

5-1-2007

**Central Mississippi teachers' perceptions of effective behaviors of principals trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training Module (OSL)**

Spurgeon Banyard

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td>

---

**Recommended Citation**

Banyard, Spurgeon, "Central Mississippi teachers' perceptions of effective behaviors of principals trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training Module (OSL)" (2007). *Theses and Dissertations*. 979. <https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/td/979>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Scholars Junction. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholars Junction. For more information, please contact [scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com](mailto:scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com).

CENTRAL MISSISSIPPI TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF EFFECTIVE  
BEHAVIORS OF PRINCIPALS TRAINED USING THE  
ORIENTATION FOR SCHOOL LEADERS  
TRAINING MODULE (OSL)

By

Spurgeon Banyard

A Dissertation  
Submitted to the Faculty of  
Mississippi State University  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
in Elementary, Middle School, Secondary Education Administration  
in the Department of Instructional Systems, Leadership and Workforce Development

Mississippi State, Mississippi

August 2007

Copyright by  
Spurgeon Banyard  
2007

CENTRAL MISSISSIPPI'S TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF EFFECTIVE  
BEHAVIORS OF PRINCIPALS TRAINED USING THE  
ORIENTATION FOR SCHOOL LEADERS  
TRAINING MODULE (OSL)

By

Spurgeon Banyard

Approved:

---

Jerry Mathews  
Associate Professor and Graduate  
Coordinator  
Instructional Systems, Leadership,  
& Workforce Development  
(Director of Dissertation)

---

Mary L. Alexander  
Assistant Professor  
Office of the President  
(Committee Member)

---

Ed Davis  
Assistant Professor  
Instructional Systems, Leadership,  
& Workforce Development  
(Committee Member)

---

Mabel CPO Okojie  
Associate Professor  
Instructional Systems, Leadership &  
Workforce Development  
(Committee Member)

---

Richard Blackburn  
Dean/Professor  
College Of Education

Name: Spurgeon Andrae Banyard

Date of Degree: August 11, 2007

Institution: Mississippi State University

Major Field: Instructional Systems, Leadership, and Workforce Development  
(Education Administration)

Major Professor: Dr. Jerry Mathews

Title of the Study: CENTRAL MISSISSIPPI'S TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF  
EFFECTIVE BEHAVIORS OF PRINCIPALS TRAINED USING  
THE ORIENTATION FOR SCHOOL LEADERS TRAINING  
MODULE (OSL)

Pages in Study: 95

Candidate for Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' perceptions of administrators who completed Mississippi's Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module. This study was conducted with an emphasis on determining whether school administrators who have been trained using OSL were implementing the knowledge gained from the training to be deemed effective in the areas of school governance, instructional leadership, and school culture and climate. Participants in this study consisted of a population of 109 teachers from Central Mississippi. This study used a causal comparative research design to examine differences among teachers' perceptions of the principals' leadership qualities. The instrument used was the *Principal Leadership Profile* that served to provide current information about Mississippi

administrators' implementation of strategies that coincide with school governance, instructional leadership, and culture and climate. The participants' responses were recorded and reported in tables in the form of percentages and frequencies. In addition, the t-test and the F-ratio were conducted to determine if differences existed among teachers. The majority of the teachers in this study seemed to have a positive view of their principals' leadership effectiveness. In each of the individual categories of leadership that were assessed, teachers appeared to have a favorable view of the principals' performance. This could be viewed by many as indicative of the efficacy of the OSL training program. A review of the analysis of each of the sections suggests that there is widespread support from the teachers for the performance of the principals as educational leaders.

## DEDICATION

I dedicate this research to my mother, Ms. Ruby J. Banyard, and my late grandmother, Mrs. Willie Mae Thomas. Neither of them was educated, but they taught me the value of an education at a very early age. They were my role models through their many selfless acts, hard work, and dedication in providing a better life for their children and families.

I also dedicate this research to my late grandfather, Mr. Curtis Thomas. He taught me the responsibility of being a man at a very young age. I learned from his many selfless acts of kindness, the willingness to help others, and the Christianity that he instilled in all of his grandchildren. I am a product of my grandfather's rearing of me. I try to live my life through the many teachings that I received from him. I love you, Mr. Curtis Thomas.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgements of this document start with my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. I am so grateful to him for giving me the strength, patience, endurance, and guidance to complete this task. I am grateful to Dr. Jerry Mathews, my dissertation director, who guided me so that completion of this task became a reality. Dr. Mathews not only served as my dissertation chair, but he also became a friend.

I would like to express my gratitude to my other committee members, Dr. Mary Alexander, Dr. Ed Davis, and Dr. Okoje for their time and efforts in helping make this research a success. A special thanks is also given to Dr. Mary Alexander for her direction and guidance throughout graduate school and for serving on my committee.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Mrs. Katherine Tankson, Dr. Clifton Addison, Dr. Valerie Bradley, Mr. Stephen Bailey, and Dr. Frederick Murray for being my mentors and for their support and guidance throughout my educational career. It is my goal to profoundly effect change in education.

To my father, Spurgeon Stamps, Jr., I thank you for the tough love and patience you showed me by always listening and understanding a sometimes troubled young man.

To my mother, Ruby Jean Banyard, I owe you for everything that I have and who I am today. I would not trade you for any other mother in the world. I thank you for always being there for me, for seeing the best in me, and for always pushing me to be my best.

My deepest and most sincere appreciation goes to my wife, Katrina Banyard. Words cannot express how much I appreciate the support you have shown me throughout my life; more specifically, the support you have given me in pursuit of my degree. I appreciate the love and humbleness you have bestowed upon our family. Thank you for my beautiful daughters, Kaylin and Taylor Banyard, whom we love so much. They bring so much joy into our lives.

I appreciate the encouragement from my sister Sheila and my brother Sherrod, for they also encouraged me “to be all I can be.” A special thanks goes to my nephew DeMarious Banyard, who has shown me toughness, courage, belief, and the mentality to stay focused and overcome all adversities.

Last, but certainly not least, I thank Dr. Frederick Murray, a talented young man, for his help with this research and encouraging words. To the countless number of supporters whom I do not have room to name, I thank you also for your prayers and moral support while on this journey.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study .....	4
Significance of the Study .....	4
Research Questions .....	5
Definitions of Terms .....	7
Methodology Overview .....	9
Limitations of the Study.....	9
Delimitations.....	10
Assumptions.....	10
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	11
Reform of Leadership Preparation Programs in Mississippi .....	12
Mississippi’s Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module Training.....	14
School Governance .....	15
Teachers’ Perceptions of School Administrators.....	17
Instructional Leadership.....	18
Culture and Climate .....	21
Principals’ Professional Development.....	24
III. METHODOLOGY .....	26
Research Design.....	26
Participants.....	27
Data Analysis .....	28
Data Collection Procedures.....	32
Instrumentation .....	33

IV.	RESULTS .....	35
	Demographic Characteristics .....	37
	School Governance .....	46
	Instructional Leadership.....	47
	Culture and Climate .....	48
	Summary .....	71
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	72
	Summary .....	72
	School Governance .....	73
	Instructional Leadership.....	73
	Culture and Climate .....	73
	Research Questions .....	73
	Conclusions.....	81
	Recommendations.....	83
	REFERENCES .....	85
	APPENDIX	
	A ACTUAL RESPONSES.....	91
	B IRB APPROVAL LETTER .....	94

## LIST OF TABLES

1	Study Group Demographic Characteristics .....	40
2	Percentages of Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Leadership Effectiveness .....	45
3	Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Leadership Effectiveness on School Governance .....	47
4	Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Leadership Effectiveness on Instructional Leadership.....	48
5	Percentages of Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Leadership Effectiveness on Culture and Climate .....	49
6	T-Test-Gender Differences in Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Performance .....	50
7	ANOVA – Differences in Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Performance Based on Teachers Race .....	52
8	Tukey Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons Based on Race .....	52
9	T-Test – Differences in Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Performance Based on Principal’s Gender.....	54
10	T-Test – Differences in Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Performance Based on Principal’s Race .....	56
11	ANOVA – Differences in Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Performance Based on Type of School .....	58
12	Post Hoc—Multiple Comparisons Based on Type of School.....	60
13	ANOVA – Differences in Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Performance Based on School Accreditation.....	61

14	ANOVA – Differences in Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Performance Based on Teachers’ Years of Experience .....	64
15	Post Hoc—Multiple Comparisons Based on Teachers’ Years of Experience.....	67
16	ANOVA – Differences in Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Performance Based on Teachers’ Years at the Current Location .....	69
17	Post Hoc—Multiple Comparisons Based on Teachers’ Years in the Current Location .....	71

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The principalship has often been characterized as one of the most demanding, satisfying and widely sought leadership positions in education (Moore & Ditzhazy, 2000). Superintendents and local school boards can no longer be satisfied with principals who simply place teachers in classrooms, provide textbooks and get students to attend schools. Schools and school leaders are being held accountable for the achievement of all students, not just the best students, as in the past (Bottoms, 2001). School leaders need to have an in-depth knowledge of curriculum, instruction and student achievement.

The emphasis on accountability that requires (a) higher standards as measured by test scores, (b) decentralized decision making for schools, and (c) increased site-based management, has placed even greater responsibility on the principal. The demands may seem overwhelming and the solutions difficult or impossible (Moore & Ditzhazy, 2000). According to Hale and Moorman (2003), implementing the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 is forcing the educational community to confront the weaknesses of contemporary school leadership. NCLB also made it impossible to ignore the escalating need for higher quality principals, which Hale and Moorman defined as individuals who are equipped with the ability to provide the instructional leadership necessary to improve student achievement.

Administrators are being held accountable for performance of their school, yet current administrative preparation programs typically fail to provide appropriate tools to manage effectively (Hershberg, Simon, & Lea-Kruger, 2004). Farkas (2001) found that principals across the nation agree that administrator training programs deserve an “F.” In a survey of educational leaders, conducted by Public Agenda, 69% of the principals responding indicated that traditional leadership preparation programs were operating in a manner inconsistent with practices generally endorsed for managing today’s schools (Farkas, 2001). The nation is now confronted by (a) a profound disconnect between pre- and in-service training, (b) the current realities and demands of the job, and (c) the capacity of school leaders to be instructional leaders (Hale & Moorman, 2003).

In 1994, Mississippi took a lead role in using the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards to restructure universities’ administrator preparation programs (Public Education Forum of Mississippi, 2003). The Mississippi Department of Education (MDE) established a statewide task force to study administrator preparation and certification in hopes of reforming the state’s preparation programs and certification procedures (Mississippi Department of Education, 1994). The state superintendent of education appointed the Administrator Preparation and Certification Task Force to focus on the importance of the role of the leader in achieving school improvement. The goal was to enhance significantly the quality of educational leadership. One critical element was the implementation of a new Orientation for School Leaders (OSL) Training Module (Office of Leadership, MDE, 1995).

An integral component of Orientation for School Leaders Training was and still is the successful completion of several projects that each participant carries out in his/her district or school. Projects involve knowledge of personality/leadership styles and teamwork in addition to providing opportunities to practice skills needed for the administrator to be an effective (a) change agent, (b) human resource manager, and (c) an instructional leader (OSL Module, [www.mde.k12.ms.us/lead/olde/OSL\\_Module.html](http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/lead/olde/OSL_Module.html), retrieved December 15, 2005).

Lovette and Watts (2002) wrote that the school principal is the most important and influential person in any school because he/she is responsible for all the building's activities. In addition, the principal's leadership sets (a) the tone for the school, (b) the climate for learning, (c) the level of professionalism, (d) the morale of teachers, and (e) the degree of concern about students. Principals' performance largely determined attitudes toward the school. Barnett and McCormick (2004) also noted that principals and other school administrators are the keys to addressing the gap between students and teacher perceptions on the educational environment of the school.

### Statement of the Problem

Effective leaders' understanding of educational administration policy and procedures should be articulated throughout their buildings, in classroom practices, and by student achievement. Since principals influence teachers, and teachers have the most direct contact with students, teachers' perceptions were important components in evaluating principal effectiveness. The training module has been in effect for years, but no data have been collected to examine its effectiveness. Consequently, there is a need to

investigate teachers' perceptions to determine to what extent Mississippi building administrators trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module utilize the information gained about school governance, instructional leadership, and school culture and climate. This study was an investigation of Central Mississippi teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL module.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' perceptions of administrators who completed Mississippi's Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module. Administrators across the state of Mississippi attend several professional development sessions throughout the first two years as new principals. Therefore, this study was conducted with an emphasis on determining whether school administrators who have been trained using OSL were implementing the knowledge gained to be deemed effective in the areas of school governance, instructional leadership, and school culture and climate.

#### Significance of the Study

While the federal government has significantly cut funding to public education, the state of Mississippi also contended with reduction of education funds. A reduction in funds will generally trickle down to impact training and professional development of educators. This study will help to assess teacher perceptions of administrators who have been trained, using the OSL Training Module, in the areas of school governance,

instructional leadership, and school culture and climate. Policymakers and the Mississippi Department of Education will be able to use the findings to (a) evaluate the articulation of the OSL module into elementary, middle, and secondary public school practices; (b) modify and improve the training module; and (c) justify the need to fund or reinstate the training module. This study will also provide Mississippi principals with information on how teachers perceived their effectiveness within the context of school governance, instructional leadership, and school culture and climate. It will provide information that will support the use of training activities to enhance the professional growth of principals.

#### Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do teachers perceive the instructional leadership effectiveness of the principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module?
2. Do male and female teachers differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module?
3. Do African-American and white teachers differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module?
4. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using

the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the principals' gender?

5. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the principals' race?
6. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the school's ethnicity?
7. Is there a significant difference in the teacher' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the type of school?
8. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the school's accreditation level?
9. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the teachers' years of experience?

10. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the teachers' years at the current location?
11. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the principals' years at the current location?

#### Definitions of Terms

1. *Elementary school teacher* - A person who provides instruction to students in grades Pre-K through 5 in the state of Mississippi.
2. *High school teacher* - A person who provides instruction to students in grades 9 through 12 in the state of Mississippi.
3. *Instructional leadership* - Leadership that encompasses those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning and includes but is not limited to the following tasks: defining the purpose of schooling; setting school-wide goals; providing the resources needed for learning to occur; supervising and evaluating teachers; coordinating staff development programs; and creating collegial relationships with and among teachers (Wildy & Dimmock, 1993).
4. *Middle school teacher* - A person who provides instruction to students in grades 6 through 8 in the state of Mississippi.

5. *Orientation for School Leadership Training Module (OSL)* - Mississippi Department of Education's mandated leadership entry level training program that is designed to orientate new administrators.
6. *School culture and climate* – Combination of shared values, beliefs, and customs combined with the way those entities are viewed from within and outside the organization.
7. *School governance*: Leadership behaviours needed to manage an effective school that ensures that policies, laws, and regulations are adhered to, that effective education occurs, and that desired goals and outcomes are achieved (Cunningham & Cordeiro, 2000).
8. *Proficiency Levels*: Student achievement is reported by proficiency levels, which are defined as follows:
  - **Exemplary (Level 5)** - students demonstrate solid academic performance and mastery of the content area knowledge and skills beyond the advanced level.
  - **Advanced (Level 4)**- students consistently perform in a manner clearly beyond that required to be successful at the next grade.
  - **Proficient (Level 3)** - students demonstrate solid academic performance and mastery of the content area knowledge and skills required for success at the next grade. Students who perform at this level are prepared to begin work on even more challenging material that is required at the next grade.
  - **Basic (Level 2)**- students demonstrate partial mastery of the content area knowledge and skills required for success at the next grade. Remediation may be necessary for these students.
  - **Minimal (Level 1)**- students perform below basic and do not demonstrate mastery of the content area knowledge and skills required for success at the next grade. These students require additional instruction and remediation in the basic skills that are necessary for success at the grade tested (Mississippi State Department of Education, 2005).

## Methodology Overview

This study used a causal comparative research design that uses intact groups of administrators and analyzed their responses on a survey to test for differences in their perceptions. This study utilized quantitative techniques to analyze the data collected. A population of Mississippi teachers, whose principals have been trained using the Orientation for School Leaders (OSL) Training Module, was selected to participate. Data were collected using the *Principal Leadership Profile* (Appendix A). The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2004) for Windows 13.0. Percent and frequency distributions were generated using the demographic information on the questionnaire. The t-test and analysis of variance test (ANOVA) were used to determine if differences existed among elementary, middle, and high school teachers' responses concerning implementation of OSL strategies by their school principals.

## Limitations of the Study

The participants in this study only consisted of core academic teachers in central Mississippi. For this study, the term "core academic teacher" refers to teachers who teach mathematics, reading/language arts, science and social studies. The study utilized only those teachers whose principals have participated using the Mississippi Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module during the years of 2000 through 2004.

### Delimitations

The study was conducted with the following delimitations in place. First, this study was based upon teachers' perception of their building principals' implementation of leadership skills covered in the Mississippi Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module on school governance, instructional leadership, and culture and climate. This study did not attempt to determine teachers' knowledge of OSL. Second, only teachers with building principals who have completed the OSL Model within the last five years were asked to participate in this study.

### Assumptions

It is assumed that all participants in this study provided honest and accurate responses to all items on the questionnaire. It is assumed that the teachers in the study have knowledge of, and are informed of, the extent to which their building administrator performs his/her school related duties in the areas of school governance, instructional leadership, and culture and climate. It is assumed that the data collected represent a true indication of administrators' usage and implementation of knowledge gained from the Mississippi OSL training module.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

School leaders find themselves in situations where their professional preparation and professional development have not equipped them to manage (Elmore, 2000). Public schools and school systems, as constituted, have not been led in ways which enable administrators to respond to the increasing demands under standards-based reform. In 1994, Mississippi took a lead role in using standards to restructure universities' administrator preparation programs and to revise the state's licensure requirements (Public Education Forum of Mississippi, 2003). The Mississippi's Orientation for School Leaders (OSL) training program was designed for first-time administrators. The goal of the training is the preparation of administrators for practical, effective leadership, which positively impacts school improvement and, subsequently, student learning. Jayne (2004) wrote that the effectiveness of a school is closely linked to the caliber of its leadership, while Lovette and Watts (2002) stated that the principal of a school is held accountable for the performance of the school and is therefore central in the effort to meet or exceed goals. Therefore, this current review of the literature focused on the following areas: (a) Reform of leadership preparation programs; (b) Mississippi's Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module Training; (c) school governance and management; (d) teachers' perceptions of school administrators; (e) instructional leadership; (f) culture and climate; and (g) professional development.

## Reform of Leadership Preparation Programs in Mississippi

The systems that produce our nation's principals are complex, interrelated, and governed by the states. Each state establishes licensing, certification and recertification requirements for school leaders and approves the college and university programs that prepare school leaders (Hale & Moorman, 2003). As a result, state policy leaders and institutional leaders have become key players in the improvement of principal preparation programs. Hale and Moorman (2003) discovered while the jobs of school leaders, superintendents, principals, teacher leaders and school board members have changed dramatically, neither organized professional development programs nor formal preparation programs based in higher education institutions have adequately prepared those holding these jobs to meet the priority demands of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

The general consensus in most quarters was that principal preparation programs are too theoretical and totally unrelated to the daily demands on contemporary principals (Farkas, 2001). The course work was poorly sequenced and organized, making it impossible to scaffold the learning. The lack of partnerships between colleges and universities and school districts made it impossible to develop learning laboratories in which "student-principals" can make protected or mentored mistakes from which they can learn and develop. This lack of a strong working relationship made clinical experiences inadequate or non-existent; therefore, students did not have mentored opportunities to develop practical understanding or real-world job competence (Farkas, 2001).

In 1996, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) established standards for school leaders. These standards laid the ground work of administrators in maximizing student achievement and fostering a climate of continuous learning and improvement (Public Education Forum of Mississippi, 2003). In Mississippi, the State Superintendent of Education initiated a reform process. His office controlled teacher and administrator program approval, but the university programs were under the general authority of another state agency, State Board of Trustees and Institutions of Higher Learning, or the boards of trustees of private colleges and universities. The State Superintendent created a special entity, the Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification, Licensure and Development that developed rigorous, research-based criteria for the State Board of Education. These reform efforts incorporated redesigns into formal state policies that reflected a reconceptualization of the administrator role as one focused on leadership for learning (Hale & Moorman, 2003).

All university administrator preparation programs in Mississippi have successfully completed a rigorous approval process conducted by a national panel of experts in school leadership. Mississippi has developed standards for preparation programs which were adopted by the State Board of Education on July 21, 1995, and published by the Office of Leadership Development and Enhancement in the Mississippi Department of Education (Office of Leadership and Enhancement, Mississippi Department of Education, 1995).

Mississippi collaborated with Educational Testing Service, ISLLC, and five other states in the development of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment. Aspiring

administrators are now required to successfully complete this assessment before being granted an entry-level license. Performance evaluation and continuing licensure based on standards have not been implemented; but the Mississippi accountability model has created new standards of responsibility for school leaders regarding student learning (Public Education Forum of Mississippi, 2003).

#### Mississippi's Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module Training

Mississippi school leaders are required to complete a two-year induction program, funded by the State Department of Education in order to transition from an entry-level license to a standard license. This training program is designed for first-time administrators of Mississippi schools. The goal of the training is the preparation of administrators for practical, effective leadership which positively impacts school improvement and, subsequently, student learning. This training provides orientation on state mandates including accreditation standards, local board policy, school administrator licensure procedures, instructional management, and interpretation/use of student assessment data. The training employs activities dealing with personality/leadership styles and teamwork, and provides the administrator with opportunities to practice skills needed as a change agent, a human resource manager, and an instructional leader.

An integral component of entry-level training is the successful completion of several projects that participants executed in their respective district or school. Mastery of the training requires each participant to demonstrate specific, practical application of concepts and practices introduced throughout the training module. This training module is designed for maximum effectiveness when the administrator completes the training

within the first two years of administrative experience. The OSL module consists of ten training days (five days per year) delivered in two, 2-day sessions and one, 1-day session. Training was delivered over a period of several months. Intervals between training sessions allowed for on-the-job application of administrative skills (OSL Module, [www.mde.k12.ms.us/lead/olde/OSL\\_Module.html](http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/lead/olde/OSL_Module.html), retrieved December 15, 2005).

As states developed and began to implement accountability in schools, Wong and Sunderman (2001) observed that the success of accountability and school improvement efforts hinged heavily on the leadership skills of the principal. Today's principals are asked to perform their jobs while dealing with higher rates of lower socio-economic families, single parent households, a greater number of English as a second language learners, a higher rate of special education students, teacher turn over, aging facilities, and mandated policies (Kimball & Sirotnik, 2000). School administrators are being judged on how well they create, sustain, and maintain change in their school environments. As new responsibilities are added, principals find themselves stretched in multiple directions (Portin, 2000). It is imperative that principals receive adequate training because of the rapidly changing educational environment.

### School Governance

Schools continue to be challenged to change governance structures, to open themselves up to community influence, and become more accountable (Barnett, McCormick & Connors, 2000). Effective leadership is needed to meet these challenges. Principals must be able to (a) lead instruction, (b) shape an organization that demands and supports excellent instruction, (c) provide dedicated learning for students and

professional development for staff, and (d) connect the outside world and its resources to the school (Hale & Moorman, 2003). The major areas of school governance included (a) academic standards, (b) instructional programs, (c) textbook selection and acquisition, (d) recruitment of certificated personnel, (e) facilities management, (f) responsible financial management, (g) data collection, and (h) accountability testing (Cunningham & Cordeiro, 2000).

Policy makers and researchers have expended effort in recent years to spell out the specific functions of the school principal. Reid (2004) mentioned that the NCLB Act of 2001 has forced principals to come to grips with the transformation of their jobs and the importance of them being instructional leaders. Cunningham and Cordeiro (2000) reported on Executive Director of American Association of School Administrators, Houston's thoughts on school leaders. Houston wrote that school leaders must move from the "B's" from past days of school administration (bonds, buildings, buses, budgets – the "stuff" of education) to the "C's" (connections, collaborations, communication, and children – the building of relationships). School management will be the management of relationships.

School governance in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is about relationships (Hoerr, 2005). Principals will answer to just about everyone. Officially, they are responsible to the school board and superintendent, and dependent upon the organization chart, principals are responsible to assistant, associate, deputy superintendents, and curriculum directors. Principals also answer to parents: three unhappy parents can cause a revolt, two dissatisfied parents can create headaches, and even one discontented parent can get an

audience with the superintendent. Principals are also responsible to their teachers, who play the role of unofficial bosses. School governance and leadership is never easy, and Hoerr (2005) stressed it is even harder to lead teachers to want to teach our students. This is because many of the qualities that are found in wonderful teachers – passion, creativity, and a thirst for independence—can make it difficult for them to share, to work toward a common goal, and to be good teammates.

### Teachers' Perceptions of School Administrators

Lovette and Watts (2000) sought research relative to the assessment of principals to determine if they were measuring up to exacted standards. They found that research in this area was very limited and research about instruments designed to measure principal performance was also limited. Keiser and Shen (2000), in their review of the literature, found limited information that compared teachers' and principals' perceptions of empowerment behaviors. Some of the behaviors they listed included management, delegation of responsibility, relationships, and personal qualities. These behaviors had been found to be an important factor in maintaining the momentum needed for school restructuring and improvement. This gave credibility to the need for assessing teacher perceptions of the principal's utilization of empowering-type-behaviors and making appropriate adjustments based upon teachers' perceptions (Lovette & Watts, 2002).

Barnett, McCormick and Conners, (2000), reported that school leadership is characterized by a one to one relationship between the leader and the teacher, who is the follower. Leaders do not have a relationship with teachers as a total group. They have a set of relationships, which vary from one teacher to another. Their study also raised the

idea that leadership and followership were interdependent and that in a fundamental way a leader's legitimacy depends on her/his standing with followers. Thus, the influence of 'leadership' depends on a person's behavior being recognized and tacitly acknowledged to be 'leadership' by others who thereby cast themselves into the role of followers. This was underscored by Brewster and Railsback's (2003) belief that teachers must believe the principal has competence, and competence has to do with the belief in another party's ability to perform the tasks required by his or her position.

When teachers followed the leadership of a principal, their actions were a response to the combination of the administrator's forms of power: reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and, most importantly, expert power (Hoerr, 2005). This combination of powers and their effectiveness vary, according to Hoerr (2005), due to the characteristics and attitudes of the principal as well as the characteristics and attitudes of the teachers the principal is supervising. All power is based on the perceptions of others, and in the administrators' case, teachers, parents, and the educational community. Successful administrators understand those who they supervise and recognize how they were perceived.

### Instructional Leadership

The primary responsibility of all instructional leaders is to put in place learning that engaged students intellectually, socially, and emotionally. Instructional leadership goes beyond temporary gains in achievement scores to create lasting, meaningful improvements in learning (Hargreaves & Fink, 2004). The role of the principal, while vital to the success of the school, is a challenging, ever-changing role. In the early

twentieth century, Harris, Ballenger, and Leonard (2004) proclaimed that principals were teachers who generally performed needed administrative and clerical tasks. By the 1900s the principal had become a “directing manager” with increasing responsibilities in the management of the school. In the 1920s, the principal was expected to accept and promote certain values and often connected spiritual issues with those of scientific management. The 1930’s saw the principal as a financial manager, and the 1940s viewed the role as that of a democratic leader. In the 1960s, the principal's role became more bureaucratic and in the 1970s the school leader was expected to become a humanistic facilitator. The 1980s cast the principal as an instructional leader, and the 1990s as a leader versus a manager. In the twenty-first century, the role of the principal has become even more complex, and effective principals must be skilled instructional leaders, change initiators, managers, personnel directors, problem solvers and visionaries (Harris, Ballenger, & Leonard, 2004).

Barnett (2004) agreed that the role of today's school administrator has changed from that of a manager to an instructional leader. Principals are (a) leading professional development activities, (b) helping school councils make decisions by consensus, (c) preparing and facilitating analysis of standardized testing results, and (d) leading their schools in ways that demanded a complete understanding of effective instructional practices. Top-down decision making is being replaced with opportunities for (a) teachers, (b) parents and (c) other stakeholders to be involved. This mandated a change in culture requiring principals to rethink leadership strategies and policies. Blasé and Blasé (2000) added that teachers believe that principals who provide on-going dialogue

with the teaching staff and opportunities for professional development have a more positive impact on student learning.

Shahid et al. (2001) collectively agreed that a principal's most important task is instructional leadership, yet they found that principals have difficulty giving instructional leadership the priority it deserved. Shahid et al. mentioned that an effective instructional leader:

1. Uses time effectively.
2. Emphasizes the concept of the school as a learning community.
3. Makes research-in-practice a high priority.
4. Equips classroom teachers with the authority to handle routine discipline issues.
5. Reduces the amount of time spent overseeing aides and supervising “supervisors.”
6. Prioritizes the meetings they attended.
7. Utilizes technology to maximize time.
8. Created a mutually respectful school climate.
9. Provides effective professional development for all staff members.

Reese (2004) wrote that the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) stated in its publication *Leadership Matters: Building Leadership Capacity* that leadership promotes learning. According to Reese, the SREB publication explored three strategies used by leaders in schools to increase student learning. Those strategies include:

1. Modeling learning, in which school leaders exhibits the behavior they want teachers to display.
2. Providing compelling reasons for others to learn (encouraging high expectations of students and high-level teaching for staff); and
3. Creating a coaching environment for continuous growth that is safe, positive and supportive.

Reese also reported that truly effective school leadership should not be the responsibility of one individual, however; it should be a cooperative effort involving a number of individuals, from the state level to the district level to the classroom.

Water, Marzano, and McNulty (2004) reported that after examining quantitative research on school leadership spanning more than 25 years that the MCREL analyzed 70 studies and found effective leadership comprised key areas of responsibility, all of which were positively correlated with higher levels of student achievement. Some of these areas are; (a) culture, (b) order and discipline, (c) focus, (d) communication, (e) curriculum, instruction, assessment, (f) monitoring and evaluation, and (g) relationships, Andrews and Quinn (2004) added that building administrators have a powerful impact on schools. They mold the atmosphere of a school and, in turn, the feelings of the teachers who worked in it.

### Culture and Climate

School culture includes collective understanding among members that are related to their particular roles, while individual perspectives direct specific behaviors. It is evident that the culture of a school affects the manner in which schools operate and the

way in which the problems of the school are handled (Carrington & Elkins, 2002). However, Zimmerman (2005) noted that in order to meet the needs of the twenty-first century, public schools are under pressure to change their school's culture. To address the demands currently placed on schools, building principals are frequently involved in leading change efforts by themselves or in collaboration with others. Numerous authors have linked the leadership and reform efforts of principals to improved school culture and instructional practices (Du-Four, 2002; Short & Greer, 2002; Sparks, 2002).

As schools scramble to meet the often stringent mandates of high-stakes testing, researchers have attempted to identify the most important factors in creating climates for learning. A growing number of studies have provided rich descriptions of schools that promote student achievement (Langer, 2000; Louis & Kruse, 1995). As Fullan (1999) suggested, the pictures that have emerged from these studies are fairly consistent. One characteristic of successful schools is that teachers work collaboratively. As they do so, they develop stronger instructional strategies, and these strategies enhance student achievement. At the same time, teachers develop a stronger professional community, enabling them to provide even more social support for learning.

Tobergte and Curtis (2002) posited that American schools are in a crisis. They reported that many efforts aimed towards school improvement have been tried but have brought about little significant change. In today's highly complex, global and informational age, there seems to be a need for high achieving schools more than ever, yet educational practices and procedures have remained constant for the last fifty years. Through experience, research, and observation of successful schools, Tobergte and Curtis

found that researchers have discovered a method to meaningful school improvement.

The method involves a set of five behaviors that provide a framework to guide schools to meaningful improvement:

1. Developing people and the school culture to keep the organization vibrant and prepared to meet new needs and challenges.
2. Recognizing the need for change.
3. Understanding the change.
4. Building support structures
5. Making sure the support structures led to focused, successful, systematic change and long-lasting school improvement.

Tobergte and Curtis also stated that changing the culture of a school takes time and that school improvement does not happen overnight, or with a one-shot in-service activity, new or revised curricula, or state mandated proficiency tests. Instead, they postulated that meaningful school improvement will take place if the school's culture embraces, engages, and supports the improvement.

Educational leadership is possibly the most important single determinant of an effective school learning climate (Kelley, Thornton, & Daugherty, 2005). Sahin (2004) defined school climate as the belief that organized thought and behavior patterns by school personnel could affect values, politics, expectations, traditions, and the unity of perceptions. Change leaders must understand procedures and processes that create the conditions necessary for organizational improvement. Building principals must envision future needs and empower others to share and implement that vision. Building principals

must be able to assess and evaluate the impact and perceptions of their leadership styles. According to Fullan (2002), "Only principals who are equipped to handle a complex, rapidly changing environment can implement the reforms that lead to sustained improvement in student achievement" (p. 16). Indeed, principals must deal with the various levels of skills and abilities of their faculty and a continuity of divergent situations within today's complex school environment.

### Principals' Professional Development

The quality of teachers and teaching has been one of the most important factors shaping the learning and growth of students (Ingersol & Smith, 2003). However, a quality school needs not only quality teachers, but quality and qualified principals. The NCLB, Title II, Part D, has required that all grantees for formula and competitive grants use a minimum of 25% of the funds for professional development aligned to program goals. Although many states have had strong professional development programs for many years, the NCLB requirement has accentuated the importance and need to ensure that administrators receive the learning opportunities that are essential toward improving teaching and learning (Professional Development, 2004).

Pierce (2000) reported that societal changes have stimulated new pressures on schools and those who lead them. Contemporary models of school reform acknowledge the principal as the passport to school success. The modern principal is no longer the "principal" teacher, but rather the manager of an increasingly complex organization. Principals today are expected to create a team relationship among staff members, acquire and allocate resources, promote teacher development, improve students' performance on

standardized tests, and build effective community linkages. In response to these societal changes, Conway, Hibbard, Albert, and Hourigan (2005) wrote that one of the goals of NCLB include providing states with grants to help fund administrator professional development and training. However, Fenwick and Pierce (2002) posited that successful professional development takes time and that principals, just like their teachers, benefit from professional development that examines best practices, provides coaching support, encourages risk-taking designed to improve student learning, cultivated team relationships and provides quality time for reflection and renewal. In the end, principals and teachers should leave these experiences with a renewed sense of faith in the transformative power of schools in children's lives.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to investigate teachers' perceptions of administrators who completed Mississippi's Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module. Administrators across the state of Mississippi must attend several professional development sessions throughout the school year. Therefore, this study was conducted with an emphasis on determining whether school administrators who have been trained using OSL were implementing the knowledge gained from the training to be deemed effective in the areas of school governance, instructional leadership, and school culture and climate.

#### Research Design

This study used a causal comparative research design to examine differences among the teachers' perceptions of the principals' leadership qualities. Causal comparative research is useful when using human subjects in real-world situations where events have already occurred (Gay & Airasian, 2000). Casual comparative designs allow for the examination of possible casual effect of independent variables on the dependent variables.

This study utilized quantitative techniques to collect and analyze the data. The population included a group of teachers whose principals have been trained using the

Orientation for School Leaders (OSL) Training Module conducted by the Mississippi State Department of Education.

Data were collected using the *Principal Leadership Profile* (Appendix A). The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows 13.0. Percent and frequency distributions were generated from teacher responses to help describe their perceptions of their administrators' use of information gained from OSL. The t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used to determine if differences exist among teachers based on their responses concerning effective leadership strategies used by their school principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders (OSL) Training Module. In addition, the Tukey Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons test was also computed to examine the differences between individual groups.

### Participants

Participants in this study consisted of a population of teachers from Central Mississippi. The teachers selected were those who were employed in school buildings where the principal has been trained since the year 2001 using the Orientation for School Leaders (OSL) Training Module conducted by the Mississippi State Department of Education. This population of teachers included only core academic teachers. These academic teachers consisted of teachers who taught mathematics, science, reading/language arts, or social studies. First, the schools with principals trained using the Orientation for School Leaders (OSL) Training Module were identified. The names of teachers who work under these administrators were obtained from the Mississippi

Department of Education's Program Analysis Department. These principals were contacted and asked to administer the survey to the core academic teachers, consisting of teachers who taught mathematics, science, reading/language arts, or social studies, and the population of this study was 148 teachers. Out of a total of 148 surveys that were mailed to the schools, 109 were returned for a response rate of 74%.

### Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2001) for Windows 13.0. The participants' responses were recorded and reported in tables in the form of percentages and frequencies. In addition, the t-test and the F-ratio were conducted to determine if differences existed among teachers in their perceptions regarding the usage/implementation of effective OSL strategies by their school principals. The problem of this study was explored through the development of eleven research questions.

Research question one: How do the teachers perceive the instructional leadership effectiveness of the principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module? This research question was assessed using descriptive statistics by examining the teachers' responses and recording the responses using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviations.

Research question two: Do male and female teachers differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module?

This research question was assessed by examining the teachers' responses using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) since there were more than two groups being examined for differences. The Tukey post hoc multiple comparisons test was also computed to examine the differences between pairs of individual groups, where differences existed.

Research question three: Do African-American and white teachers differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module? This research question was assessed using the t-test to examine the teachers' responses since there were two groups being examined for differences.

Research question four: Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module based on the principals' gender? This research question was assessed by examining the teachers' responses using the t-test since there were two groups being examined for differences.

Research question five: Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module based on the principals' race? This research question was assessed by examining the teachers' responses using the ANOVA since there were more than two groups being examined for differences. The Tukey post hoc multiple comparisons test was also computed to examine the differences between pairs of individual groups, where differences existed.

Research question six: Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the school's ethnicity? This research question was assessed by examining the teachers' responses using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) since there were more than two groups being examined for differences. The Tukey post hoc multiple comparisons test was also computed to examine the differences between pairs of individual groups, where differences existed.

Research question seven: Is there a significant difference in the teacher' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the type of school? This research question was assessed by examining the teachers' responses using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) since there were more than two groups being examined for differences. The Tukey post hoc multiple comparisons test was also computed to examine the differences between pairs of individual groups, where differences existed.

Research question eight: Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the school's accreditation level? This research question was assessed by examining the teachers' responses using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) since there were more than two groups being examined for differences. The Tukey post hoc multiple comparisons test

was also computed to examine the differences between pairs of individual groups, where differences existed.

Research question nine: Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the teachers' years of experience? This research question was assessed by examining the teachers' responses using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) since there were more than two groups being examined for differences. The Tukey post hoc multiple comparisons test was also computed to examine the differences between pairs of individual groups, where differences existed.

Research question ten: Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the teachers' years at the current location? This research question was assessed by examining the teachers' responses using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) since there were more than two groups being examined for differences. The Tukey post hoc multiple comparisons test was also computed to examine the differences between pairs of individual groups, where differences existed.

Research question eleven: Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the principals' years at the current location? This research question was assessed by examining the

teachers' responses using the analysis of variance (ANOVA) since there were more than two groups being examined for differences. The Tukey post hoc multiple comparisons test was also computed to examine the differences between pairs of individual groups, where differences existed.

#### Data Collection Procedures

The researcher obtained permission to conduct this study from Mississippi State University's Graduate School and its Institutional Review Board. Names of Mississippi administrators who have been trained using the Orientation for School Leaders (OSL) Training Module, since the year 2001, were obtained from the Mississippi State Department of Education. The names of teachers who work under these administrators were obtained from the Mississippi Department of Education's Program Analysis Department. The questionnaires, along with letters of explanation to the administrators, participant consent forms, timelines for completion and return, and self-addressed stamped envelopes were mailed to each administrator, whose school was chosen to participate.

Upon completion and collection of the questionnaires and consent forms, the administrators were instructed to return these items to the researcher, using the self-addressed, stamped envelopes provided. Participants were given two weeks to return the questionnaires. A follow-up mail-out was done for participants who did not respond by the first deadline. Further telephone calls were made to participants to help improve the return rate.

## Instrumentation

The instrument that was used was the *Principal Leadership Profile*. The original instrument was developed by a team of researchers in 1987. This team of researchers validated the instrument across a number of different settings, states, and school districts. The instrument was also used in several research studies and the findings were published in various journals, such as *Educational Administration Quarterly* 1990, and the *Peabody Journal of Education* (1995). The team provided the researcher consent to use the instrument in whole or part (Heck, 2000).

To help validate the instrument, structural equation modeling was used. This method provided a means for the researcher to lay out the theoretical model, which consisted of various numbers of items related to each dimension. The research team then tested this specific model against the data collected. The data fit the model by loading on all of the dimensions, and the constructs related to each other in the way they were supposed to, thus helping to further validate the instrument.

The instrument's reliability rating was judged to be acceptable. Its internal consistency was measured, and the alpha coefficient ranged from  $r = .80$  to  $.90$ . The subsections reliability was tested as well, revealing a range of  $r = .70$ . This is attributed to the belief that if a school principal was rated high on one domain, such as school governance, then he/she would probably rate high on domains such as instructional leadership. Or if a school principal rated low on one domain, then he/she will more than likely rate low on another domain.

The purpose for using the instrument was to provide current information about Mississippi administrators' implementation of strategies that coincide with school governance, instructional leadership, and culture and climate. The first section of the questionnaire consisted of information related to school governance. It was comprised of six items. The second section of the questionnaire consisted of information related to instructional leadership. It was comprised of six items. The third section of the questionnaire consisted of information related to school culture and climate. It was comprised of nine items. The questions in sections one through three were answered using a Likert Scale, where 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Disagree, and 5 = Strongly Disagree. The last section of the questionnaire contained demographic information that required participants to respond to questions about their gender, classification of their school, years of teaching experience, and the accreditation level of their school.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

In Chapter IV, the data analyses that served to answer the research questions are presented, along with the findings. These analyses make it possible to address the problem of this study fully. This study was conducted to examine the perceptions of teachers regarding the leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module.

The research questions that guided this study were the following:

The following research questions will guide this study:

1. How do the teachers perceive the instructional leadership effectiveness of the principals who were trained using the OSL Module?
2. Do teachers who are African-American, white or of other ethnic backgrounds differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module?
3. Do African-American and white teachers differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module?

4. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module based on the principals' gender?
5. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module based on the principals' race?
6. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module based on the school's ethnicity?
7. Is there a significant difference in the teacher' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module based on the type of school?
8. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module based on the school's accreditation level?
9. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module based on the teachers' years of experience?
10. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module based on the teachers' years at the current location?

11. Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module based on the principals' years at the current location?

Chapter IV presents a descriptive analysis of the participants' responses to the demographic questions, followed by a statistical analysis and results relating to their perceptions of the principals' leadership effectiveness. The demographic and descriptive details are presented in the form of frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The statistical analyses along with the descriptive characteristics of the participants are presented in tables.

#### Demographic Characteristics

The first section of the questionnaire solicited responses from the teachers on the principals' effectiveness on school governance issues. Statements one to six represented the School Governance sub-scale. The second section of the questionnaire consists of Instructional Leadership sub-scale. Statements seven to twelve requests responses on the instructional leadership sub-scale. The third section of the questionnaire measures the teachers' perception of the principals' effectiveness on school culture and climate. This School Culture and Climate sub-scale is represented by statements thirteen to twenty-one on the survey. The survey used a five point Likert scale consisting of the following response choices: 1 = "Strongly Agree", 2 = "Agree", 3 = "Neutral", 4 = "Disagree", and 5 = "Strongly Disagree". The teachers were asked to select the responses that best described their perceptions responses and record them on the questionnaire. The t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were computed to address the research questions to

determine if there were differences between teachers' perceptions about their principals' leadership effectiveness. In addition, the Tukey Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons test was also computed to examine the differences between pairs of individual groups.

In order to determine the teachers' perceptions of the leadership effectiveness of principals trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module, general descriptive analysis was conducted and reported in terms of percentages, means and standard deviations. A mean score was computed for each of the items, and the t-test and Analysis of Variance were conducted to examine for differences. The choices with the lower numbers "1" and "2" indicated strong agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals' leadership effectiveness. For analysis purposes and to facilitate an accurate description of the teachers' sentiments and their perceptions the choices representing "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" were transformed into one response category "Agree".

Table one is a presentation of the demographic characteristics of the teachers who were investigated in this study. The majority of them (81.9%) were female, while 18.1% of the principals who were being evaluated were males. The schools of the teachers were predominantly African-American, (96.1%) and the principals were predominantly African-American (70.2%) as were 70.7% of the teachers. There were more elementary schools (49.1%) involved in this study, followed by high schools (32.4%). Approximately 48.5% of the schools whose teachers were surveyed were level three schools according to the State of Mississippi school accreditation system. Only 1.0% of the schools was at the highest level (5), and 16.5% was at the next highest accreditation level (4).

The largest group of teachers (35.2%) had seven years or less of teaching experience, and 24.8% of the teachers had 22 or more years of teaching experience. A little over half of the teachers were at their present location for seven or less years, and the majority of the principals (91.9%) were at their present location for seven or less years.

Table 1  
Study Group Demographic Characteristics

Variable	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Gender		
Males	19	18.1
Females	86	81.9
Principal's Gender		
Males	58	56.3
Females	45	43.7
School Ethnicity		
African American	99	96.1
White	4	3.9
Principal's Race		
African American	73	70.2
White	31	29.8
Teacher's Race		
African American	70	70.7
White	27	27.3
Type of School		
Elementary School	53	49.1
Middle School	14	13.0
High School	35	32.4
Other	6	5.6

(table continues)

Table 1 (continued)

Variable	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
School Level		
Level 1	3	2.9
Level 2	32	31.1
Level 3	50	48.5
Level 4	17	16.5
Level 5	1	1.0
Years of Experience Teaching		
Caucasian	110	82.8
African-American	23	17.3
Years of Teaching Experience		
0-7	37	35.2
8-14	25	23.8
15-21	17	16.2
22+	26	24.8
Years at Current Location		
0-7	51	51.5
8-14	25	25.3
15-21	7	7.1
22+	16	16.2
Years Principal at Current Location		
0-7	91	91.9
8-14	6	6.1
15-21	0	0.0
22+	2	2.0

*Note.* n=109

Research question one was: “Do male and female teachers differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the

Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module?” The data in tables two, three, four, and five serve to address the teachers’ perceptions of the leadership effectiveness of the principals. Table two is a display of the teachers’ overall perceptions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness. Out of the 21 leadership traits that were examined, the overall consensus of the teachers regarding the principals’ leadership effectiveness was highly positive. The lowest amount of support from the teachers is seen for statement number two that asked if the principal “involves staff members in important decisions”. This statement received the support of 78.7% of the teachers. The top ten principal traits that were overwhelmingly supported by the teachers are the following:

1. Questionnaire item #19—the teachers’ perception that the principal “establishes high expectations for student learning” was supported by 97.2% of the teachers. The mean score was 1.28 indicating strong agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals’ leadership effectiveness.
2. Questionnaire item #20-- the teachers’ perception that the principal “has clearly explained the school’s mission to all staff members” was supported by 96.3% of the teachers. The mean score was 1.39 indicating strong agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals’ leadership effectiveness.
3. Questionnaire item #21-- the teachers’ perception that the principal “works to establish a safe and orderly environment” was supported by 94.4% of the teachers. The mean score was 1.41 indicating strong

agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals' leadership effectiveness.

4. Questionnaire item #11-- the teachers' perception that the principal "uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance" was supported by 92.5% of the teachers. The mean score was 1.54 indicating strong agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals' leadership effectiveness.
5. Questionnaire item #1-- the teachers' perception that the principal "knows/understands the problems of the school" was supported by 91.7% of the teachers. The mean score was 1.50 indicating strong agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals' leadership effectiveness.
6. Questionnaire item #3-- the teachers' perception that the principal "encourages parent involvement" was supported by 91.7% of the teachers. The mean score was 1.48 indicating strong agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals' leadership effectiveness.
7. Questionnaire item #12-- the teachers' perception that the principal "works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities" was indicated by 91.7% of the teachers. The mean score was 1.54 indicating strong agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals' leadership effectiveness.

8. Questionnaire item #14-- the teachers' perception that the principal "has confidence in the decision he/she makes" was supported by 91.7% of the teachers. The mean score was 1.40 indicating strong agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals' leadership effectiveness.
9. Questionnaire item #7-- the teachers' perception that the principal "works with teachers to coordinate the school's program and curricula improvement effort" was supported by 88.9% of the teachers. The mean score was 1.63 indicating strong agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals' leadership effectiveness.
10. Questionnaire item #8-- the teachers' perception that the principal "helps to provide teachers with necessary resources to be successful in their instructional activities" was supported by 88.9% of the teachers. The mean score was 1.59 indicating strong agreement with that trait as being an accurate representation of their perception of the principals' leadership effectiveness.

Appendix A provides the actual responses of the teachers listing the Likert scale responses they selected for describing the principals' leadership effectiveness.

Table 2

## Percentages of Teachers' Perception of Principals' Leadership Effectiveness

<i>Leadership Traits</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
19. Establishes high expectations for student learning	97.2	1.28	.5085
20. Has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members	96.3	1.39	.5934
21. Works to establish a safe and orderly environment	94.4	1.41	.6841
11. Uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance	92.5	1.54	.6925
1. Knows/understands the problems of the school	91.7	1.50	.6753
3. Encourages parent involvement	91.7	1.48	.7016
12. Works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities	91.7	1.54	.7028
14. Has confidence in the decision he/she makes	91.7	1.40	.6400
7. Works with teachers to coordinate the school's program and curricula improvement efforts	88.9	1.63	.8270
8. Helps to provide teachers with necessary resources to be successful in their instructional activities	88.9	1.59	.8542

(table continues)

Table 2 (continued)

<i>Leadership Traits</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
9. Makes regular classroom visits and provides feedback and strategies to improve instruction	87.2	1.61	.8391
18. Encourages innovation and risk-taking	86.9	1.70	.7674
4. Works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction	86.1	1.68	.9218
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems	86.1	1.60	.8421
15. Establishes effective two-way communication with staff about school-related matters	86.0	1.71	.8356
17. Can be easily approached when a staff member has a problem	83.5	1.80	.9601
10. Works with teachers to establish and maintain effective classroom management	82.2	1.84	.9727
5. Establishes positive and cooperative relationships with organizations and agencies in the community	80.6	1.71	.8434
16. Provides praise and recognition to staff members	80.6	1.76	.9054
2. Involves staff members in important decisions	78.7	1.90	.9426

*Note.* \*A=Agree + Strongly Agree, %=valid percent, n=109

Based on the Likert Scale responses, mean scores between 1 and 2 indicated agreement

### School Governance

The majority of the principals received strong support on their effectiveness in this area from the teachers. As seen in Table 3, support ranged from a high of 91.7% to a low of 78.7%. All of the mean scores were between 1 and 2. These mean scores represent strong support by the teachers for the principals' effectiveness in school governance.

Table 3

## Teachers' Perception of Principals' Leadership Effectiveness on School Governance

<i>School Governance</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
1. Knows/understands the problems of the school	91.7	1.50	.6753
3. Encourages parent involvement	91.7	1.48	.7016
4. Works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction	86.1	1.68	.9218
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems	86.1	1.60	.8421
5. Establishes positive and cooperative relationships with organizations and agencies in the community	80.6	1.71	.8434
2. Involves staff members in important decisions	78.7	1.90	.9426

*Note.* \*A=Agree + Strongly Agree, %=valid percent, n=109

## Instructional Leadership

The majority of the principals received strong support on their effectiveness in this area from the teachers. As seen in Table 4, support ranged from a high of 92.5% to a low of 82.2%. All of the mean scores were between 1 and 2. These mean scores represent strong support by the teachers for the principals' effectiveness in instructional leadership.

Table 4

Teachers' Perception of Principals' Leadership Effectiveness on Instructional Leadership

<i>Instructional Leadership</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
11. Uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance	92.5	1.54	.6925
12. Works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities	91.7	1.54	.7028
7. Works with teachers to coordinate the school's program and curricula improvement efforts	88.9	1.63	.8270
8. Helps to provide teachers with necessary resources to be successful in their instructional activities	88.9	1.59	.8542
9. Makes regular classroom visits and provides feedback and strategies to improve instruction	87.2	1.61	.8391
10. Works with teachers to establish and maintain effective classroom management	82.2	1.84	.9727

*Note.* \*A=Agree + Strongly Agree, %=valid percent, n=109

Culture and Climate

The majority of the principals received strong support on their effectiveness in this area from the teachers. As seen in Table 5, support ranged from a high of 97.2% to a low of 80.6%. All of the mean scores were between 1 and 2. These mean scores represent strong support by the teachers for the principals' effectiveness in culture and climate.

Table 5

Percentages of Teachers' Perception of Principals' Leadership Effectiveness on Culture and Climate

<i>Culture and Climate</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
19. Establishes high expectations for student learning	97.2	1.28	.5085
20. Has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members	96.3	1.39	.5934
21. Works to establish a safe and orderly environment	94.4	1.41	.6841
14. Has confidence in the decision he/she makes	91.7	1.40	.6400
13. Is supportive of staff members	88.0	1.62	.8507
18. Encourages innovation and risk-taking	86.9	1.70	.7674
15. Establishes effective two-way communication with staff about school-related matters	86.0	1.71	.8356
17. Can be easily approached when a staff member has a problem	83.5	1.80	.9601
16. Provides praise and recognition to staff members	80.6	1.76	.9054

*Note.* \*A=Agree + Strongly Agree, %=valid percent, n=109

Research question two asked: “Do male and female teachers differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module? Table 6 is a presentation of a t-test analysis that was computed to examine the differences between the male and female teachers on their perceptions of the principals' leadership effectiveness. Differences between male and female teachers were seen in five of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

Questionnaire Item #1-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "knows/understands the problems of the school" (t, 103 =2.497, p = .014);

Questionnaire Item #6-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems" (t, 102 = 2.160, p = .033;

Questionnaire Item #11-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance" (t, 102 =1.996, p = .049);

Questionnaire Item #16-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "provides praise and recognition to staff members" (t, 102 = 2.226, p = .028);

Questionnaire Item #20-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members" (t, 102 = 2.337, p = .021).

Table 6

T-Test-Gender Differences in Teachers' Perception of Principals' Performance

<i>Statements</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i> <i>(2-tailed)</i>
1. Knows/understands the problems of the school						
Male	19	1.84	.8342	2.497	103	.014*
Female	86	1.43	.6047			
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems						
Male	19	1.95	.9703	2.160	102	.033*
Female	85	1.51	.7657			

(table continues)

Table 6 (continued)

<i>Statements</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i> <i>(2-tailed)</i>
11. Uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance						
Male	18	1.83	.9236	1.996	100	.049*
Female	84	1.48	.6301			
16. Provides praise and recognition to staff members						
Male	19	2.16	1.213	2.226	102	.028*
Female	85	1.66	.7951			
20. Has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members						
Male	19	1.68	.8652	2.337	102	.021*
Female	86	1.35	.4997			

*Note.* \* signifies significance

Research question three asked: “Do teachers who are African-American, white or of other ethnic backgrounds differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module?” Table 7 is a presentation of an Analysis of Variance that was computed to examine the differences between the teachers on their perceptions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness based on the teachers’ race. Differences between the teachers were seen in one of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following trait:

Questionnaire Item #3-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “encourages parent involvement” (F, 2, 96 = 7.180, p = .001).

Table 7

ANOVA- Differences in Teachers' Perception of Principals' Performance Based on Teachers Race

<i>Statements</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
3. Encourages parent involvement					
Between Groups	5.536	2	2.768	7.180	.001*
Within Groups	37.010	96	.386		
Total	42.546	98			

*Note.* \* signifies significance

As seen in Table 8, the results of the Tukey post hoc test revealed that differences occurred between African-Americans and Other, and Whites and Other. The sample was overwhelmingly Comprised of African-American, followed by whites and a few teachers classified as other. The mean for African-American teachers was higher than whites and “other”

Table 8

Tukey Post Hoc Multiple Comparisons Based on Race

<i>Leadership Trait</i>	<i>Years at Current Location</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
3. Encourages parent involvement			
	African-Americans and Other	-1.62857	.001*
	Whites and Other	-1.44444	.006*

*Note.* \* signifies significance

Research question four asked “Is there a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the principals’ gender?” Table 9 is a presentation of a t-test analysis that was computed to examine the differences between the teachers on their perceptions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness based on the principals’ gender. Differences between the teachers were seen in nine of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

Questionnaire Item #1-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “knows/understands the problems of the school” (t, 100 = 1.895 p = .050);

Questionnaire Item #4-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction” (t, 100 = 2.071, p = .041);

Questionnaire Item #5-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “establishes positive and cooperative relationships with organizations and agencies in the community” (t, 99=2.288, p = .025);

Questionnaire Item #11-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance” (t, 98 = 2.180, p = .032);

Questionnaire Item #14-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “has confidence in the decision he/she makes” (t, 100 = 2.549, p = .012);

Questionnaire Item #15-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “establishes effective two-way communication with staff about school-related matters” (t, 98 =2.708, p = .008);

Questionnaire Item #16-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “provides praise and recognition to staff members” (t, 99 = 3.269, p = .001);

Questionnaire Item #17-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "can be easily approached when a staff member has a problem" ( $t, 100 = 1.993, p = .049$ );

Questionnaire Item #18-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "encourages innovation and risk-taking" ( $t, 98 = 2.037, p = .044$ ).

Table 9

T-Test- Differences in Teachers' Perception of Principals' Performance Based on Principal's Gender

<i>Statements</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>
1. Knows/understands the problems of the school						
Male	58	1.6034	.7479	1.985	100	.050*
Female	44	1.341	.6047			
4. Works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction						
Male	58	1.828	1.045	2.071	100	.041*
Female	44	1.455	.6631			
5. Establishes positive and cooperative relationships with organizations and agencies in the community						
Male	57	1.860	.9149	2.288	99	.025*
Female	44	1.477	.7310			
11. Uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance						
Male	56	1.625	.7277	2.180	.98	.032*
Female	44	1.340	.5258			

Table 9 (continued)

<i>Statements</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i> <i>(2-tailed)</i>
15. Establishes effective two-way communication with staff about school-related matters						
Male	58	1.862	.9070	2.708	98	.008*
Female	42	1.429	.5902			
16. Provides praise and recognition to staff members						
Male	57	1.983	1.009	3.269	99	.001*
Female	44	1.409	.6533			
17. Can be easily approached when a staff member has a problem						
Male	58	1.914	1.047	1.993	100	.049*
Female	44	1.546	.7300			
18. Encourages innovation and risk-taking						
Male	58	1.810	.7825	2.037	98	.044*
Female	42	1.500	.7071			

*Note.* \* signifies significance

Research question five asked “Is there a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the principals’ race?” Table 10 is a presentation of a t-test analysis that was computed to examine the differences between the teachers on their perceptions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness based on the principals’ race. Differences between the teachers were seen in two of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

Questionnaire Item #4-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction" ( $t, 100 = 2.071, p = .041$ );

Questionnaire Item #6-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems" ( $t, 102 = 2.160, p = .033$ ).

Table 10

T-Test- Differences in Teachers' Perception of Principals' Performance Based on Principal's Race

<i>Statements</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>
4. Works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction						
African American	73	1.795	.9274	2.301	102	.023*
White	31	1.355	.7979			
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems						
African American	72	1.694	.8982	2.079	101	.040*
White	31	1.323	.6525			

*Note.* \* signifies significance

Research question six asked "Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the school's ethnicity?" A t-test was computed to examine differences in the teachers' perceptions of the principals' leadership ability based on school ethnicity. No difference was found probability and that is most likely because the schools were predominantly African-American.

Research question seven asked “Is there a significant difference in the teacher perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the type of school?” Table 11 is a presentation of an analysis of variance that was computed to examine the differences between the teachers on their perceptions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness based on type of school. Differences between the teachers were seen in nine of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

Questionnaire item # 2--The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “involves staff members in important decisions” (F, 3, 100 = 2.764, p = .046).

Questionnaire item # 5--The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “establishes positive and cooperative relationships with organizations and agencies in the community” (F, 3, 103 = 5.082, p = .003).

Questionnaire item # 6--The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems” (F, 3, 103 = 5.505, p = .001);

Questionnaire item # 11--The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance” (F, 3, 101 = 7.309, p = 000);

Questionnaire item # 12--The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities” (F, 3, 103 = 3.651, p = .015);

Questionnaire item # 15--The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “establishes effective two-way communication” (F, 3, 102 = 3.043, p = .032);

Questionnaire item # 19--The teachers' perceptions that the principal "establishes high expectations for student learning" (F, 3, 104 = 3.662, p = .015);

Questionnaire item # 20--The teachers' perceptions that the principal "has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members" (F, 3, 104 = 5.484, p = .002);

Questionnaire item # 17--The teachers' perceptions that the principal "can be easily approached when a staff member has a problem" (F, 3, 104 = 2.693, p = .050).

Table 11

ANOVA- Differences in Teachers' Perception of Principals' Performance Based on Type of School

<i>Leadership Traits</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
2. Involves staff members in important decisions					
Between Groups	7.156	3	2.385	2.834	.042*
Within Groups	86.713	100	.842		
Total	93.869	106			
5. Establishes positive and cooperative relationships with organizations and agencies in the community					
Between Groups	9.802	3	3.267	5.082	.003*
Within Groups	66.217	103	.643		
Total	76.019	106			
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems					
Between Groups	9.834	3	3.278	5.505	.001*
Within Groups	60.241	103	.585		
Total	70.075	106			
11. Uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance					
Between Groups	8.942	3	2.981	7.309	.000*
Within Groups	41.191	101	.408		
Total	50.133	102			

Table 11 (continued)

<i>Leadership Traits</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
12. Works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities					
Between Groups	5.059	3	1.686	3.651	.015*
Within Groups	47.577	103	.462		
Total	51.846	106			
15. Establishes effective two-way communication					
Between Groups	6.073	3	2.024	3.043	.032*
Within Groups	67.861	102	.640		
Total	73.934	105			
19. Establishes high expectations for student learning					
Between Groups	2.616	3	.872	3.662	.015*
Within Groups	24.522	103	.238		
Total	27.140	106			
20. Has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members					
Between Groups	5.145	3	1.715	5.484	.002*
Within Groups	32.522	104	.313		
Total	35.990	107			
17. Can be easily approached when a staff member has a problem					
Between Groups	6.823	3	2.274	2.693	.050*
Within Groups	87.844	104	.845		
Total	94.667	107			

*Note.* \* signifies significance

As seen in Table 12, the results of the Post Hoc Tukey Test revealed that differences occurred between elementary school teachers and high school teachers, and between middle school teachers and high school teachers in a few situations.

Table 12  
Post Hoc—Multiple Comparisons Based on Type of School

<i>Leadership Trait</i>	<i>Type of School</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
2. Involves staff members in important decisions	Middle(M = 1.3641) High (M=1.9231)	-0.559	.031*
5. Establishes positive and cooperative relationships with organizations and agencies in the community	Elementary(M=1.3279) High (M =1.9231)	-0.595	.005*
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems	Elementary(M=1.1923) High (M 1.7219) Middle (M=1.0219) High (M =1.7219)	-0.529  0.700	.011*  .024*
11. Uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance	Elementary(M=1.3729) High (M =1.8796) Middle (M=1.2143) High (M=1.8796)	-0.506  -0.665	.003*  .011*
12. Works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities	Elementary(M=1.3833) High (M 1.8465)	-0.463	.012*

*Note.* \* signifies significance

Research question eight asked “Is there a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained

using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the school’s accreditation level?” Table 13 is a presentation of an analysis of variance that was computed to examine the differences between the teachers on their perceptions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness based on school accreditation level. Differences between the teachers were seen in four of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

Questionnaire Item #4--The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction” (F, 4, 98 = 2.611, p = .040);

Questionnaire Item #6--The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “stresses teamwork and collaboration in decision s to solve school problems” (F, 4, 97 = 2.586, p = .042);

Questionnaire Item #13--The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “is supportive of staff members” (F, 4, 97 = 2.584, p = .042);

Questionnaire Item #16--The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “provides praise and recognition to staff members” (F, 4, 97 = 4.097, p = .002

Table 13

ANOVA- Differences in Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Performance Based on School Accreditation

<i>Leadership Traits</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
4. Works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction					
Between Groups	8.357	4	2.089	2.611	.040*
Within Groups	78.419	98	.800		
Total	86.777	98			

(table continues)

Table 13 (continued)

<i>Leadership Traits</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decision s to solve school problems					
Between Groups	6.471	4	1.618	2.586	.042*
Within Groups	60.676	97	..626		
Total	67.147	101			
13. Is supportive of staff members					
Between Groups	7.111	4	1.778	2.584	.042*
Within Groups	66.733	97	..640		
Total	78.843	101			
16. Provides praise and recognition to staff members					
Between Groups	12.874	4	4.460	4.072	.002*
Within Groups	69.999	97	.722		
Total	82.873	101			

*Note.* \* signifies significance

Research question nine asked “Is there a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the teachers’ years of experience?” Table 14 is a presentation of an Analysis of Variance that was computed to examine the differences between the teachers on their perceptions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness based on years of experience. Differences between the teachers were seen in 13 of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

Questionnaire Item #1-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “knows/understands the problems of the school” (F, 3, 101 = 3.749, p = .013);

Questionnaire Item #2-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "involves staff members in important decisions" (F, 3, 100 = 2.764, p = .046;

Questionnaire Item #3-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "encourages parent involvement" (F, 3, 101 = 3.111, p = .030);

Questionnaire Item #4-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction" (F, 3, 101 = 5.911, p = .001);

Questionnaire Item #6-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems" (F, 3, 101 = 5.686, p = .001);

Questionnaire Item #10-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works with teachers to establish and maintain effective classroom management" (F, 3, 99 = 4.413, p=.002);

Questionnaire Item #12-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities" (F, 3, 100 = 3.811, p = .012);

Questionnaire Item #13-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "is supportive of staff members" (F, 3, 100 = 5.509, p = .002;

Questionnaire Item #16-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "provides praise and recognition to staff members" (F, 3, 100 = 4.072, p = .009;

Questionnaire Item #18-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "encourages innovation and risk-taking" (F, 3, 101 = 3.073, p = .031);

Questionnaire Item #19-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "establishes high expectations for student learning" (F, 3, 100 = 3.048, p = .032);

Questionnaire Item #20-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members" (F, 3, 101 = 2.832, p = .042);

Questionnaire Item #21-- The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works to establish a safe and orderly environment" (F, 3, 101 = 3.915, p = .011).

Table 14

ANOVA- Differences in Teachers' Perception of Principals' Performance  
Based on Teachers' Years of Experience

<i>Leadership Traits</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
1. Knows/understands the problems of the school					
Between Groups	4.634	3	1.545	3.749	.013*
Within Groups	41.613	101	.412		
Total	46.248	104			
2. Involves staff members in important decisions					
Between Groups	6.784	3	2.261	2.764	.046*
Within Groups	81.831	100	.819		
Total	88.615	103			
3. Encourages parent involvement					
Between Groups	4.418	3	1.473	3.111	.030*
Within Groups	47.811	101	.473		
Total	52.229	104			

(table continues)

Table 14 (continued)

<i>Statements</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
4. Works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction					
Between Groups	13.291	3	4.430	5.911	.001*
Within Groups	75.699	101	.749		
Total	88.990	104			
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems					
Between Groups	10.110	3	3.370	5.686	.001*
Within Groups	59.274	100	.593		
Total	69.385	103			
10. Works with teachers to establish and maintain effective classroom management					
Between Groups	13.240	3	4.413	5.145	.002*
Within Groups	84.954	99	.859		
Total	98.194	102			
12. Works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities					
Between Groups	5.319	3	1.773	3.811	.012*
Within Groups	46.527	100	.465		
Total	51.846	103			
13. Is supportive of staff members					
Between Groups	10.583	3	3.528	5.509	.002*
Within Groups	64.032	100	.640		
Total	74.615	103			

(table continues)

Table 14 (continued)

<i>Statements</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
16. Provides praise and recognition to staff members					
Between Groups	9.909	3	3.030	4.072	.009*
Within Groups	74.410	100	.819		
Total	88.615	103			
18. Encourages innovation and risk-taking					
Between Groups	5.077	3	1.692	3.073	.031*
Within Groups	55.077	101	.551		
Total	60.154	104			
19. Establishes high expectations for student learning					
Between Groups	2.255	3	.752	3.048	.032*
Within Groups	24.649	100	.247		
Total	26.913	103			
20. Has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members					
Between Groups	2.870	3	.957	2.832	.042*
Within Groups	34.121	101	.338		
Total	35.990	104			
21. Works to establish a safe and orderly environment					
Between Groups	5.134	3	1.711	3.915	.011*
Within Groups	43.703	100	.437		
Total	48.837	103			

*Note.* \* signifies significance

As seen in Table 15, the results of the Post Hoc Tukey Test revealed that most of the differences occurred between teachers with 7 years or less of experience and teachers with 22 years or more of experience. In three situations, differences were detected

between teachers with 8-14 years of experience and teachers with 22 years or more of experience.

Table 15  
Post Hoc—Multiple Comparisons Based on Teachers' Years of Experience

<i>Leadership Trait</i>	<i>Years at Current Location</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
1. Knows/understands the problems of the school	0-7 (M = 1.6111) 22+ (M=1.0737)	.537	.008*
2. Involves staff members in important decisions	0-7 (M= 1.9444) 22+ (M=1.2822)	.662	.026*
3. Encourages parent involvement	0-7 (M= 1.6389) 22+ (M=1.1.1249)	.510	.023*
4. Works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction	0-7 (M= 1.9722) 22+ (M=1.0449)	.927	.000*
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems	0-7 (M= 1.6111) 22+ (M=1.1200)	.491 .57949	.004* .013*
10. Works with teachers to establish and maintain effective classroom management	0-7 (M= 1.5714) 22+ (M=1.1600) 8-14 (M= 1.6087) 22+ (M=1.1600)	.411 .449	.003* .015*

(table continues)

Table 15 (continued)

<i>Leadership Trait</i>	<i>Years at Current Location</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
12. Works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities	0-7 (M= 1.5000)	.420	.042*
	22+ (M=1.0800)		
	8-14 (M= 1.5217)	.441	.035*
	22+ (M=1.0800)		
13. Is supportive of staff members	0-7 (M= 1.9143)	.798	.001*
	22+ (M=1.1600)		
16. Provides praise and recognition to staff members	0-7 (M= 2.000)	.600	.005*
	22+ (M=1.400)		
18. Encourages innovation and risk-taking	0-7 (M= 1.7429)	.343	.018*
	22+ (M=1.4000)		
19. Establishes high expectations for student learning	8-14 (M= 1.4348)	.350	.027*
	22+ (M=1.0833)		
20. Has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members	0-7 (M= 1.4167)	.297	.026*
	22+ (M=1.1200)		
21. works to establish a safe and orderly environment	0-7 (M= 1.6207)	.484	.014*
	22+ (M=1.1364)		

Research question ten asked “Is there a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the teachers’ years at the current location?” Table 16 is a presentation of an Analysis of Variance that was computed to examine the differences between the teachers on their perceptions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness based on the teachers’ years at the current location. Differences between the teachers were seen in three of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

Questionnaire Item #2-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “involves staff members in important decisions” (F, 3, 94 = 3.745, p = .014);

Questionnaire Item #6-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems” (F, 3, 94 = 2.191, p = .017);

Questionnaire Item #20-- The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “has clearly explained the school’s mission to all staff members” (F, 3, 95 = 3.121, p = .030).

Table 16

ANOVA- Differences in Teachers’ Perception of Principals’ Performance Based on Teachers’ Years at the Current Location

<i>Statements</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
2. Involves staff members in important decisions					
Between Groups	8.755	3	2.918	3.745	.014*
Within Groups	73.245	94	.799		
Total	82.000	97			

(table continues)

Table 16 (continued)

<i>Statements</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems					
Between Groups	6.572	3	2.191	3.565	.017*
Within Groups	57.764	94	.615		
Total	64.337	97			
20. Has clearly explained the school's Mission to all staff members					
Between Groups	2.414	3	.805	3.121	.030*
Within Groups	24.495	95	.258		
Total	73.843	98			

*Note.* \* signifies significance

As seen in Table 17, the results of the Post Hoc Tukey Test revealed that the differences occurred between teachers with 7 years or less of experience and teachers with 22 years or more of experience regarding the statement “involves staff members in important decisions. In response to the principals willingness to “stress team work and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems,” the differences was noted between teachers with 0-7 years of experience and teachers with 8-14 years of experience.

Table 17

Post Hoc—Multiple Comparisons Based on Teachers’ Years in the Current Location

<i>Leadership Trait</i>	<i>Years at Current Location</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
2. Involves staff members in important decisions	0-7 (M= 1.9167)	.559	.017*
	22+ (M=1.3571)		
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems	0-7 (M= 1.5208)	.298	.020*
	8-14 (M=1.2222)		

Research question eleven asked “Is there a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the principals’ years at the current location?” No differences were observed between the teachers on their perceptions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness based on the principals’ years at the current location.

### Summary

Chapter IV provided the data analysis in the form of tables to give a description of the teachers’ perceptions of the principals’ leadership effectiveness. The teachers’ responses on the questionnaire provided their perceptions about the school governance, instructional leadership, and culture and climate effectiveness of their principals.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V is a summary of the study, and its conclusions, and recommendations.

The purpose of this study was to examine teachers' perceptions of the leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training Module (OSL). The teachers' responses were recorded through the use of the *Principal Leadership Profile* and analyses were conducted to examine their overall rating of the principals and to determine if there were differences among the teachers regarding their perceptions of the principals.

#### Summary

The majority of the teachers in this study seemed to have a positive view of their principals' leadership effectiveness. In each of the individual categories of leadership that were assessed, teachers seemed to have a favorable view of the principals' performance. This could be viewed by many as indicative of the efficacy of the OSL training program. The analysis of each of the sections below indicates that there is widespread support from the teachers for the performance of the principals.

### *School Governance*

The majority of the principals received strong agreement on their effectiveness in this area from the teachers. Support ranged from a high of 91.7% to a low of 78.7%. All of the mean scores were between a score of 1 and 2. These mean scores represent strong support by the teachers for the principals' effectiveness in school governance.

### *Instructional Leadership*

The majority of the principals received strong support on their effectiveness in this area from the teachers. As seen in Table 4, support ranged from a high of 92.5% to a low of 82.2%. All of the mean scores were between 1 and 2. These mean scores represent strong support by the teachers for the principals' effectiveness in instructional leadership.

### *Culture and Climate*

The majority of the principals received strong support on their effectiveness in this area from the teachers. Support ranged from a high of 97.2% to a low of 80.6%. All of the mean scores were between 1 and 2. These mean scores represent strong support by the teachers for the principals' effectiveness in culture and climate.

### *Research Questions*

Research question one asked "Do male and female teachers differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module?" Out of the 21 leadership traits that were examined, the overall consensus of the teachers regarding the principals' leadership effectiveness was highly positive. The lowest amount of support

from the teachers was reflected from the statement that asked if the principal “involves staff members in important decisions.” This statement received the support of 78.7% of the teachers. All of the other principal leadership traits received much stronger support.

Research question two asked “Do male and female teachers differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module?” Differences between male and female teachers were seen in five of the leadership traits examined. The leadership traits where males and females differed in their perception of the principals’ leadership effectiveness are the following:

1. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “knows/understands the problems of the school”;
2. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems”;
3. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance”;
4. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “provides praise and recognition to staff members”;
5. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “has clearly explained the school’s mission to all staff members.”

Research question three asked “Do African-American and white teachers differ in their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module?” Differences

between the teachers were seen in one of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following trait:

1. The teachers' perception that the principal "encourages parent involvement."

Research question four asked "Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the principals' gender?" Differences between the teachers were seen in nine of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

1. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "knows/understands the problems of the school";
2. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction";
3. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "establishes positive and cooperative relationships with organizations and agencies in the community";
4. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance";
5. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "has confidence in the decision he/she makes";
6. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "establishes effective two-way communication with staff about school-related matters";

7. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "provides praise and recognition to staff members";
8. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "can be easily approached when a staff member has a problem";
9. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "encourages innovation and risk-taking."

Research question five asked "Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the principals' race?" Differences between the teachers were seen in three of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

1. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction";
2. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems" in important decisions";
3. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "encourages parent involvement."

Research question six asked "Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the school's

ethnicity?” No difference was found probability and that is most likely because the schools were predominantly African-American.

Research question seven asked “Is there a significant difference in the teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the type of school?” Differences between the teachers were seen in nine of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

1. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “involves staff members in important decisions”;
2. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “establishes positive and cooperative relationships with organizations and agencies in the community”;
3. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems”;
4. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance”;
5. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities”;
6. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “establishes effective two-way communication”;
7. The teachers’ perceptions that the principal “establishes high expectations for student learning”;

8. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members";
9. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "can be easily approached when a staff member has a problem."

Research question eight asked "Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the school's accreditation level?" Differences between the teachers were seen in nine of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

1. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction";
2. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "stresses teamwork and collaboration indecision s to solve school problems";
3. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "is supportive of staff members";
4. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "provides praise and recognition to staff members."

Research question nine asked "Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the teachers' years of experience?" Differences between the teachers were seen in 13 of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

1. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "knows/understands the problems of the school";
2. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "involves staff members";
3. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction";
4. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems";
5. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works with teachers to establish and maintain effective classroom management";
6. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities";
7. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "is supportive of staff members";
8. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "provides praise and recognition to staff members";
9. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "encourages innovation and risk-taking";
10. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "establishes high expectations for student learning";
11. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members";

12. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "works to establish a safe and orderly environment."

Research question ten asked "Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the teachers' years at the current location?" Differences between the teachers were seen in three of the leadership traits examined. The differences are seen in the following traits:

1. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "involves staff members in important decisions";
2. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems";
3. The teachers' perceptions that the principal "has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members."

Research question eleven asked "Is there a significant difference in the teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the Orientation for School Leaders Training (OSL) Module based on the principals' years at the current location?" No differences between the teachers were seen in the leadership traits examined based on the principals' years at the current location.

## Conclusions

The NCLB has placed an increased responsibility on principals to augment all facets of the leadership to ensure an improved quality of education and the educational environment. According to Hale and Moorman (2003), NCLB made it impossible to ignore the escalating need for higher quality principals who have been prepared to provide the instructional leadership necessary to improve student achievement. In other words, school leaders must increase their capacity to be instructional leaders. The opinion of most of these teachers in this study is that their principals have been meeting the onus of educational leadership.

The main component of OSL is the successful completion of several projects that each participant carries out in his/her district or school. The projects that the principals learned involve knowledge of personality/leadership styles and teamwork; in addition to provision of opportunities to practice skills needed for the administrator to be an effective (a) change agent, (b) human resource manager, and (c) an instructional leader (OSL Module, 2005). The perceptions of the teachers in this study seem to endorse the efficiency of the OSL training module. And, as Jayne (2004) reports, the effectiveness of a school is closely linked to the caliber of its leadership, and for that reason, as Lovette and Watts (2002) suggests, the principal of a school is held accountable for the performance of the school and is therefore central in the effort to meet or exceed goals. The majority of the teachers are in agreement that their principals are accepting the challenge of being accountable for the success of their school and have been taking the necessary steps to maintain efficiency.

The standards established for school leaders by the ISLLC in 1996 laid the ground work to help administrators to maximize student achievement and foster a climate of continuous learning and improvement (Public Education Forum of Mississippi, 2003). Using the teachers' endorsement of the principals' effectiveness in school leadership, one can assume that the school principals have succeeded in satisfying the requirements for accountability and school improvement as proposed by Wong and Sunderman (2001). As Barnett, McCormick & Conners (2000) state, effective leadership is needed to meet the challenges to change governance structures, encourage community influence, and become more accountable. These principals have demonstrated their ability to (a) lead instruction, (b) shape their schools to demand and support excellent instruction, (c) provide dedicated learning for students and professional development for staff, and (d) connect the outside world and its resources to the school in alliance with the recommendations submitted by Hale & Moorman (2003).

The principals in this study also appear to have developed the one to one relationship recommended by Barnett, McCormick and Conners (2000) to accentuate the principals' leadership legitimacy. These leaders appear to have good standing with their followers, the teachers. They have exhibited the type of behavior that has been recognized and acknowledged by the teachers, which is consistent with the beliefs underscored by Brewster and Railsback (2003) that teachers must perceive that their principal has competence, and the ability to perform the tasks required by his or her position.

It is clear that in the 21st century, the role of the principal is becoming more demanding and more complex, but, judging from the responses of the teachers the principals in this study appear to have met the required criteria, proposed by Harris, Ballenger, & Leonard (2004), of skilled instructional leaders, change initiators, managers, personnel directors, problem solvers and visionaries. Similar to reports by Blasé and Blasé (2000), these teachers indicated that their principals provided ongoing dialog with the teaching staff and created opportunities for professional development, and, as a result, their influence, undoubtedly, would lead to a more positive impact on student learning.

The teachers' perception of the principals' leadership on culture and climate also was consistent with declarations by Sahin (2004), who defined school climate as the effect that organized thought and behavior patterns by school personnel would have on values, politics, expectations, traditions, and the unity of perceptions. According to Fullan (2002), "good building principals must be able to assess and evaluate the impact and perceptions of their leadership styles" (p.16).

### Recommendations

The goal of all principals' leadership training should be the preparation of administrators for practical, effective leadership, so that they can positively impact school improvement with the final outcome being measured by student academic performance. All leadership training should incorporate instructional management with leadership, and should provide the administrator with opportunities to practice skills needed as a change agent, a human resource manager, and an instructional leader. The teachers in this study confirm that their principals are succeeding in the areas of school governance,

instructional leadership, and in effectively managing the schools' culture and climate. As a result, it is recommended that Mississippi's OSL Module should be re-instated as an effective tool for training future administrators of public schools in the state of Mississippi.

Further study is recommended to examine and compare leadership preparation programs in Mississippi, as well as other states across the United States. Further study is also recommended to compare the perceptions of teachers from schools with principals trained using the OSL and teachers from schools where the principals were not trained using the OSL regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership effectiveness of principals who were trained using the OSL Module and principals who were not trained using the OSL Module. It is further recommended that funding be re-instated to ensure adequate support for effective execution of the OSL in the state of Mississippi public schools.

## REFERENCES

- Andrews, B.D. & Quinn, R.J. (2004). First-year teaching assignments. *Clearing House*, 78(2), 78.
- Barnett, D. (2004). School leadership preparation programs: Are they preparing tomorrow's leaders. *Education*, 125(1), 121.
- Barnett, K., & McCormick, J. (2004). Leadership and individual principal-teacher relationships in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 405-434
- Barnett, K., McCormick, J., & Conners, R. (2000). Leadership behavior of secondary school principals, teacher outcomes and school culture. School of Education University of New South Wales. A Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education Annual Conference, Sydney, Australia
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teacher's perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38, 130-141.
- Bottoms, G. (2001). *What School Principals Need to Know About Curriculum and Instruction*. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Brewster, C., & Railsback, J. (2003). *Building trusting relationships for school improvement: Implications for principals and teachers*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved December 15, 2005, from [www.nwrel.org/request/2003sept/](http://www.nwrel.org/request/2003sept/)
- Bucher, K.T., & Manning, M.L. (2005). Creating safe schools. *Clearing House*, 79(1), 55-60.
- Carrington, S., & Ellis, J. (2002). Bridging the gap between inclusive policy and inclusive culture in secondary schools. *Support for Learning*, 17(2), 51.
- Conway, C.M., Hibbard, S., Albert, D., & Hourigan, R. (2005). Professional development for arts teachers. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 107(1), 3-9.
- Cookson, P.W. (2005). The challenge of isolation. *Teaching PreK-8*, 36(2), 14-18.

- Cunningham, W., & Cordeiro, P. (2000). *Educational administration: A problem-based approach*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Developing highly qualified teachers.(2005) *The Journal*, 32(12), 22.
- Drake, T., & Roe, W. (2003). *The principalship*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- DuFour, R. (2002). The learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 12-15.
- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, D.C.: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Farkas, S. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. New York: Public Agenda.
- Finn, C., & Hess, F. (2004). On leaving no child behind. *Public Interest*, 157(35).
- Fleischer, C. (2004). Professional development for teacher-writers. *Educational Leadership*, 62(2), 24.
- Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel*. London: Falmer.
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Jersey: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
- Hale, E., & Moorman, H. (2003). Preparing school principals: A national perspective on policy and program innovations. Washington, D. C. : *Institute for Educational Leadership*, and Edwardsville, IL: *Illinois Education Research Council*,
- Halverson, R. (2004). Accessing, documenting, and communicating practical wisdom: The phronesis of school leadership practice. *American Journal of Education*, 111(1), 90.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fink, D. (2004). The seven principles of sustainable leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 8-13.
- Harris, S., Ballenger, J., & Leonard, J. (2004). Aspiring principal's perceptions: Are mentor principals modeling standards-based leadership? *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 12(2), 155-172.'

- Heibert, J., Gallimore, R., & Stigler, J. (2002). A knowledge base for the teaching profession: What would it look like and how can we get one? *Educational Researcher*, 31(2), 3-15.
- Hershberg, T., Simon, V., & Lea-Kruger, (2004). The revelations of value-added. *School Administrator*, 61(11), 10.
- Hoerr, T. (2005). *The art of school leadership*. Alexandria, VA; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ingersoll, R.M., & Smith, T.M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 77, 30-33.
- Jayne, V. (2004). Managing our schools. *New Zealand Management*, 51(2), 26.
- Jennings, J. (2003). From the capital to the classroom: State and federal efforts to implement the No Child Left Behind Act. Melon Park, Calif: Center for Education Policy
- Kaplan, L., & Owings, W. (2003). *National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 86(633), 22-41.
- Keiser, N. M., & Shen, J. (Summer 2000). Principals' and teachers' perceptions of teacher empowerment. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 115
- Kelley, R.C., Thornton, B., & Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationships between measures of leadership and school climate. *Education*, 126(1), 17-25.
- Kent, A.M. (2004). Improving teacher quality through professional development. *Education*, 124(3), 427.
- Kimball, K., & Sirotnik, K. (2000). The urban school principalship. *Education & Urban Society*, 32(4), 535.
- Kussmaul, D. (2005). Reflections on leadership. *The School Administrator*. 6(82), <http://www.aasa.org/publications/saarticledetail.cfm?ItemNumber=2496&snItemNumber=950&tnItemNumber=951>
- Langer, J. (2000). Excellence in English in middle and high school: How teachers' professional lives support student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37, 397-440.479074.
- Lashway, L. (2003). Inducting School Leaders. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management* (ED 479074)

- Louise, S., & Kruse, S. (Eds.). (1995). *Professionalism and community*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin
- Lovette, O., & Watts, S. (2002). Teachers' perceptions of principal: Refining the instrument. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Chattanooga, TN November 6-8 2002. EDRS ED 471 351.
- McElroy, E.J. (2005). The highly qualified teacher. *Teaching PreK-8*, 36(2), 8.
- Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning Newsletter: Changing Schools*. (Winter 2002) Adequate yearly progress: In depth, Aurora, CO.
- Mississippi New Accountability System*. (2003). Office of Innovative Support. Mississippi Department of Education, Jackson, MS.
- Mississippi Department of Education. (1994). Improving the preparation of Mississippi school leaders: The final report from the administrator preparation and certification task force, Jackson, MS.
- Mississippi State Department of Education (2004). Mississippi Public School Accountability Standards. Jackson, MS: Mississippi State Department of Education.
- Moore, D., & Ditzhazy, H. (2000). "Where have all the principals gone? Responses from graduate students in two university graduate leadership programs." *The AASA Professor* 24(1).
- National Research Council (1999). *Starting out right: A guide to promoting children's reading success*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. 70 § 6301 *et seq.*
- Norusis, M. Social Sciences (2001).
- Office of Leadership and Enhancement, Mississippi Department of Education (1995) Orientation to School Leaders Module. [www.mde.k12.ms.us/lead/olde/OSL\\_Module.html](http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/lead/olde/OSL_Module.html). retrieved December 15, 2005.
- Pierce, M. (2000). Portrait of the super principal. *Harvard Education Letter* (March/April). Cambridge, MA.
- Pikulski, J.J. (2000). *Increasing reading achievement through effective reading instruction* (Tech. Rep. No. 19716). Newark, DE: University of Delaware, School of Education.

- Portin, B. (2000) The changing urban school principalship. *Education & Urban Society*, 32 (4), 442.
- Professional development. (2004). *THE Journal*, 31(12), 20.
- Public Education Forum of Mississippi (2003). *Task Force on Teacher Quality*  
<http://www.publiceducationforum.org/Teacher%20Quality%20Report%20Jan%202003.pdf>.
- Rafferty, T.J. (2003). School climate and teacher attitudes toward upward communication in secondary schools. *American Secondary Education*, 31(2), 49-70.
- Reese, S. (2004). Effective school leadership. *Techniques: Connecting Education & Careers*, 79(6), 18.
- Reid, K. S. (2004). States' roles prove tough on big scale. *Education Week*, 24(7).
- Sahin, S. (2004). The relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles of school principals and school culture. *Educational Science: Theory & Practice*, 4(2), 387.
- Sergiovanni, T. (April 2005). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Shahid, B., Chavez, R., Hall, B. L., Long, S., Pritchard, A., Randolph, B., Sullivan, J. & Wildman, L. (2001). How can principal spend more time on instructional leadership? *Education*, 121(3), 508.
- Short, P. & Greer, J. (2002). *Leadership in empowered schools: Themes from innovative efforts*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Simpson, LaCava, P., & Graner, P. (2004). The No Child Left Act: Challenges and implications for educators. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 40(2), 65-75.
- Sparks, D. (2002). Designing powerful professional development for teachers and principals. *National Staff Development Council*. Retrieved December 18, 2005 from <https://www.nsd.org>.
- Strahan, D. (2003). Promoting a collaborative professional culture in three elementary schools that have beaten the odds. *Elementary School Journal*, 104(2), 127.
- Tobergte, D.R., & Curtis, S. (2002). There is a crisis! And failure is not an option. *Education*, 122(4), 770.

- Water, J.T., Marzano, R.J., & McNulty, B. (2004). Leadership that sparks learning. *Educational Leadership*, 61(7), 48.
- Wildy, H., & Dimmock, C. (1993). Instructional leadership in primary and secondary schools in Western Australia. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 31(21), 43-61.
- Wong, S., & Sunderman, G. (2001). How bureaucratic are big-city school systems? *Peabody Journal of Education*, 76(3), 14-40.
- Zimmerman, J.A. (2005). Making change at a junior high school: One principal's sense of it. *American Secondary Education*, 33(2), 29.

APPENDIX A  
ACTUAL RESPONSES

## Appendix A

### Actual Teachers' Responses on Their Perception of Principals' Leadership Effectiveness

Statements	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. Knows/understands the problems of the school	58.7	33.0	7.3	0.9	0.0
2. Involves staff members in important decisions	39.8	38.9	12.0	9.3	0.0
3. Encourages parent involvement	62.4	29.4	6.4	1.8	0.0
4. Works to reduce interruptions so teachers can focus on instruction	52.3	35.8	6.4	2.8	2.8
5. Establishes positive and cooperative relationships with organizations and agencies in the community	50.9	29.6	16.7	2.8	0.0
6. Stresses teamwork and collaboration in decisions to solve school problems	58.3	27.8	9.3	4.6	0.0
7. Works with teachers to coordinate the school's program and curricula improvement efforts	53.7	36.2	5.6	5.6	0.0
8. Helps to provide teachers with necessary resources to be successful in their instructional activities	57.4	31.5	7.4	1.9	1.9
9. Makes regular classroom visits and provides feedback and strategies to improve instruction	56.9	30.3	9.2	2.8	0.9
10. Works with teachers to establish and maintain effective classroom management	43.9	38.3	9.3	6.5	1.9
11. Uses a variety of data to monitor and improve school academic performance	56.7	36.8	5.7	1.9	0.0

12. Works with teachers to provide professional development opportunities and activities	56.5	35.2	6.5	1.9	0.0
13. Is supportive of staff members	55.6	32.4	7.4	3.7	0.9
14. Has confidence in the decision he/she makes	67.9	23.9	8.3	0.0	0.0
15. Establishes effective two-way communication with staff about school-related matters	47.7	38.3	10.3	2.8	0.9
16. Provides praise and recognition to staff members	49.1	31.5	14.8	3.7	0.9
17. Can be easily approached when a staff member has a problem	46.8	36.7	7.3	8.3	0.9
18. Encourages innovation and risk-taking	45.8	41.1	10.3	2.8	0.0
19. Establishes high expectations for student learning	75.0	22.2	2.8	0.0	0.0
20. Has clearly explained the school's mission to all staff members	65.1	31.2	2.8	0.9	0.0
21. Works to establish a safe and orderly environment	67.6	26.9	2.8	2.8	0.0

---

*Note.* \*SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree, % = valid percent, n = 109

APPENDIX B  
IRB APPROVAL LETTER



December 8, 2006

Spurgeon Andrae Banyard  
303 Kirkwood Dr.  
Clinton, MS 39056

RE: IRB Study #06-253: Central Mississippi Teachers Perceptions of Effective Behaviors of Principals Trained Using The Orientation for School Leaders Training Module

Dear Mr. Banyard:

The above referenced project was reviewed and approved via administrative review on 12/8/2006 in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2). Continuing review is not necessary for this project. However, any modification to the project must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to implementation. Any failure to adhere to the approved protocol could result in suspension or termination of your project. The IRB reserves the right, at anytime during the project period, to observe you and the additional researchers on this project.

Please refer to your IRB number (#06-253) when contacting our office regarding this application.

Thank you for your cooperation and good luck to you in conducting this research project. If you have questions or concerns, please contact me at [cwilliams@research.msstate.edu](mailto:cwilliams@research.msstate.edu) or 325-5220.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Christine Williams".

Christine Williams  
IRB Administrator

cc: Jerry Mathews

**Office for Regulatory Compliance**

P. O. Box 6223 • 8A Morgan Street • Mailstop 9563 • Mississippi State, MS 39762 • (662) 325-3294 • FAX (662) 325-8776