depicts transformational leadership as a resource for school leaders to develop collaborative relationships, improve school culture, and encourage staff to solve new problems. Leithwood (1996) maintains that developing and sustaining a school culture involves continuous encouragement with one another regarding ways to improve teaching. The transformational leader continuously supports the school culture and shared beliefs. Leithwood (1992, 1996) explained through shared commitment
toward goals, teachers are motivated to professional growth, which resulted in higher standards for the school community.

Bass (1997) showed work done by Leithwood (1996) which centered around three categories of leadership. These categories are reflected in transformational leadership practice and may be used to promote organizational improvement in different cultural contexts. Modeling, inspiring purpose, and providing rewards provide leaders with different strategies to spur growth in schools.

Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2006) work identified eight dimensions of transformational leadership and how it provides development for growth. The dimensions are building a school vision, building consensus to goals, providing intellectual stimulation, offering individualized support, modeling professional practices and values, demonstrating high performance expectations, developing structures to foster participation in school decisions, and strengthening school culture.

*Leadership and Gender*

Leadership at its most basic levels can be categorized as transformational or transactional in nature (Burns, 1978). Most of the research concludes transformational leaders are individuals who possess a great deal of charisma, vision, intellectual stimulation, and creativity (Komives, 1991). Thus, leading to the conclusion, one who is in an academic setting is expected to be dynamic, flexible, stimulating, and encouraging (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009).

The transformational leader will challenge his/her colleagues to find new solutions to existing problems, and seek to increase the ambitions of those with whom they work, empowering them to attain personal goals and expected outcomes.
Transactional leaders are believed to have a great impact on the skill set of followers. Transactional leadership is grounded in the concept of bureaucratic authority and authenticity. Burns (1978) reported transactional leaders focused more on the work, task-oriented goals and work standards. Transactional leaders also focused on completion of tasks and compliance with the demands of the organization.

The transactional leadership model, according to Stewart (2006) is grounded in the process of the leader making all decisions with little or no input from colleagues.

Transformational leadership embodies the idea all stakeholders are vital in the experience which is believed to produce benefits for both the leader and the follower; leaders are transformed into change agents and followers are developed into leaders (Stewart, 2006; Leithwood 1996, Bass 1985, and Burns, 1978).

It is imperative transformational leaders exhibit the ability to clearly articulate their ideas for the organization which they lead. They must also be viewed as credible sources of knowledge. Komives (1991) reported transformational leaders generally function from two motivations of power: personalized and socialized. Personalized transformational leaders are focused on a single vision and desire their followers to be dependent and submissive. In contrast, socialized transformational leaders seek to empower their followers, develop shared vision and value independence (Bass, 1990; Leithwood, 1996; & Burns, 1978).

In examination of the preferences of leadership held by each gender, it is useful to apply the indicators from the Myers-Briggs Scale (Myers & Myers, 1980). It is evident women tend toward the feeling preference while their male counterparts tend toward the thinking preference (Kelley, 1998). Brown & Reilly (2009) studied the possible
relationship between elements of personality as measured by the Myers-Briggs type indicator and transformational leadership as measured by the Multilevel Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1993). While their findings indicated no relationship between follower assessments of transformational leadership and leader personality as measured by the Multilevel Leadership Questionnaire, leaders did perceive themselves as significantly more transformational than those who were subordinate to them.

According to Bass and Avolio (2000), both transformational and transactional leadership constructs are dynamic and viable forms of leadership styles. Young, Beauchamp, Dowd and Dunningham’s (2004) study of leaders in higher education validated these findings by revealing that leaders typically exhibit equal amounts of transformational and transactional leadership traits in their communications with their subordinates during the first year in leadership positions.

When students evaluate professors for leadership styles, their preferences come to the forefront. The professor who teaches in a style which matches student expectations will be evaluated more favorably by students (Poulson, Smith, Hood, Arthur and Bazemore 2011).

Poulson, Smith, Hood, Arthur and Bazemore (2011) examined the impact of gender preferences in college students for transactional and transformational professorial leadership styles. Using information from The Professional Leadership Questionnaire, their data focused on seven items:

1. Mutuality of Learning
2. Flexibility in Coursework
3. Grade Orientation
4. Charisma

5. Student Success

6. Stimulating the Transformation of Students

7. Creativity of Assignments

Empirical findings from these data with respect to mutuality of learning showed women placed a higher value on the interchange which transformational leadership provides to them. With reference to flexibility in coursework, there was no significant difference between the genders. Klenke (1996) specified both genders indicated their value of incorporation of personal experiences into classes, where personal experiences came from both students and professors. Grade orientation provided no difference between genders with regard to grading of assignments. The charisma scale indicated both genders valued professors who show an interest in their subject as well as their students, but women had a higher preference for professors who worked to inspire them better than men did. Reviewing student success, women felt it was more important for their professors to believe they could meet with success more than their male counterparts. Women placed a higher value on professors who have a positive vision for their success. With regard to stimulating transformation, both men and women find it necessary that leaders transform them as people and prepare them for success. In the last section, which refers to the creativity of assignments for the course and the recognition of individual differences, women showed a higher preference for this type of behavior from professors (Poulson, Smith, Hood, Arthur & Bazemore, 2011).
The conclusion of this study indicates differences between genders in the preference for transformational and transactional leaders which indicates some elements are regarded more highly based on gender preferences.

Interestingly, leadership continues to be described in masculine terms. Masculine behaviors are still considered important for leadership. Individuals who exhibit these behaviors are still viewed with higher regard as leaders than those who do not exhibit these behaviors. To understand diversity in the workplace and to increase productivity, researchers must understand how gender intertwines with politics and practices. More research in gender and leadership could be helpful and is worthy of research because gender is directly related to perception of leadership style and effectiveness of leadership.

Research on how students perceive leadership styles of teachers suggests that style discriminates student outcomes but not instructional outcomes (Lashway, 2000).

Male students tend to view male instructors as exhibiting more active management styles while female students do not. Both genders agreed they thought poor instructors were those who employ passive management skills and do not seek extra effort from their students. Teachers who exhibited active management and had higher expectations for students were viewed more positively by both genders. Males tend to respond more favorably to transactional leaders who are task oriented, offer praise, and penalize poor behavior by withholding rewards (Lashway, 2000).

The survey reported by Lashway (2000) provides a basis for further research. While it supports the need for an organization rich in leadership, how that might be achieved requires study. Schools of today will not meet the needs of the students of tomorrow without a new mindset which gives way to new ideas and processes. Studies
of emergent leaders can provide useful information in light of how perceptions of male and female leaders are examined. Viewing these perceptions may provide means to identify strategies that allow both sexes to develop leadership potential. There is no evidence that women or other minorities develop a style that is different from their male counterparts. Women and other minorities have felt the need to exist within the prevailing culture; therefore, instruments used to this point to measure leadership of those groups do not fully reflect what leadership could be (Chemers, 1997).

Values are the other area which had not been developed. Researchers need to develop instruments which examine integrity, dedication, magnanimity, humility, openness, and creativity. Kouzes and Posner, (2002) found honesty to be the main quality followers want to see in leaders. It is not only these qualities people look for, but also what their leaders stand for and are willing to risk.

With research and knowledge available today, is it safe to assume these characteristics and behaviors would apply to school leadership? Many would respond, “Yes.” However, in reality, school leadership is viewed differently.

Public schools are non-profit, so there is no single standard of success (even testing is an ambiguous measurement). Public school leaders operate in a highly public domain, where every action is scrutinized, and every memo may become public record. Public schools are political institutions trying to please a diverse and often contentious society. Public schools have a near monopoly, meaning the competitive spirit that drives many businesses is lacking (Lashway, 2000).

In conclusion, studies show a direct link between behaviors of a leader and teacher efficacy but variance does exist. This can be attributed to leader behavior,
modeling, and providing contingent rewards. Teachers rely on their own a healthy school climate, judgment, experiences, and interactions with colleagues.

Summary

This chapter highlighted transformational leadership and how it is linked to teacher efficacy and school climate. It also discussed Bandura’s thinking regarding teacher efficacy and the perception of principal’s leadership style as defined through the use of the Multi-level Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). It also discussed the role of leadership in establishing a healthy school climate.

The next chapter will describe the design of the study to determine the links between transformational leadership and teacher efficacy and school climate.
CHAPTER III
Methodology

**Target Population**

This study focused on changing the behaviors of a transactional leader and the target population included two principals and the professional employees each supervised. This researcher met with the superintendent of the school district who identified two prospective administrators whose leadership style matched the independent variables included in the study. The researcher verified the superintendent’s perception by administration of the Multilevel Leadership Questionnaire (Bass & Avolio, 1993). The MLQ gave simulated situations and asked administrators how they would react. These reactions identified them as transformational or transactional.

The principal at elementary school B, identified by the MLQ as transactional, has been an elementary teacher for approximately twenty years, an assistant principal for three years, and a principal for seven years. The principal at elementary school A, identified as transformational, has been an elementary teacher for fifteen years and an elementary principal for three years.

In this study, teachers were administered a pre-test and a post-test of Bandura’s Scale of Teacher Efficacy, (Bandura’s Survey) which measured teacher efficacy, and the Organizational Health Inventory-Elementary (OHI-E) for teachers which measured the climate of the school. At this level the null hypothesis will be rejected if the level of significance is $\rho \leq .05$.

This study examined if transformational leadership resulted in a more healthy school climate and greater teacher efficacy. The first two dependent variables were
measured after selecting two elementary principals. School B included grades three through five while school A included grades one through five. The teachers in elementary school B came from six public colleges and one private college during their teacher training. The teachers at elementary school A came from five public colleges and two private colleges during their teacher training. The number of full-time equivalent staff in elementary school A is 27 while the number of full-time equivalent teachers in elementary school B is 18. The range of years of teaching experience in elementary school A is from three to 23 while the range of years of teaching experience in elementary school B is from three to 22. The number of non-white students in elementary school B is 59 while the number of non-white students in elementary school A is 60.

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of School A & School B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>School B</th>
<th>School A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of full-time teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time principal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of free lunch</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of reduced lunch</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years of teaching experience 3 – 22* 3-23*

of professional staff

Diversity of Teacher Training 7 7
(Number of schools)

Span of Grades 3-5 1-5

Ethnicity
Asian 20 3
African-American 20 38
Hispanic 20 17

* Teachers with less that three years teaching experience were excluded from the study

One of these principals had a transformational leadership style and the other had a transactional leadership style according to the operational definitions in Chapter 1. The principal at elementary school B was the transactional leader while the principal at elementary school A was the transformational leader. The researcher identified the principal’s leadership style during a conference with the district superintendent. The researcher verified the superintendent’s informal identification by administering the MLQ to each principal.

The MLQ, one of the benchmark measures of leadership, measures and explains key factors necessary for exceptional leaders. The MLQ measured a broad range of leadership types from passive leaders, to leaders who give contingent rewards to followers, to leaders who transform their followers into becoming leaders themselves. The MLQ is valid across cultures, different organizational types, and leadership levels. The results of the analysis at the item level demonstrated that these findings would apply when compared with other models.
Judge and Piccolo (2004) found the validities of both transformational and transactional leadership appear to be influenced by research design and the independence of data sources used in the particular study. Transformational leadership had a higher validity in cross-sectional ($\rho = .50$) than in longitudinal ($\rho = .27$) studies ($Z = 4.00, \rho < .01$) and a higher validity when both leadership and criteria were measured by the same ($\rho = .55$) than by different ($\rho = .28$) sources ($Z = 5.46, \rho < .01$). The same results are true for transactional leadership. Transactional leadership had higher validity in cross-sectional ($\rho = .49$) than in longitudinal ($\rho = .13$) studies ($Z = 4.44, \rho < .01$) and a higher validity when leadership and criteria were measured by the same ($\rho = .54$) than by different ($\rho = .15$) sources ($Z = 5.65, \rho < .01$).

Teachers who were assigned in the buildings with these principals completed Bandura’s Survey. Bandura’s Survey measured teacher efficacy through a thirty-item survey, which results in six subscale measures: Cross-validation to test for invariance in the pattern of factor loadings across the calibration and the validation sample was a test for invariance which comprised of specification of a model in which the number of factors and the pattern of loadings were invariant across two samples, specification of a model in which the pattern of factor loadings was constrained to be equal across two samples, and comparison of two models. Bandura’s Survey was evaluated on the chi-square likelihood ratio, the Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index, the Root Mean Square Residual, the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), the Normed Comparative Fit Index CFI), and the Parsimony Normed Comparative Fit Index (PCFI). To analyze TLI, CFI, and PCFI, null models were specified, models in which the variables were mutually independent. The fit of a model was considered to be acceptable if TEI and CFI exceeded 0.90. PCFI
was used to assess a model’s parsimony, which is especially useful when comparing models. Results indicated Chi Square a poor absolute fit, most probably caused by large sample size (Brouwers & Welco, 2003).

The final instrument used was the Organizational Health Inventory Elementary-(OHI-E) which measured the health of the organization. The (OHI-E) has five subscales: institutional integrity, collegial leadership, resource influence, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis.

Teachers who completed this survey were full-time professional employees, teaching in regular or special education and included teachers of art, music, physical education, and reading specialists. The hypothesis tested will determine if transformational leadership rather than transactional leadership results in a more healthy climate and greater teacher efficacy.

Method of Sampling

The sample of this study was a stratified sample which was derived from the entire teaching population at Building A and Building B. The sample included only those teachers who completed Bandura Scale and OHI-E. The criteria for eligibility in this study were: full-time professional employees assigned to each building for all duties.

The target population for the pretest was 18 teachers from building B whose leader followed a transactional style. After excluding teachers who did not complete of all portions of the instrument for the pretest the sample was six teachers who completed the OHI-E) and eight teachers who completed Bandura’s Scale. These teachers completed the survey in a manner which provided sufficient data to be analyzed. Due to
the rate of response, all teachers who met the criteria were included in the sample. This group was representative of the total population.

The target population consisted of teachers in the buildings who have an administrator whose leadership style was either transformational or transactional. This sample size produced a diverse group of teachers in both elementary schools who have from three to 23 years experience who have varying years in either or both of the elementary schools in the study and credentials from eight different public and private institutions. The sample was representative of the population.

*Measurement Devices*

This study used the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which measured each principal’s leadership across five dimensions: Charisma, Individualized consideration, Intellectual stimulation, Contingent reward, and Management by exception.

The second measurement device used in this study was Bandura’s Scale of Teacher Efficacy (Bandura, 1997) (see Appendix A) which measured teacher efficacy. This scale measures teacher efficacy through a thirty-item instrument. The scale returned six subscale measures. The instrument, developed in 1997, reports on efficacy to influence decision making, to influence school resources, to improve instructional efficacy, to improve disciplinary efficacy, to enlist parental involvement, to enlist community involvement, and to create a positive school climate. The instrument measured the belief teachers feel they have in the influencing students in their charge. The options for scoring were nothing, very little, some influence, quite a bit, and a great deal. This instrument provided a multi-faceted picture of teachers’ beliefs.
The Organizational Health Inventory (Elementary) was the final measurement device used in this study. It measured school climate and consisted of thirty-seven questions spread across five sub-categories: institutional integrity, collegial leadership, resources influences, teacher affiliation, and academic emphasis.

**Data Collection Method**

The teachers for the target population were asked to complete Bandura’s Scale and the OHI-E. Each principal delivered the survey instruments and returned the completed ones to the researcher. OHI-E measured school climate with a thirty-seven item survey. Each item had a four point Likert-type scale in which the choices were: Rarely Occurs, Seldom Occurs, Often Occurs, and Very Frequently Occurs. Bandura’s Scale measured teacher efficacy with a nine point scale which varied over a continuum of “Nothing” to “A Great Deal.”

To analyze the data from Bandura’s Scale, the responses were weighted using one for “Nothing” through nine for “A Great Deal.” The results were sorted by sub-category and the sum of all the responses for all of the items in a sub-category was calculated. From this, a mean for the sub-category was determined. A t-test for independent samples was analyzed for each sub-category.

To analyze the data from the OHI-E, the responses were weighted using a one for “Rarely Occurs” through four for “Very Frequently Occurs.” The results were sorted by sub-category and the sum of all the responses for all of the items in the sub-category was calculated. From this, a mean for the sub-category was determined. A t-test for independent samples was determined for each sub-category.
For each sub-category in both the OHI-E and Bandura’s Survey, the homogeneity of variance was tested using Levine’s Test for data from transformational and the transactional principal data. The values of the Levine’s Test were reported along with the t-test values for each sub-category. The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) was used for all calculations. For all tests, the level of statistical significance was $p \leq 0.05$

Research Design

This study was an experimental design using a stratified sample. The teachers with the building principal identified as transactional were the experimental group. The researcher provided an intervention for the transactional principal of elementary school B. Based on the results of the surveys administered, the data suggested three areas for intervention: the teaching staff was to be involved in the decision-making process when possible; the staff would be insulated from parental interruptions for curricular and/or social complaints; and the principal and staff would adhere to the district curriculum so that parents could not bring personal projects for the teaching staff to integrate into the daily curriculum. The principal and the researcher believed these three areas, based on the initial responses could influence teacher efficacy and school climate.

The study surveyed two groups of professional employees and two administrators and analyzed the data provided. Each group used the same survey instruments. The administrator in both elementary schools completed the MLQ. The teachers from both groups completed Bandura’s Scale and the OHI-E as a pretest to establish base line data. Data were collected from Bandura’s Scale, the Organizational Health Inventory, and the MLQ. After the administration of the surveys, the data were analyzed and comparisons made according to definitions of transformational and transactional leadership.
A posttest was administered three months later in Building B which teachers repeated Bandura’s Scale and the OHI-E. Those survey results are compared in the next chapter with the pretest data in addition to the changes implemented by the transactional principal to determine any significant changes in administrator behavior in the period between the pretest and the posttest.
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Results

The study involved professional staff from a school whose building administrator was a transactional (School B) leader and a staff from a building whose leader was a transformational leader (School A) as determined by the MLQ. The MLQ is an instrument of leadership, which measures and explains key factors necessary for exceptional leaders. MLQ measures a broad range of leadership styles from passive leaders, to leaders who give contingent rewards to followers and to leaders who transform followers into leaders themselves. The MLQ is valid across cultures, different organizational types, and leadership levels. The results of the analysis at the item level demonstrated that these findings would apply when compared with other models (Bass & Avolio, 2000).

Bandura’s Scale and the OHI-E were administered as pretests to the qualifying professional staff (School A & School B). The individual teachers had to be full-time professional employees at each building to participate in the study.

Following the analysis of the data, the principal at School B and the researcher selected three areas for intervention. After a twelve week intervention period, Bandura Scale and OHI-E were administered a second time to determine if the interventions altered teacher efficacy or if there was improvement in the school climate.

In the OHI-E, the professional staff rated the thirty-seven item questionnaire across five subcategories: Instructional Integrity, Collegial Leadership, Resource Influence, Teacher Affiliation, and Academic Influence (See Appendix A for the individual items on the inventory). Teachers responded with a four point Likert-type
scale in which the choices were: Rarely Occurs, Seldom Occurs, Often Occurs, and Very Frequently Occurs. The responses were weighted on a four-point scale with the direction depending on the nature of the item.

The responses in both measures were categorized by sub-category and a total calculated by sub-category. The mean and standard deviation were calculated for each sub-category. On these data, a t-test for independent samples was used to determine if the results for each sub-category were significant at the .05 level.

Data Analysis

Ohio Health Inventory-Elementary

Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Err. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrity</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influence</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affiliation</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In reporting the data from this administration of the OHI-E, there was little difference among the means. Based upon this, there was little expectation of statistical significance between the groups. The means for the teachers in School A were greater than the means for School B in (institutional integrity, collegial leadership, teacher affiliation and academic emphasis). In the sub-category resource influence, the mean in School B was greater that from School A.

Table III

*Ohio Health Inventory – Elementary*

*Levene’s test for equality of variances for School A and School B*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional integrity</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial leadership</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource influence</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher affiliation</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic emphasis</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>3.572</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be certain that the samples were similar, Levene’s test of equality of variances was applied. This test found no significant differences among the variances on the sub-categories in the variances at the .05 level (.603, .939, .888, .677, and .078.)
The data from the first administration of the OHI-E was gathered and a t-test for the equality of means gave a statistical significance for the sub-categories of collegial leadership \( (t= 2.728, \ p=.012) \) and academic emphasis \( (t= 4.897, \ p=.000) \). The t-test for the other sub-categories in School A and School B were not statistically significant. The sample size in School B involved only six participants so the results need to be considered with caution.
Table V

Ohio Health Inventory-Elementary
Grouped results from School B pre and post administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>School B Pre-test</th>
<th>School B Post-test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Err. Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional integrity</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial leadership</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource influence</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher affiliation</td>
<td>School B Pre-Test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic emphasis</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In reporting the data from the administration of the OHI-E pre and post-test for School B, after interventions, there were little differences between the means for the two administrations. In two sub-categories, instructional integrity, and teacher affiliation, the means increased in the second administration following the interventions. In all other sub-categories, the means were greater during the first administration which is not what was expected. Again the small sample size in the pre-test and larger size in the second (6 and 14) post-test sample are of concern and the results need to be considered with much caution.
Table VI

Ohio Health Inventory – Elementary School B pre-test & post test
Levene’s test for equality of variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional integrity</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial leadership</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>.565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource influence</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher affiliation</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic emphasis</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine if the samples were similar, Levine’s test of equality of variances was applied to the data at the .05 level. None of the sub-categories had a significant difference among variances.
The data from the administrations of the OHI-E in building B (pre-test and post-test) were analyzed using a t-test for the equality of means. One sub-category (academic emphasis) resulted in a statistically significant difference (t= 2.453, ρ = .025). This result followed the twelve week intervention period. For all the other sub-categories, there were no significant differences. The sample sizes between the two administrations were six and fourteen so the results need to be considered with caution. The second instrument administered was Bandura’s Scale. This instrument is designed to gain an understanding of situations, which create difficulty for teachers in their daily activities. Using this instrument professional staff rated thirty items across seven categories: efficacy to

Table VII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err. Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional integrity</td>
<td>Equal var.</td>
<td>-.473</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegial leadership</td>
<td>Assumed</td>
<td>1.837</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource influence</td>
<td>Equal var.</td>
<td>1.609</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher affiliation</td>
<td>Assumed</td>
<td>-.898</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic emphasis</td>
<td>Equal var.</td>
<td>2.453</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ohio Health Inventory-E Elementary School B pre and post-test
t-test for equality of means
influence decision making, efficacy to influence school resources, instructional self-efficacy, disciplinary self-efficacy, efficacy to enlist parent involvement, efficacy to enlist community involvement, and efficacy to create a positive school climate. Teachers responded to a nine point, Likert-type scale, on a continuum where the major points were Nothing, Very Little, Some Influence, Quite a Bit, and A Great Deal. First, the responses were weighted on a nine-point scale with the direction depending on the nature of the item. The responses for all of the items in a sub-category were totaled and a mean for each sub-category determined. A t-test for independent samples was applied to determine if any of the means were significant. After the first administration this researcher met with the building principal at School B and reviewed the data gathered. Based on that review, three interventions were developed. The researcher and the principal met on a weekly basis about implementing the strategies for the interventions. The interventions were: adherence to the curriculum, not allowing parental interference for projects and shared decision-making in the areas of resource allocation.
Table VIII

_Bandura’s Scale of Teacher Efficacy_
_Grouped Results from School A and B_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>N School</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed dec. mkg.</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence sch. resources</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instit. self efficacy</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline self efficacy</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist parental involvement</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>1.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist comm. involvement</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create positive school climate</td>
<td>School A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>1.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>.890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When reviewing the data from this administration of Bandura’s Scale, the mean from School A was greater than the mean from School B for all but one category (enlist parental involvement). This was an anticipated result. All the means are similar.
The samples were analyzed using Levine’s test for equality of variances. The test found no significant difference in the variances of the samples on any of the seven sub-scales. This indicates that the samples were similar.
Table X

*Bandura’s Scale of Teacher Efficacy*

*Levene’s test for equality of variances*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err. Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed decision mkg.</td>
<td>Equal var.</td>
<td>2.380</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence sch. resources</td>
<td>Equal var.</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instit. self efficacy</td>
<td>Equal var.</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline self efficacy</td>
<td>Equal var.</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist parental involvement</td>
<td>Equal var.</td>
<td>-.974</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>-.642</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist comm. involvement</td>
<td>Equal var.</td>
<td>2.201</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create positive school climate</td>
<td>Equal var.</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.736</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data from the first administration of the Bandura Scale was gathered and a t-test for the equality of means gave a statistically significant difference for sub-category ρ informed decision making (t=2.20, ρ=.044). The t-tests for the other sub categories were not significant. The sample sizes in both schools were small so the results need to be considered with caution.
Table XI

Bandura’s Scale of Teacher Efficacy
Group Characteristics – School B Pre-test & School B Post Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed dec. mkg.</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.217</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.726</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence sch. resources</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>1.727</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.859</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instit. self efficacy</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline self efficacy</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1.139</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist parental involvement</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>1.671</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist comm. involvement</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create positive school climate</td>
<td>School B Pre-test</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School B Post-test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bandura’s Scale was administered to the teachers in School B following the implementation of the interventions. In three of the sub-categories the results show the mean increasing for sub-categories informed decision making, institutional control of resources and enlisting community involvement. In the other sub-categories, the mean decreased after the interventions were implemented.
Table XII

*Bandura’s Scale of Teacher Efficacy*

*Levene’s test for equality of variances – School B Pre-test & School B Post-test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed dec. mkg.</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>3.568</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence sch. resources</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instit. self efficacy</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>5.233</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline self efficacy</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist parental involvement</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist comm. involvement</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>2.005</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create positive school climate</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine if the samples were similar, Levene’s t-test for equality of variances was applied. One sub-category (institutional self-efficacy was significant (f= 5.233, ρ= .033). This indicates variances in the sub-category and raises the possibility that the samples are not similar. All other values for the test were not significant.
The data from the second administration of Bandura’s Scale was gathered and analyzed using a t-test for the equality of the means. Two sub-categories (enlist parental involvement ($t=2.12, \rho=.47$) and create a positive climate ($t=2.155, \rho=.044$)) were statistically significant.

Table XIII

*Bandura’s Scale of Teacher Efficacy*

$t$-test for equality of means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category</th>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Std. Err. Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed dec. mkg.</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>-1.414</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>-.982</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instit. control of resources</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.948</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instit. self efficacy</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>1.725</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline self efficacy</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist parental involvement</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>2.121</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>1.470</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlist comm. involvement</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>-.214</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>.708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create positive climate</td>
<td>Equal var. assumed</td>
<td>2.155</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
Discussion

The present study was designed to investigate if transformational leadership was a factor in improving teacher efficacy and school climate. It focused on differences in perceptions and attitudes of teachers who worked in a building with a principal who used a transformational leadership compared with a principal who used transactional leadership. It sought to examine any relationship between transformational leadership and organizational climate. This study also examined any relationship between transformational leadership and its influence on teacher efficacy.

Sergiovanni (2007) views the role of principal as instructional leader and transformational leadership as the style which best meets the needs of all stakeholders in the academic process. This approach advocates a shared leadership in which school administrators, along with faculty and staff, participate in decision-making focused on effective curriculum development and instructional practices. His research shows that transformational leaders seek to inspire and empower members of the organization to focus on a common vision and take ownership of the change process through a collaborative approach. This type of leadership encourages teachers to focus on the organizational purpose, shared beliefs, and team member responsibility. The leader is more concerned with the process of how to get results, rather than the results. The members of the organization are given the opportunity to determine the best path to take to reach goals, insuring the pathway meshes with the organizational beliefs and purposes. The focus on a shared vision and collaboration builds a strong school culture and commitment of faculty and staff. While other styles can incorporate these characteristics,
the research indicates transformational leadership leads to a strong incorporation of these characteristics.

Previous chapters dealt with an introduction, a review of the relevant literature, and a statement of the hypotheses. Procedures, methodology, data collection, description of analyses, and findings of the study followed in later chapters. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the findings driven by the research questions, discuss implications and interpretations, draw conclusions, and propose possible areas for further research as it pertains to the concepts of transformational leadership, teacher efficacy and organizational climate.

Two questions constituted the essence of this study. Is there a relationship between transformational leadership and teacher efficacy? Is there a relationship between transformational leadership and a healthy school climate? These questions resulted in two hypotheses which were tested with statistical inferences.

**Hypothesis 1**

H1: There will be a significant increase in teacher efficacy in schools whose leaders are transformational leaders as opposed to transactional leaders.

Bandura’s Scale of Teacher Efficacy was the instrument used to measure teacher efficacy. For the pre-test between a control group and an experimental group, there were two sub-categories which showed a significant difference, informed decision making and enlisting community involvement. All the other sub-categories did not produce any statistically significant results. For those cases, the null hypothesis would be accepted.

After an intervention, a second administration of the Bandura Scale produced a post-test sample. A comparison of the first administration with the subsequent
administration after the interventions did not show a significant difference for the same sub-categories. Two sub-categories produced significant differences, and these were enlisting parental involvement and creating a positive school climate. It could be argued that the interventions did produce some type of change in teacher efficacy.

The research does not support the findings. According to Demir (2008), leadership influences teacher efficacy. Teachers who feel comfortable in an organization, believe they have a share in the mission, and feel supported by their building administrator have a higher sense of self-efficacy. In discussion of transformational leadership and collective efficacy, Demir (2008) states that previous research has found that teacher beliefs about their individual and collective capacity and collaborative culture are greatly influenced by transformational leadership.

However, the small size of the initial group in the experimental school casts doubt on such an interpretation. The short period over which the interventions occurred may also have contributed to the results in a negative manner.

This was in contrast to what was learned in the review of literature. Yukl (1998) claims a transformational leader articulates the vision in a clear and appealing manner, explains how to attain the vision, acts confidently and optimistically, expresses confidence in the followers, emphasizes values with symbolic actions, leads by example, and empowers followers to achieve the vision.

Bass (2000) asserts transformational leadership occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of employees, when they generate acceptance and awareness of the mission and purpose of the group, and when they move employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group.
Bass and Riggio (2006) share the view that transformational leadership is intellectual stimulation that encourages the delivery of content of teaching and learning.

Hoy and Miskel (2005) contend transformational leaders stimulate followers to be more innovative by questioning old assumptions and approaching old situations in new ways.

With the exception of two sub-categories, the results of this study did not agree with the findings in the review of the literature. This does not imply that this researcher questions the findings of such research, but the results of this study are not congruent with that research.

Hypothesis 2

H2: There will be a significant increase in school climate in schools whose leaders are transformational leaders as opposed to transactional leaders.

The OHI-E was used to measure school climate. When comparing the control group with the experimental group, the results were significant for two sub-categories, collegial leadership and academic emphasis. None of the other sub-categories measured significant differences and the null hypotheses would be accepted. Those other sub-categories were instructional integrity, resource influence, and teacher affiliation.

After an intervention, a second administration of the OHI-E produced a post-test sample. A comparison of the first administration with the subsequent administration after the interventions showed a significant difference for the same sub-category, academic emphasis. This is important because it was the only instance when the results in the comparison of the experimental group with the control group and the subsequent results from the second administration in the experimental group showed consistent
improvement. This was the strongest relationship found in the study, and in this area, the null hypothesis is rejected with more certainty than any other result.

Conclusions

It could be theorized that the interventions did cause some type of change in school climate, however limited that change was. The small sample size in the initial administration of the instrument and the brief intervention period make substantiating this conclusion uncertain.

To conclude, the results of the data analysis did not support the research findings in all but very limited circumstances. This was not the result the researcher expected, but the data cannot support any other conclusion.

The research suggested an overwhelmingly positive correlation between transformational leadership and school climate. Transformational leadership forms the foundation of recent leadership studies. It focused on the more personal side of organizational interactions. Words such as climate, vision, values, development, teamwork, and service describe transformational leadership. Transformational leadership promotes interpersonal relationships and fosters communication. Transformational leaders meet the needs and wants of their followers instead of driving them through the exercise of power. Leaders remain sensitive to their higher purposes (Bass, 2000).

Elmore (2004) advocates shared decision-making (participatory management) as one of the most important components of transformational leadership. Shared decision making is shared leadership. This approach energizes the staff from the bottom up, rather than expectations from the top down. Leadership roles are taken on by faculty and staff with the most expertise or experience to provide guidance to the organization. Elmore
(2004) advocates this process produces a climate of collegiality and collaboration, in which the school community embraces a shared vision and shared commitment to school change.

Friedman (2004) found transformational leadership changes the workplace culture and productivity by appealing to high ideals, by changing assumptions and by building commitment to common goals and objectives. Korkmaz (2007) also found transformational leadership had a positive impact on teacher job satisfaction, which leads to a strong impact on school climate.

Transformational leadership serves as a balance which promotes exchange and elevates the ideas. This encourages followers to transcend their self-interests and develop goals for the good of the order. Transformational leadership promotes empowerment which is attained through participatory management and shared decision-making (Jung & Avolio, 2000).

Implications for Future Research

As a result of the findings of this study, the following recommendations are offered:

1. This study could be replicated over a longer time period for implementing more interventions to change the behavior of the principal. The results in this study demonstrate the difficulty in changing leadership behavior. The research indicates principal behaviors are difficult to change due to many intangible variables. These results are substantiated in this study.

2. This study could be replicated involving a larger cross-section of principals and teachers from different school districts. This would provide more in-depth information in greater detail regarding transformational and transactional, or
blended styles of leadership, and the effect they have on school climate and teacher efficacy.

3. This study could be replicated within an entire school district using both elementary and secondary schools. All principals would be chosen according to their leadership styles using the MLQ. After this a pre-test would be administered using the OHI and Bandura’s Scale. Interventions resulting from building needs of the transactional group would be implemented over a school year. After a school year, the OHI and Bandura’s Scale would be administered as a post-test to indicate if the results would be higher measures of climate and efficacy. An experimental study including both the control and experimental groups could examine climate and efficacy change in both groups on the basis of maturation of the time teachers and the principal worked together. It would be interesting to examine if principals became more transformational after working with a group of teachers over an extended period.

4. This study could be replicated to determine if demographic factors such as education experience, length of experience as a principal, type of educational background, gender, and race have any effect on the development of leadership styles of the principal.

5. This study could be replicated with a superintendent’s leadership style and its impact on principals who may become more or less transformational in the perceptions of their teachers. OHI and Bandura’s Scale could be used to measure teachers’ perception of efficacy and the school climate.
6. This study could be replicated using other factors such as changes in state and national standards and how they impact on teacher efficacy and school climate.

7. This study could be replicated as a historical study that reviewed leadership styles at different times in history and any link with major curriculum changes.

8. This study could be replicated using instruments to determine teacher perceptions of building and district leadership styles.

9. This study could be replicated using qualitative measures with principals and teachers.

10. This study could be replicated reviewing the impact programs such as Learning Focused Schools and other major emphases have on teacher perceptions of teacher efficacy and school climate.

**Summary**

Transformational leadership is important in promoting and managing school development by influencing teachers both directly and indirectly. Research indicates transformational leadership practices supply a link to teacher outcomes and teacher beliefs regarding their individual and collective ability in addition to their collective capacity (Demir, 2008).

The literature indicated that structure and support go together within a climate of trust established by the principal. Education leaders are those principals who inspire through creation of trust among their followers.

This study contributed to understanding the differences between principals who inspire and foster a positive school climate to encourage teaching and learning and those principal who do not. Leadership remains difficult to understand because of the many
factors which influence the principal. Research was conducted on two schools which had
principals with differing leadership styles to indicate if one was a better forecaster of
teacher efficacy and positive school climate.
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Appendix A
Ohio Health Inventory - Elementary

DIRECTIONS: THE FOLLOWING ARE STATEMENTS THAT ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL. PLEASE INDICATE THE EXTENT TO WHICH EACH STATEMENT CHARACTERIZES YOUR SCHOOL BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

RO=RARELY OCCURS  SO=SOMETIMES OCCURS  O=OFTEN OCCURS  VFO=VERY FREQUENTLY OCCURS

1. The principal explores all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist
   RO  SO  O  VFO

2. The principal gets what he or she asks for from superiors
   RO  SO  O  VFO

3. The principal discusses classroom issues with teachers
   RO  SO  O  VFO

4. The principal accepts questions without appearing to snub or quash the teacher
   RO  SO  O  VFO

5. Extra materials are available if requested
   RO  SO  O  VFO

6. Students neglect to complete homework
   RO  SO  O  VFO

7. Students are cooperative during classroom instruction
   RO  SO  O  VFO

8. The school is vulnerable to outside pressures
   RO  SO  O  VFO

9. The principal is able to influence the actions of his or her superiors
   RO  SO  O  VFO

10. The principal treats all faculty members as his or her equal
    RO  SO  O  VFO

11. The principal goes out of his or her way to show appreciation to teachers
    RO  SO  O  VFO
12. Teachers are provided with adequate materials for their classrooms

13. Teachers in this school like each other

14. Community demands are accepted even when they are not consistent with the educational program

15. The principal lets faculty know what is expected of them

16. Teachers receive necessary classroom supplies

17. The principal conducts meaningful evaluations

18. Students respect others who get good grades

19. Teachers feel pressure from the community

20. The principal's recommendations are given serious consideration by his or her superiors

21. The principal maintains definite standards of performance

22. Supplementary materials are available for classroom use

23. Teachers exhibit friendliness to each other

24. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades.

25. Select citizen groups are influential with the board.
26. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of faculty members
   RO SO O VFO

27. Teachers express pride in their school
   RO SO O VFO

28. Teachers identify with the school
   RO SO O VFO

29. The school is open to the whims of the public
   RO SO O VFO

30. A few vocal parents can change school policy.
   RO SO O VFO

31. Students try hard to improve on previous work
   RO SO O VFO

32. Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm
   RO SO O VFO

33. The learning environment is orderly and serious
   RO SO O VFO

34. The principal is friendly and approachable
   RO SO O VFO

35. There is a feeling of trust and confidence among the staff
   RO SO O VFO

36. Teachers show commitment to their students
   RO SO O VFO

37. Teachers are indifferent to each other
   RO SO O VFO
Appendix B
BANDURA’S INSTRUMENT TEACHER SELF-EFFICACY SCALE

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinions about each of the statements below by circling the appropriate number. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential and will not be identified by name.

**Efficacy to Influence Decision making**

How much can you influence the decisions that are made in the school?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you express your views freely on important school matters?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

**Efficacy to Influence School Resources**

How much can you do to get the instructional materials and equipment you need?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

**Instructional Self-Efficacy**

How much can you do to influence the class sizes in your school?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to get through to the most difficult students?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to promote learning when there is lack of support from the home?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal
How much can you do to keep students on task on difficult assignments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Nothing | Very Little | Some Influence | Quite a Bit | A Great Deal |

How much can you do to increase students’ memory of what they have been taught in previous lessons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Nothing | Very Little | Some Influence | Quite a Bit | A Great Deal |

How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Nothing | Very Little | Some Influence | Quite a Bit | A Great Deal |

How much can you do to get students to work together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Nothing | Very Little | Some Influence | Quite a Bit | A Great Deal |

How much can you do to overcome the influence of adverse community conditions on students’ learning?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Nothing | Very Little | Some Influence | Quite a Bit | A Great Deal |

How much can you do to get children to do their homework?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Nothing | Very Little | Some Influence | Quite a Bit | A Great Deal |

Disciplinary Self-Efficacy

How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Nothing | Very Little | Some Influence | Quite a Bit | A Great Deal |

How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Nothing | Very Little | Some Influence | Quite a Bit | A Great Deal |
How much can you do to prevent problem behavior on the school grounds?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

Efficacy to Enlist Parental Involvement

How much can you do to get parents to become involved in school activities?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you assist parents in helping their children do well in school?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to make parents feel comfortable coming to school?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

Efficacy to Enlist Community Involvement

How much can you do to get community groups involved in working with the schools?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to get churches involved in working with the school?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to get businesses involved in working with the school?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to get local colleges and universities involved in working with the school?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal
Efficacy to Create a Positive School Climate

How much can you do to make the school a safe place?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to make students enjoy coming to school?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to get students to trust teachers?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you help other teachers with their teaching skills?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to enhance collaboration between teachers and the administration to make the school run effectively?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to reduce school dropout?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to reduce school absenteeism?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal

How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Nothing Very Little Some Influence Quite a Bit A Great Deal