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Abstract

The purpose of this replication study was to assess the differences in perceptions of the leader-constituent relationship between principals, given a self-assessment survey, and instructors, given an observer survey. The study used the Leadership Practices Inventory developed by Kouzes and Posner (2007). Principals from 150 Missouri public schools were invited to respond to the survey. Further, 1,100 of their building instructors were also invited to respond to a survey indicating their perception of their leaders’ effectiveness. A comparative analysis is included in this study. The investigator then offers some conclusions and recommendations for further research based on the results of the study and review of the literature.
Chapter I: Introduction

Introduction

Articles regarding Educational Leadership are published at a rate of ten or more articles per day (Grint, 1997). Additionally, numerous editorials, books and commentaries are available to help individuals develop, or enhance, the skills necessary to advance today’s educational environments. This change of focus reflects the current trend emphasizing the leaders’ skills for serving the organization and leading these organizations into the future via beliefs, core values, demonstrated behavior and truth. Kussrow and Purland (2001) suggest that effective leadership originates from a congruency in thought. The leader who displays consistency in management (demonstrated by the individual’s internalized beliefs, core values and concept of truth) provides vision to the organization that will produce results at all levels of service. Today’s leaders guide the organization by establishing core values that define workplace norms. The desired result is the daily implementation of these values and beliefs into organizational decisions and practices.

Anderson (as cited in Kussrow and Purland, 2001) concluded that clear and consistent beliefs are commonly used to improve leader self-control, increase performance in leadership tasks, and promote the exercise of leadership skills. Although ‘self” is a difficult and complex concept for definition, the educational leader is primarily defined by the sum of her/his personal, professional and educational experiences prior to accepting the position. In addition, personal and professional development activities after entrance into an educational leadership position helped to provide additional insight into the leaders abilities. An individual’s notions of ‘self”, when taken as a sum of its component parts, exhibit the development of self-esteem and provide the formational measurement of a leader.
To understand good leadership one must also consider the principles of bad leadership. Burns (as cited in Kellerman, 2004, pg. 8) stated that,

“Leadership over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize … resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers…in order to realize goals mutually held by leaders and followers.”

Leadership is the engagement of others through the process of creating shared meaning. Followers tend to accept leadership when the leader speaks in a distinctive voice that demonstrates one’s capability to adapting to circumstances within, and without, the environment. Finally, leadership is an expression of one’s personal integrity.

Bad leadership, as described by Kellerman, falls into seven classes. The first three types of bad leadership exemplify ineffective leadership under the categories: Incompetent, Rigid, and Intemperate. The remaining four categories exemplify unethical leadership under the terms: Callous, Corrupt, Insular, and Evil.

Brief descriptions of each category of bad leadership, as defined by Kellerman, are included for comparison with effective leadership.

**Incompetent Leadership:** “The leader and at least some followers lack the will or skill (or both) to sustain effective action. With regard to at least one important leadership challenge, they do not create positive change.” (Kellerman, 2004, pg. 40-46)
Rigid Leadership: “The leader and at least some followers are stiff and unyielding. Although they may be competent, they are unable or unwilling to adapt to new ideas, new information, or changing times.” (Kellerman, 2004, pg. 40-46)

Intemperate Leadership: “The leader lacks self-control and is aided and abetted by followers who are unwilling or unable effectively to intervene.” (Kellerman, 2004, pg. 40-46)

Callous Leadership: “The leader and at least some followers are uncaring or unkind. Ignored or discounted are the needs, wants, and wishes of most members of the group or organization, especially subordinates.” (Kellerman, 2004, pg. 40-46)

Corrupt Leadership: “The leader and at least some followers lie, cheat, or steal. To a degree that exceeds the norm, they put self-interest ahead of the public interest.” (Kellerman, 2004, pg. 40-46)

Insular Leadership: “The leader and at least some followers minimize or disregard the health and welfare of ‘the other’ – that is, those outside the group or organization for which they are directly responsible.” (Kellerman, 2004, pg. 40-46)

Evil Leadership: “The leader and at least some followers commit atrocities. They use pain as an instrument of power. The harm done to men, women, and children is severe
rather than slight. The harm can be physical, psychological, or both.” (Kellerman, 2004, pg. 40-46)

The educational leader will be judged by their leadership history. Good leadership will result in positive memories and acknowledgement of the advancement of the organization. Bad leadership will also result in memories; however, they will often be negative memories that hold the key to the organization’s failure to thrive in accomplishing its stated goals.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this replication study is to describe the administration and teacher perceptions of principal leadership practices using the Leadership Practices Inventory. In addition, overall principal’s self-observation of leadership practices was compared to overall teacher’s observation of their principal’s leadership effectiveness at a random sample of Missouri school districts.

Clarification of the Problem

Definition of Terms

Leadership Practices Inventory: An identification tool for behaviors that make a difference in a leader’s effectiveness. The Leadership Practices Inventory (“LPI”) consists of thirty statements that address the essential behaviors found when people report achieving their personal best as leaders. (Kouzes, 2007)
The Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership:

- **Model the Way** – the exercise of personal credibility to establish one’s voice and lead by example (Kouzes, 2007);
- **Inspire a Shared Vision** – capturing a vision for the future and enlisting others to join in the pursuit of a shared vision (Kouzes, 2007);
- **Challenge the Process** – soliciting innovative approaches to promote change, growth, and improvement through experimentation and risk taking (Kouzes, 2007);
- **Enable Others to Act** – encouraging collaboration, shared power and impact evaluation (Kouzes, 2007); and
- **Encourage the Heart** – providing opportunities for recognition of individual and team contributions and celebrating organization and individual values and victories. (Kouzes, 2007)

**Limitations**

This study was limited to practicing educational leaders in Missouri public school district. School districts were randomly selected for participation. Administrators and teachers voluntarily participated in the study via a signed consent form and completion of the Leadership Practices Inventory (“LPI”). [The “self” form was completed by the administrators and the “observer” form was completed by the administrators’ reporting teachers.]

The ideal administration of the LPI occurs when a leader completes the “self” form and direct reports and/or supervised staff members complete the “observer” form in review of the leader. Due to the nature of this study, following this ideal scenario proved a limitation on the study.
Delimitations

The study is based on voluntary participation of the educational leaders and direct report faculty from the administrator’s building. The response rate for the survey could be limiting and interfere with the results of the study. Additionally, educational leaders could participate, but the faculty could choose not to provide input for comparison data.

Assumptions

All educational leaders have an understanding of exemplary leadership practices as defined through the questions on this survey instrument and will accurately provide an assessment of her/his personal leadership practices as part of this study. Educational leaders are interested in determining how one’s self-rating of leadership practices compares to the perception of the faculty in an assessment of one’s success in an educational leadership position.

Conceptual Framework

Previous research and literature has focused on the preparation of the principal for educational leadership founded upon pre-position leadership skill development and professional development activities engaged during the individual’s tenure as principal in the school environment. (Browne-Ferrigno, 2002; Coleman, 1996; Daresh, 2001; Fenwick, 2002; Lashway, 2003; Lashway, 1996; Lewis, 1993; Losee, 2000; Malone, 2001; and Zellner, 2002) Additional research and literature has focused on principal duties, such as, the development of leadership teams and school cultures (Lucas, 2002), models for teacher leadership (Strodl, 1992), professional development programming for the principal (Peterson, 2001) and developing data analysis skills in principals (Polnick, 2003). Finally, Lashway has focused his research on education leadership in these areas: guides for measuring leadership (Lashway, 1999), the
development of instructional leaders (Lashway, 2002), measurement of leadership potential (Lashway, 1997), vision in the educational leadership position (Lashway, 1997), and ethics in educational leadership (Lashway, 1996).

Some literature related to gender roles in education administration has focused on the ‘micro-politics’ of inter- and intra-personal communication related to genders in the workplace (Peters, 2002). Hackney (1998) and Hawk (1995) offered reflections of women who had progressed into education administration as one avenue of motivating other women to see the potential of filling education leadership roles. Finally, looking at the 1990’s and beyond, Logan (2000) reflected on the influence women would have on schools entering the 21st century.

Other researched and reviewed influences on the principal’s role and leadership in the school building include: hard-to-staff-schools (Lashway, 2003); retention of principals under the increasing demands placed on the position (Hertling, 2001); and the influence of the school environment on principal leadership (Wiseman, 2003). The impact of organizations like the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, and the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards also are important considerations for educational leaders and those who employ them (Lashway, 2003). Finally, the principal’s acquisition of leadership skills, pre- and post-employment, is an influence of how well the educational leader achieves the standard roles set for the position of organizational leader (Huber, 2002).

*Significance of the Study*

The educational facility’s leader positively, or adversely, affects progress toward the successful achievement of the district’s goals (Arif, 2003; Lashway, 2003; Logan, 1998).
Developing a frame of understanding that delineates the characteristics of a successful leader will help many organizations select and groom better leaders for the building and the district (Coleman, 1996; Department of Education, 1999; Haberman, 1999; Lashway, 2002; Rorrer, 2005). Finding a positive match for the organizations current, or desired, climate will provide the strongest opportunity for positive growth in student academic achievement (Johnson, 2005; Lashway, 2002; Lucas, 2003; Polnick, 2003), teacher satisfaction (Daresh, 2001; Lashway, 2002; Lucas, 2002; Strodl, 1992; Terry, 1995), local perceptions of success (Arif, 2003; Bulach, 1998; Lashway, 2003; Lashway, 2002; Lashway, 1999; Logan, 1998; Lucas, 2002; Wiseman, 2003) and compliance with state and federal mandates (Arif, 2003; Department of Education, 1999; Daresh, 2001; Haberman, 1999; Johnson, 2005; Lashway, 2003; Lashway, 1997; Leech, 2002; Polnick, 2003; Rayfield, 2004; Zellner, 2002).

The significance of this process rests in the constituents who are impacted by the decision to employ a particular leader for an educational facility. The obvious constituents are the school board, faculty, staff and community leaders. Recent legislative action at the state and national level raised the need for more accountability to local, state and federal mandates and expectations (Arif, 2003; Logan, 1998; SEDL, 2005). In addition, educational facilities are now discerning the importance of making sure that students, parents and social service organizations are also a part of the mix of constituents to be addressed by educational leaders (Lashway, 2003; Lashway, 2002; Logan, 1998; SEDL, 1994, Terry, 1995; Wiseman, 2003).

An impact group often forgotten in the community is the senior citizens. Senior citizen involvement is important from two perspectives. First, retired voters, without school-aged children, traditionally carry, or defeat, necessary bond issues in a district. Second, there has been a significant rise in the number of grandparents who are raising their children’s children through
the school-age years in the United States. Thus, school districts have had to perceive the attitudes and values of many more constituents than previously addressed by educational leaders. These changes require adaptation in the selection process for educational leaders. (SEDL, 2005)

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this replication study was to describe the administration and teacher perceptions of principal leadership practices using the Leadership Practices Inventory. In addition, overall principal’s self-observation of leadership practices was compared to overall teacher’s observation of their principal’s leadership effectiveness at a random sample of Missouri school districts.

**Research Questions**

The following research question guided this inquiry: What is the relationship between administrator and teacher perception of leadership using the Leadership Practices Inventory in a sample of Missouri school districts? Further the following sub-questions will be addressed:

- How do administrators and teachers assess “modeling the way” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “inspiring a shared vision” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “challenging the process” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “enabling others to act” in educational leadership?
• How do administrators and teachers assess “encouraging the heart” in educational leadership?

Summary

As already noted, leadership articles have been published at a rate of ten or more articles per day. (Grint, 1997) Additional editorials, books and commentaries are readily available to aid the educational leader to develop, or enhance, her/his leadership skills to advance the school’s academic achievement and social development of its students. Understanding the pre- and post-position perception of leadership practices for the educational leader may unlock some assistance for superintendents and school boards to engage solid employment decisions when employing administrators.

Central Office personnel have been charged with the responsibility of hiring teachers, building community trust and overseeing student academic achievement. Thus, the educational leader has a significant influence over students, parents and district constituents. “Yet most graduate education programs that train these school administrators are deeply flawed, suffering from irrelevant curriculum, low standards, weak faculty and little clinical instruction. Many programs are doing little more than dishing out higher degrees to teachers who are trying to qualify for salary increases,” says Levine (as cited by Feller, 2005, pg. 1). Educator training programs must significantly change or the impact on the development of leaders and school districts will destroy the integrity and credibility of the school community.

As the debate for improving administrator-training programs continues, school districts, central office administration and school boards must find a panacea for improving the selection, retention and development of educational leaders. One way to do this is through research and
investigation of the characteristics of successful leaders. Providing a link between successful leaders and those who are thinking about educational leadership is important to the success of the organization in obtaining a quality candidate that can meet the district’s needs and expectations.
Chapter II: Review of Literature

Introduction

In addition to the vast amount of published leadership research that has been added to existing academic publications and reviews, including numerous editorials, books and commentaries (Grint, 1997), executive desks in American business offices receive mail daily touting workshops promising the development of life-changing leadership skills. A cursory review of marketing tools reflected the trend emphasizing leadership skills for the supervisor to guide the organization into the future via beliefs, core values, demonstrated behavior and truth. Kussrow and Purland (2001) suggested that effective leadership originates from a congruency in thought – individual exhibition of consistency demonstrated by internalized beliefs, core values and truth. Leadership of the organization occurs via a system of established guiding core values in the form of organizational norms. Good leadership skills results in daily incorporation of those values and beliefs into organizational decisions and practices.

Anderson (as quoted in Kussrow & Purland, 2001) concluded that a concise and relevant set of organizational beliefs was commonly used, and necessary, to enhance leader self-control, improve performance in leadership tasks, and promote the development of leadership skills. This literature review focused on five areas of leadership skill development: Principal Preparation, Principal Duties, Principal Impact, Gender Roles in Educational Administration, and Other Peripheral Influences on Principal Leadership.

Principal Preparation

The preparation of the principal for educational leadership is founded on pre-position leadership skill development, as well as, professional development activities engaged during the
individual’s tenure as principal in the school environment. (Browne-Ferrigno, 2002; Coleman, 1996; Daresh, 2001; Fenwick, 2002; Lashway, 2003; Lashway, 1996; Lewis, 1993; Losee, 2000; Malone, 2001; and Zellner, 2002)

Hughes (1998) conducted a study asking three research questions. These questions included review regarding whether age, gender and/or ethnicity were a factor in whether or not an administrator completed a college/university administrator preparation program. Hughes also reviewed whether the administrator found the training program effective, for those who completed an administrator-training program in relation to demographic characteristics. Finally, Hughes sought to discern differences in perceived importance of a number of training topics based on demographic characteristics of the participating administrators.

Hughes (1998) randomly selected 700 (of 3,881) private school chief administrators in the state of California to administer a survey seeking to determine perception of what skills were essential for success in educational leadership positions. Of the 700 surveys mailed, 255 surveys were returned with 174 female respondents (68%) and 82 male respondents (32%). The survey also sought suggestions for improving the pre-service preparation of administrators for private schools.

Demographics of the respondents included a majority that were predominantly white, in the 41-60 year old age bracket, with between 5 to 15 years of experience, most having been first appointed to an administrative position between 31 and 50 years of age, and the majority held at least a Master’s degree (Hughes, 1998). Only 51% of the respondents completed a college/university level education administration preparation program. Of those respondents who completed a preparation for education administration program, older administrators reported a higher degree of preparation for their job than those who were first appointed between 21 to 30
years of age. Females also reported a stronger feeling of preparation for their jobs than did their male colleagues. Those respondents who had completed a preparation for education administration program assigned greater importance to three specific areas of administration skills. The areas identified were: management skills (i.e., budget development, administration of food services, maintaining custodial services, monitoring and developing secretarial services, and evaluation of teaching and non-teaching staff); interpersonal skills (i.e., changes to one’s family as a result of the position, changes to other interpersonal relationships, interpersonal networking skills, and encouraging involvement by all parties of the educational community); and leadership skills (i.e., knowledge and awareness of organizational power and authority, knowing ethical limits, balancing professional and ethical values, and assessing job responsibilities).

Haberman and Dill (1999) provide a stark contrast to Hughes by forwarding the basic assumption that training individuals in classroom structured preparation programs does not produce significant results. Haberman and Dill believe that ‘star’ principals receive support via an ideology that enhances, but must be intrinsically present to influence the leadership of the principal in the role of educational administrator. Effective principal candidate selection occurs in tandem with assessment of the candidate’s response to certain critical events.

Some of the areas that Haberman and Dill (1999) include as ‘star’ principal beliefs include:

- Emphasis on the safety and security of everyone in and around the school building.
- Principal belief that he/she is present to help the teachers improve students’ learning.
- Principal leadership in connecting students and their families to all kinds of health and human services.
Principal benefits are tied to the accountability and responsibility the principal has for the effectiveness of the total school.

Classroom management is only a beginning point to effective teaching. Student learning is the best criterion for deciding teacher effectiveness.

Society is the consumer of education. Parents are useful sources of information about their children, as well as, resources in the educational process. Parents are vital partners in meeting the needs of the children.

Every individual who sets foot in the school building needs to be treated as important and of inherent value and worth.

Leadership is ‘best’ exemplified by assisting the community in seeking what is in the best interests of their children.

Admitting, and embracing, the shortcomings of the school program are the most important steps for producing improvement.

It is vital to the school environment to get rid of a ‘bad’ teacher.

Selection and assignment of ‘new’ teachers is important to principal accountability for instruction.

The principal is the primary source of protecting the school building from the chaos in which it must operate.

(Haberman, 1999, pg. 2)

Various literature sources approached principal preparation from multiple perspectives. A common thread in the literature was the principal as a strategic key to success in the school building (Haberman, 1999; Hughes, 2000; Lashway, 2003; Lashway, 1999; Leech, 2002;
Wiseman, 2003). Other literature indicated that some principal abilities have been natural extensions of the principal’s personality and character (Browne-Ferrigno, 2002; Hackney, 1998; Hawk, 1995; Holtkamp, 2002; Kussrow, 2001; Lewis, 1993, Losee, 2000; Zellner, 2002). Yet additional literature indicated that some of the abilities of the principal experience growth through an education administration preparation program (Browne-Ferrigno, 2002; Coleman, 1996; Daresh, 2001; Fenwick, 2002; Huber, 2002; Hughes, 2000; Lashway, 1997; Peterson, 2001; Zellner, 2002). Finally, some of the necessary improvements for continued leadership development in the principal position results from post-position professional development and mentoring programs (Coleman, 1996; Daresh, 2001; Hertling, 2001; Lashway, 2003; Lucas, 2002; Malone, 2001; Peterson, 2001; Zellner, 2002).

**Duties and Responsibilities of the Educational Leader**

Another important part of the development of principal leadership skills focuses on the duties that the principal performs within the educational administration position. Rayfield and Diamantes (2004) concluded that the principalship is complex and, at times, difficult. Many of the duties of the principal have a negative impact on the individual’s perception of job satisfaction. Rayfield and Diamantes used a focus group approach to identify key job responsibilities for the principal. Using a variety of items from textbooks and case studies, the researchers formed independent focus groups (one of 6 administrators and another of 14 administrators) to provide evidence of content validity related to a list of specific job items identified as important to the role of principal. The twenty-five (25) items listed were:

- Selection of teachers
- Evaluation of instructional staff
Assignment of faculty to courses
• Leading professional development
• Development of a master schedule
• Working to develop a cooperative relationship
• Enforcement of contract provisions
• Making the school safe
• Dealing with disruptive students
• Dealing with attendance concerns
• Working with parents relative to student behavior
• Curriculum development or alignment
• Accepting accountability for instructional programs
• Compliance with state mandates
• Special education supervision
• Publication of newsletters
• Attendance at community events
• Awards recognition programs
• Budget development
• Budget management
• Fundraising
• Selection of coaches
• Evaluation of supplemental personnel
• Supervision/Attendance at extra-curricular activities
Facilities maintenance personnel supervision

(Rayfield, 2004, pgs. 710-11)

Rayfield and Diamantes (2004) conclude that principals are accountable for all of these aspects in their role as the educational leader; however, principals are not necessarily high achievers in every role. The authors called for further research related to principal satisfaction regarding specific duties of job performance. Further research would benefit from the use of the twenty-five (25) specific task areas in comparison groups of educational leaders relative to self-reported satisfaction with regard to performance in the role of the educational leader.

Johnson (2005) stated that the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) provided assessment of the preparation and continued professional development of school administrators. Johnson wrote that training centers, state education departments and school districts, must create pre-service and in-service delivery systems that afford the opportunity for school leaders to develop and demonstrate the six standardized areas for the ISLLC assessment, including: vision, culture, management, community relationships, ethics and the larger political, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Bulach (1998) offered identification of common mistakes that principals are perceived to make as educational leaders through a study of 375 Georgia educators who were enrolled in graduate programs. The mistakes identified in this study were in the following areas:

- inadequate inter- or intra-personal relation skills,
- inadequate interpersonal communication skills,
- failure to have, or propone a clear vision,
- failure to exercise decisive leadership,
• avoiding necessary, or productive, conflict,
• lack of specific knowledge skills related to instruction/curriculum,
• over-reliance on authoritative leadership styles,
• lack of integrity or character,
• forgetting what it was like to be a teacher in the classroom,
• inconsistency in decision-making procedures,
• showing favoritism for an area within the building,
• failure to hold all staff accountable to a consistent degree,
• failure to follow through on tasks or offers to help,
• coming to, and implementing, snap judgments,
• interrupting instruction with all-call announcements.

(Bulach, 1998, pgs. 2-3)

Other literature related to principal duties includes the development of leadership teams and school cultures (Lucas, 2002), models for teacher leadership (Strodl, 1992), professional development programming for the principal (Peterson, 2001) and developing data analysis skills in principals (Polnick, 2003).

Principal Impact

Preparation and duties of the principal are factors that lead to defining the principal’s impact on the school climate and environment. The Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) has compiled several documents reviewing leadership characteristics that facilitate change. The SEDL’s literature review concluded that there are six characteristics in leaders of educational change: obtaining and expressing a clear vision for the school
building/district; maintaining a strong commitment to the belief that schools are for learning; prioritizing and promoting the value of one’s human resources; having good communication skills and utilizing effective listening with staff; taking effective and proactive action; and the willingness to take, and motivate others to take risks. By focusing on these characteristics, the SEDL believes that a principal will be able to meet the primary goal of achieving the instructional needs of her/his students. (SEDL, 1993, 2000, and 2005)

The SEDL (2000), in the report entitled, “Leadership: An Imperative for Successful Change” recommended that educational leaders, including principals, focus on actions such as developing and communicating a shared vision; comprehensive planning for, and provision of human, academic and clerical resources; investment in the comprehensive professional development and training of all staff; regular monitoring and assessment for program progress; commitment to continual assistance for instructional staff; and creative development of an environment that is conducive to change. The paper went on to relate a specific example where this occurred in the educational setting and the positive results for students, parents, community, district, staff, as well as, the educational leadership.

Finally, the SEDL (1994) proposes that vision is a primary component of educational leadership. In the document entitled, “Vision, Leadership, and Change,” the SEDL offers a vision for educators, and educational administrators, to contemplate. The SEDL relates vision to an engaging idea that provides inspiration, motivation and engagement for all staff. The vision provided by the principal to the school building is part of a necessary, compelling picture of the future that inspires the students, teachers, staff, parents and community to a high level of commitment to complete the vision. Every principal should consider these five characteristics of vision in developing the role she/he has within the school building: attracting commitment and
energizing people; creating meaning in educational delivery systems; establishing standards of excellence amongst students, faculty, staff, parents, community and district administration; bridging the gap between the present and the future; and leading the organization beyond the status quo.

Rorrer (2005) undertook two separate multi-year, multi-phase research projects in two states (North Carolina and Texas) to determine how leaders cultivate relationships and interactions, engage staff and students in reform at the district and individual school building level, and integration, or alignment, of school purposes, goals, policies, and practices to support achievement in all children. The conclusion of this research included the determination that local administrators retain considerable control over how a policy is perceived, enacted, ignored, misappropriated, or integrated. The ability of the educational leader to re-conceptualize the purpose of a policy and adapt the frame to meet local needs provides the foundation for achievement in outcomes for all children within a district. Rorrer also stated that this research showed that children from low-income homes and students of color are impacted strongly by these factors.

Terry (1996) added to the available literature by suggesting that shared decision-making and site-based decision-making are also important components of successful education leadership. Terry concluded that principals are the building leader providing structure to the climate within the school building, while creating teacher and student empowerment. The U.S. Department of Education (1999) also provides examples of effective leaders for, and in, today’s schools. Finally, Leech (2002) offers ‘best’ practices through a study of the leadership practices of middle and high school principals.

The impact of the principal on educational administration is widely documented in literature and through research (Bulach, 1998; Daresh, 2001; Feller, 2005; Haberman, 1999; Hertling, 2001; Hughes, 2002; Lashway, 2003; Leech, 2002; Logan, 1998; Lucas, 2002; Rorrer, 2005; Zellner, 2002). The impact of the principal on the educational setting forms the third leg of the stool defining the principal’s role in school building leadership. Two additional factors are important to consider in reviewing the literature on principal leadership skills and development. They are the role gender plays in education administration (a traditionally male organization) and other peripheral influences on the role of principal as leader within the school building (Wolverton, 1999; SEDL, 1994; Arif, 2003).

**Gender Roles in Educational Administration**

Educational leadership, including the principal position, has a distinctively ‘male’ appearance. According to Holtkamp (2002), the ratio of men to women in school administration is roughly a four-to-one comparison. Holtkamp also identified that the general workforce ratio of women was approximately 50%; however, women maintained a reduced margin of 13% of the management positions and 7% of the executive positions. The advancement of women in education administration characterizes each individual’s effort to overcome internal and external
barriers created by the Board of Education, Central Office Administration, peers, faculty, parents, communities and students.

Wolverton (1999) researched the impact of gender-based segregation in workplace hierarchies in the state of Washington. The research identified that men still dominate the majority of key leadership positions in the state. Additionally, Wolverton commented that the proportion of women to men in educational leadership positions were not comparable to the levels of female participation in the educational marketplace.

Shepherd (1998) discussed barriers that appeared for women desiring to advance in educational leadership positions. A persistent question for researchers has existed when women refrain from attempting to assert themselves in education administration. Shepherd offers important advice to all women making the move to attain a position in education administration by advocating that women avail themselves to the differences perceived between men and women in filling education leader roles without allowing this to impede the pursuit of the leadership position. Perception, Shepherd explained, is reflective of the understanding, or beliefs, of the individual related to one’s internal, or external, sense of truth.

Shepherd (1998) followed up on a 1978 study by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) that utilized a survey to assess employment characteristics that Boards of Education, Superintendents and others would use in making an employment decision regarding a potential candidate. Shepherd used a stratified sample for a national survey of school districts of various sizes. The survey instrument, “The Science Research Associates Opinion Survey for Men and Women (“SRA”) was used for the 1996, as well as, the 1978 survey. In the 1996 survey, 256 superintendents and 256 board presidents received the survey, 130 responded to the survey. Of the 130 returned surveys, 86 were from superintendents and 44 were from
Shepherd (1998) concluded that differences in the perceptions of employment characteristics for men and women have changed since 1978. The change appeared positive; however, the change has not been statistically significant in all areas of the survey. Negative results obtained from the survey included the perception that superintendents and school boards still perceive women as being emotional and displaying these emotions in the educational setting. Finally, Shepherd concluded that superintendents needed to champion the support of women as educational administrators. Superintendents know the capabilities of women as educational leaders and they need to promote a change in perception by the Board of Education related to the aptitudes, knowledge and skills of women in leadership positions.

Additional literature related to gender roles in education administration focused on the ‘micro-politics’ of inter- and intra-personal communication related to genders in the workplace (Peters, 2002). Hackney (1998) and Hawk (1995) offered reflections of women who had progressed into education administration as one avenue of motivating other women to see the potential of filling education leadership roles. Finally, Logan (2000) looked at the 1990’s, and beyond, reflecting on the influence women will have on education as schools enter the 21st century.

Other Peripheral Influences on Principal Leadership

The primary role of the Board of Education in a school district is to focus on systematic planning and policy development; however, recent events in schools have led many boards to spend a majority of their time on crisis management and operational details that influence the
role of the principal and her/his ability to fill the role of educational leader. When the Board of Education established a strong commitment to focus on the youth of the community, and allowed the administrator to fill the important role of visionary leadership, the district achieved greater student success. (SEDL, 1994)

Arif and Smiley (2003) detailed one of the current practices of school evaluation related to business-like accountability for schools. These authors related a review of the growing practice of using “Total Quality Management” (TQM) [pg. 740] and the Malcolm Baldridge Awards as a measure of school success.

The impact on the education professional in the school building is profound (Lashway, 2002). Principals, and faculty, see increased responsibility for curriculum decisions, and the impact on student success, as measured by the business-like tools of industrial review (Arif, 2003; Johnson, 2005; Lucas, 2002; Polnick, 2003; Rorrer, 2005). The impact on teachers is profound when considering they are making immediate judgments regarding curriculum implementation with students (SEDL, 2005). The roles of the principal are increasing, as she/he must now validate achievement through grades, state and standardized testing, and documentation reviews for programs such as the Malcolm Baldridge Awards (Arif, 2003; Polnick, 2003; SEDL, 1994).

Yet other influences on the principal’s role and leadership in the school building included: hard-to-staff-schools (Lashway, 2003); retention of principals under the increasing demands placed on the position (Hertling, 2001); and the influence of the school environment on principal leadership (Wiseman, 2003). The impact of organizations like ISLLC, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) also weighed-in for the principal (Lashway, 2003).
Finally, the principal’s acquisition of leadership skills, pre- and post-employment, influenced how well standards of success were achieved (Huber, 2002).

**Summary**

The review of literature on leadership in the educational setting offers a variety of perspectives related to principal preparation. How an individual acquired educational leadership skills was vital to the success the person could expect to attain during the tenure of leadership. Preparation programs prior to and during one’s experience as a leader enhanced, or detracted, from success.

Principal roles, duties and responsibilities were documented as having an impact on the effectiveness of the educational leader. What one did either enhanced, or detracted, the effectiveness of the individual in leading the school building/district. Additionally, the educational leader’s impact on the environment resulted from other influences, including gender roles in administration and accreditation standards and procedures.

Leaders must be selected carefully and in the context of the environment that will serve as the field of one’s experience. Understanding the many influences on the educational leader will help future superintendents, school boards, consultants and communities ensure the selection of the best candidate for the available environment and provide students with successful experiences in academic endeavors.
Chapter III: Methodology

Statement of the Problem

Perceived leadership can be vastly different from experienced leadership for principals and teachers. Self-assessment of one’s ability to lead effectively can be dramatically different from the observed assessment of the leader’s effectiveness by direct and indirect reports. The gap that these differences create can negatively influence the educational leaders’ capability to lead the educational environment forward in today’s high stakes, results-oriented review of classroom results.

Significance of the Study

The educational facility’s leader positively, or adversely, affects progress toward the successful achievement of the district’s goals (Arif, 2003; Lashway, 2003; Logan, 1998). Developing a frame of understanding that delineates the characteristics of a successful leader will help many organizations select and groom better leaders for the building and the district (Coleman, 1996; Department of Education, 1999; Haberman, 1999; Lashway, 2002; Rorrer, 2005). Finding a positive match for the organizations current, or desired, climate will provide the strongest opportunity for positive growth in student academic achievement (Johnson, 2005; Lashway, 2002; Lucas, 2003; Polnick, 2003), teacher satisfaction (Daresh, 2001; Lashway, 2002; Lucas, 2002; Strod, 1992; Terry, 1995), local perceptions of success (Arif, 2003; Bulach, 1998; Lashway, 2003; Lashway, 2002; Lashway, 1999; Logan, 1998; Lucas, 2002; Wiseman, 2003) and compliance with state and federal mandates (Arif, 2003; Department of Education, 1999;
The significance of this process rests in the constituents who are impacted by the decision to employ a particular leader for an educational facility. The obvious constituents are the school board, faculty, staff and community leaders. Recent legislative action at the state and national level raised the need for more accountability to local, state and federal mandates and expectations (Arif, 2003; Logan, 1998; SEDL, 2005). In addition, educational facilities are now discerning the importance of making sure that students, parents and social service organizations are also a part of the mix of constituents addressed by educational leaders (Lashway, 2003; Lashway, 2002; Logan, 1998; SEDL, 1994; Terry, 1995; Wiseman, 2003).

An impact group often forgotten in the community is the senior citizens. Senior citizen involvement is important from two perspectives. First, retired voters without school-aged children traditionally carry, or defeat, necessary bond issues in a district. Second, there has been a significant rise in the number of grandparents who are raising their children’s children through the school-age years in the United States. Thus, districts have had to perceive the attitudes and values of many more constituents than previously addressed by educational leaders. These changes require adaptation in the selection process for educational leaders. (SEDL, 2005)

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this replication study was to describe the principal and teacher’s perceptions of principal leadership practices using the Leadership Practices Inventory. In addition, an analysis of the overall principal’s self-observation of leadership practices was
compared against the overall teacher’s observation of their principal’s leadership effectiveness at a random sample of Missouri school districts.

Research Questions

The following research question guided this inquiry: What is the relationship between administrator and teacher perception of leadership using the Leadership Practices Inventory in a sample of Missouri school districts? Further, the following sub-questions will be addressed:

- How do administrators and teachers assess “modeling the way” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “inspiring a shared vision” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “challenging the process” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “enabling others to act” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “encouraging the heart” in educational leadership?

Design of the Study

Research Methodology

The research methodology incorporates a replication-type approach using the Leadership Practices Inventory survey tool (Kouzes, 2007). Specifically, a questionnaire was used to gather the educational leaders’ “self” assessment of the five leadership practices demonstrated on the Leadership Practices Inventory. Items on the survey correspond to the five exemplary leadership
practices identified by Kouzes and Posner (2007). Participants were offered selected responses with a Likert-type rating scale, from 1, “almost never” to 10, “almost always.”

**Population and Sampling Techniques**

The population selected for use in this research study included current administrators and teachers in a randomly selected number of school district across the state of Missouri during the 2006-2007 school year. Administrators were randomly selected from urban/rural areas, as well as, large, medium and small school buildings via a list obtained from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. This study determined that at least one hundred and fifty administrators were needed for the research.

For comparison, at least eight individuals from the administrator’s building were invited to provide comparison data for review with the self-evaluation completed by the educational leader. For this element of the study, faculty members from the educational leader’s building were selected to complete an evaluation of the educational leader for comparison data.

Selection, and use, of human subjects was done according to the policies and procedures of the Human Subjects Committee at Northern Michigan University. Permission for participation was also obtained from state organizations (e.g., Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals; Missouri Council of Career and Technical Administrators; etc) and individual participants.

Individuals were given the purpose and aims of the study prior to participation, how the results would be utilized, and the possible social consequences that this study would have on the lives of the participant. Individual participants were given express permission to refrain from participating in the study, as well as, the right to withdraw from the study at any time. The
individual’s participation did not compromise her/his anonymity, as the researcher protected this. Upon completion of the study, all participants were given specific information on how to obtain a copy of the research study and/or its results.

By choosing to utilize a survey format, the impact on research sites was minimized. Individuals received a mailing that sought participant acknowledgement of the willingness to participate and verified the participant’s qualification for the study, as well as, verifying mailing address accuracy. Additionally, this mailing included the survey instrument. The mailing included a stamped, addressed envelope for return of the materials to the researcher.

Data presented in this study was reported honestly without changing or altering the findings to satisfy certain predictions or interest groups. All materials in this study that were the result of another individual’s work have been appropriately cited within the text of this study.

Instrumentation

The Leadership Practices Inventory (“LPI”) consists of thirty statements that identify behaviors found when leaders report being at the personal best in their leadership role. In addition to a “Self” version [completed by the leader], the “Observer” version allows for feedback from direct and indirect reports to the leader in order to provide a picture of leadership behaviors practiced by the individual. (Kouzes, 2007)

Responses are marked on a 10-point scale, with behavior anchors. For each statement, those responding indicate the frequency with which the particular behavior is engaged in by the leader. Responses range from 1, indicating “almost never” to 10, indicating “almost always”. Six statements comprise each of the five leadership practice measures. Given responses from leaders and direct/indirect reports, a computerized scoring software package provides feedback along a
number of dimensions, including comparisons by respondent category or relationship with the normative database, rankings by frequency, and variances between “Self” and “Observer” scores.

Data Collection

A letter summarizing the research design and protection of the participants was sent to the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education requesting permission to obtain a full listing of all comprehensive, public high schools in the state of Missouri. A listing of the 524 public school districts was obtained from this request. From the 524 districts represented in the list, 150 school buildings were chosen by random number assignment. [All districts were assigned a number and, from a random number chart, districts were chosen when their assigned number appeared in the random number chart.] A list of the principals for these buildings was obtained from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, including contact information. In addition, the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education also provided a listing of all teachers in these building with an address of the school building. Eight instructors were selected from each building list of instructors randomly, except where a building had less than eight teachers. [In these buildings, all instructors were chosen to get the greatest sample from the building.]

Each individual instructor, and each building principal, was mailed a coded-copy of the Leadership Practices Inventory and a written consent to participate in the study, along with a return addressed, stamped envelope. Only those who completed the written consent to participate and the Leadership Practices Inventory and mailed both copies back were used in the study. Individual instructors were required NOT to put their name on the Leadership Practices Inventory and the code on their form linked them to the specific building principal in the
building where they worked. The coding system, and whom they were supposed to be evaluating, proved to be a weakness in the study for many respondents.

An additional email was sent to the building principal re-explaining the procedure and requesting that the building principal forward an explanatory email (attached to their email) that would answer some of the basic questions received prior to the due date for the completion of the survey and written consent form.

**Data Analysis**

A total of 100 surveys were returned. Instructors completed 65 of the returned surveys and the building principals returned 35 of the surveys. Only three building principals and instructors from the principals’ buildings completed the surveys and returned them. This meant that data analysis using the Leadership Practices Inventory software could only be completed for three of the school buildings. All other data interpretations would have to be completed without using the Leadership Practices Inventory software.

**Validity**

Validity answers the question: “So what difference do scores on the Leadership Practices Inventory make?” The Leadership Practices Inventory has been correlated with other measures, typically of important outcomes such as job satisfaction, employee commitment, work-group productivity, credibility, sales performance, and items like these. To minimize self-report biases, responses from the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer (constituents) are used in these analyses rather than responses from the Leadership Practices Inventory – Self. Leadership, as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory, consistently has been found by researchers to
be related to positive employee and organizational outcomes. These relationships have been duplicated across industries and disciplines, within public and nonprofit organizations, as well as, in private sector businesses, despite possible individual differences (for example, gender, ethnicity, age, and so on). The findings are relatively consistent within and across U.S.-based and non-U.S.-based organizations and global studies. (Kouzes, 2007)

*Treatment of the Data*

For the purpose of analyzing the replicated data, and for the statistical analysis in this study, the mean was calculated for each question and grouping category on the Leadership Practices Inventory. Upon calculating the mean for each of the subgroups described above, the standard deviation was determined for each. The purpose of this type of statistical analysis was to determine the consistency and/or variances among the total population on each question and/or grouping category on the Leadership Practices Inventory. This technique provided data to the investigator allowing the ability to make inferences and draw conclusions about the perception of the group of principals’ perceptions of their effectiveness in leadership, and the assessment of the group of teachers on the effectiveness of their principals’ effectiveness in leadership practices.

*Summary*

The assessment of leadership-ability can be a daunting task; however, it is a necessary part of the field of education and, thus, deserves research attention (Lashway, 1999, 1997). The influences on educational leaders are numerous and vary from item to item (Bulach, 1998; Wiseman, 2003). Keeping one’s perspective in the midst of chaos, change, and accountability
demands provides hope for the vocational future of the educational leader (Daresh, 2001; Feller, 2005).

Self-evaluation is a key element for dealing with the amount of external pressures that demand time of the educational leader in the school building/district (Huber, 2002). A strong sense of personal significance accommodates the ever increasing and demanding requirements of the educational leadership position (McGee, 2003). Professionalism is predicated on the ability of today’s educational leader meeting the increasing demands of accountability as structured and designed by corporate America (Arif, 2003).
Chapter IV: Results and Analysis Relative to the Problem

Introduction

An individual’s self-evaluation of their leadership effectiveness must be close to the assessment made of the leadership effectiveness by direct and indirect reports. Principals who fail to see that this congruency is important will face more struggles in leading the educational environment due to disconnect with the direct and indirect reports. Disconnect between one’s perception and the perceptions of others can eventually result in failure to meet goals, increase student achievement, and/or decrease job satisfaction.

Producing and maintaining effective leadership is essential in meeting current expectations for organizational success. Practicing principals and principal candidates need data collection and analysis that will assist them in adopting leadership practices in their everyday professional experience that has a positive impact on student achievement. Studies such as this one are important aides for guiding leaders in setting and meeting professional development goals that produce results individually, as part of a team, and in the context of leading the educational environment.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this replication study was to discover the relationship between an individual leader’s self-evaluation of leadership practices as compared to the observed perceptions of the administrator’s leadership practices by teachers at a random sample of Missouri school districts.

Principals and instructors at 150 public schools in the state of Missouri were selected for this study. After written consent was obtained for participation in this study, the participants
completed the Leadership Practices Inventory for themselves (as in the case of the principals who participated), or for their leader (as in the case of the instructors who participated). All participants were informed of minimal risk involved in participating in this study. Data was collected anonymously with the forms being coded (by number) to link the self-report to a specific principal and the observer reports to a specific principal. Additionally, participants were assured that the data would be secured during the time of the study and destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

Of the 150 principals invited to participate in this study, 35 returned the Leadership Practices Inventory – Self Survey, representing 23.33% of the sample population. Of the 1100 teachers invited to participate in this study, 65 returned the Leadership Practices Inventory – Observer Survey, representing 5.9% of the sample population. Of the surveys returned, nineteen (19) sets of surveys [representing 12.67% of the buildings] were received from building locations; however, only three (3) [or 2% of the buildings] included a principal and additional teacher assessments. In addition, 16 surveys were returned to the researcher that were incomplete and, therefore, not included in the statistical analysis.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this replication study was to describe the administration and teacher perceptions of principal leadership practices using the Leadership Practices Inventory. In addition, overall principal’s self-observation of leadership practices was compared to overall teacher’s observation of their principal’s leadership effectiveness at a random sample of Missouri school districts.
Research Questions

The following research question guided this inquiry: What is the relationship between administrator and teacher perception of leadership using the Leadership Practices Inventory in a sample of Missouri school districts? Further, the following sub-questions will be addressed:

- How do administrators and teachers assess “modeling the way” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “inspiring a shared vision” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “challenging the process” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “enabling others to act” in educational leadership?
- How do administrators and teachers assess “encouraging the heart” in educational leadership?

Description of Population

The total population consisted of 150 public high school buildings, 150 principals and 1100 instructors across the state of Missouri covering rural, urban, small, medium and large school buildings. This represents 100% of the school buildings selected as a sample, but respondents were as follows: Principals – 35 of 150, or 23.3%, Instructors – 65 of 1100, or 5.9%. Sixteen surveys were invalid, or incomplete, and were not included in the statistical analysis. Of the 100 respondents, 19 sets of data were collected from single school building;
however, only three sets of data included a response from a principal and teachers in their building.

*Statistical Data Comparisons of Teachers and Principals Responses*

Comparing statistical data revealed a difference between principal self-evaluation and instructor’s observer assessment. Considering all scores, the principals mean score was 8.16 with a standard deviation of 1.58 and a confidence score of 0.017 at the 95% level. The teachers mean score was 6.92 with a standard deviation of 2.95 and a confidence score of 0.023 at the 95% level. When all scores were analyzed, the mean score was 7.35 with a standard deviation of 2.62 and a confidence score of 0.016 at the 95% level. The median score for the principals was 8 while the mode was 9. For the teachers, the median score was 8 while the mode was 10. Finally, the median score for all respondents was 8 and the mode was 10. The following charts signify this data in graphic form.
Comparison of Teachers and Principals by LPI Software

As stated previously, there were three school buildings where data was received from the principal and at least two other direct reports (teachers) from that building. The Leadership Practices Inventory has a software program that takes this information and creates a report to assist the principal in using the self evaluation and observer evaluation to direct effort on impact leadership practices. The following is a statistical analysis of the information obtained from each of these buildings.

**Building A:**

With a score range of 6 to 60, the principal’s self evaluation compared to the teachers’ direct report observation in the five subgroups of the Leadership Practices Inventory is included in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Group</th>
<th>Self (Exact Score)</th>
<th>Direct Report (Average Score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The leader of this building’s five highest rated areas (by self and observer) were: Ensures that people grow in their jobs; Treats others with dignity and respect; Follows through on promises and commitments; Challenges people to try new approaches; and Gives people choice.
about how to do their work. A difference of 1.5, or more, between the self-score and the observer average score is designated as noteworthy. None of these categories was so marked.

The leader of this building’s five lowest areas (lowest self scored and the difference between self and observer scores) were: Asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect people’s performance (difference of 6.3 – 8 to 1.7); Expresses confidence in people’s abilities (difference of 5.3 – 8 to 2.7); Creatively rewards people for their contributions (difference of 5.0 – 8 to 3.0); Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments (difference of 4.7 – 8 to 3.3); and Praises people for a job well done (difference of 4.7 – 8 to 3.3).

Another part of the report identifies how the self evaluation and observer evaluations compare to thousands of administrations of the Leadership Practices Inventory. The cut offs for the table are the 70th and 30th percentiles with the three categories being “High”; “Moderate”; and “Low”. The distribution of scores in this fashion roughly approximates a normal distribution of scores.

This principal’s score for “Model the Way” was in the high category (or above the 70th percentile) while the other four sub groups were in the moderate category (or between the 30th and 70th percentile); however, all five of the direct report scores were in the low category (or below the 30th percentile). Thus, the principal’s self-evaluation was higher than the assessment of the direct reports.

_Building B:_

With a score range of 6 to 60, the principal’s self evaluation compared to the teachers’ direct report observation in the five subgroups of the Leadership Practices Inventory is included in the following table.
The leader of this building’s five highest rated areas (by self and observer) were: Makes
certain that people adhere to agreed-on standards; Talks about future trends influencing our
work; Schedules outside organization for innovative ways to improve; Challenges people to try
new approaches; Makes certain that goals, plans, and milestones are set. A difference of 1.5, or
more, between the self score and the observer average score is designated as noteworthy. Two of
these five categories showed a greater than 1.5 difference (Searches outside organization for
innovative ways to improve; and Challenges people to try new approaches).

The leader of this building’s five lowest areas (lowest self scored areas and the difference
between self and observer scores) were: Praises people for a job well done (difference of 4.5 – 9
to 4.5); Asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect people’s performance (difference of 2.0
– 7 to 5.0); Gives team members appreciation and support (difference of 3.0 – 8 to 5.0);
Expresses confidence in people’s abilities (difference of 2.0 – 7 to 5.0); and Creatively rewards
people for their contributions (difference of 2.0 – 7 to 5.0).

Another part of the report identifies how the self evaluation and observer evaluations
compare to thousands of administrations of the Leadership Practices Inventory. The cut offs for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Group</th>
<th>Self (Exact Score)</th>
<th>Direct Report (Average Score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model the Way</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire a Shared Vision</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge the Process</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable Others to Act</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage the Heart</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the table are the 70th and 30th percentiles with the three categories being “High”; “Moderate”; and “Low”. The distribution of scores in this fashion roughly approximates a normal distribution of scores.

This principal’s score for “Model the Way”, “Inspire a Shared Vision”, “Challenge the Process”, and “Enable Others to Act” were in the high category (or above the 70th percentile) while the other sub group was in the moderate category (or between the 30th and 70th percentile); however, all five of the direct report scores were in the low category (or below the 30th percentile). Thus, the principal’s self-evaluation was markedly higher than the assessment of the direct reports.

Building C:

With a score range of 6 to 60, the principal’s self evaluation compared to the teachers’ direct report observation in the five subgroups of the Leadership Practices Inventory is included in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Group</th>
<th>Self (Exact Score)</th>
<th>Direct Report (Average Score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model the Way</strong></td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inspire a Shared Vision</strong></td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge the Process</strong></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enable Others to Act</strong></td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encourage the Heart</strong></td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The leader of this building’s five highest rated areas (by self and observer) were:
Develops cooperative relationships; Actively listens to diverse points of view; Treats others with
dignity and respect; Praises people for a job well done; and Describes a compelling image of the
future. A difference of 1.5, or more, between the self score and the observer average score is
designated as noteworthy. The two areas where there was greater than a 1.5 differential were
“Actively listens to diverse points of view” and “Praises people for a job well done” and the
difference was one that reflected higher scoring by the direct reports, rather than the self-
evaluation.

The leader of this building’s five lowest areas (lowest self scored areas and the difference
between self and observer scores) were: Experiments and takes risks (difference of 0.5 – 3 to
3.5); Asks for feedback on how his/her actions affect people’s performance (difference of 4.0 – 8
to 4.0); Asks “What can we learn?” (difference of 2.0 – 6 to 4.0); Seeks challenging
opportunities to test skills (difference of 1.0 – 6 to 5.0); and Ensures that people grow in their
jobs (difference of 3.0 – 8 to 5.0).

Another part of the report identifies how the self evaluation and observer evaluations
compare to thousands of administrations of the Leadership Practices Inventory. The cut offs for
the table are the 70\(^{th}\) and 30\(^{th}\) percentiles with the three categories being “High”; “Moderate”;
and “Low”. The distribution of scores in this fashion roughly approximates a normal distribution
of scores.

This principal’s score for “Enable Others to Act” was in the high category (or above the
70\(^{th}\) percentile) as was the direct reports assessment of this leader. “Model the Way”, “Inspire a
Shared Vision”, and “Encourage the Heart” were scored in the moderate category (or between
the 30\(^{th}\) and 70\(^{th}\) percentile) by both the self report and the direct reports [“Model the Way was
the same, the direct reports were slightly higher on “Inspire a Shared Vision”, and the self report was slightly higher than the direct reports on “Encourage the Heart”. Only in the category of “Challenge the Process” was the self-report and direct reports in the low category (or below the 30th percentile) with the self-report being slightly lower than the direct reports assessment. Thus, this principal’s self-evaluation was directly related to the direct reports assessment, as well as, the direct reports tending to score this principal higher than the self-evaluation score.

**Comparison of Teachers and Principals on Subgroup Category Scores**

The following charts give a graphic depiction of the mean and standard deviation for the self-evaluation (principal) and the observer evaluation (teacher). These graphs represent the values calculated for individual questions (numbered on the chart) and an overall mean and standard deviation, which includes all scores in the sub group for the principal group and the teacher group.

**MODEL THE WAY:**
The mean scores for the questions related to the subgroup “Model the Way” are higher for the principals on every item with a smaller standard deviation. The mean scores for the teachers were lower for their principal and the standard deviation was greater on all six questions. In addition, the mean score was higher for the “all” category by the principals in their self-evaluation. In addition, the standard deviation of the teacher scores was greater than the standard deviation for the principals’ self-evaluation.

INSPIRE A SHARED VISION:

The mean scores for the questions related to the subgroup “Inspire a Shared Vision” are higher for the principals on every item with a smaller standard deviation; however the difference between the principals’ scores and the teachers’ scores were less noteworthy. The mean scores for the teachers were lower for their principal and the standard deviation was greater on all six questions; however, this difference was less noteworthy in this sub group. In addition, the mean score was higher for the “all” category by the principals in their self-evaluation. In addition, the standard deviation of the teacher scores was greater than the standard deviation for the principals’ self-evaluation.
The mean scores for the “Challenge the Process” subgroup were again more consistent and higher than the scores obtained on the questions in the “Inspired a Shared Vision” category. Once again, the standard deviation was greater for the teachers in this sub group, but it was more closely associated with the standard deviation for the principals in their self-evaluation.

**ENABLE OTHERS TO ACT:**
In the “Enable Others to Act” subgroup the mean scores for the principals’ self evaluation were higher than the teachers’ mean scores on all questions and in the “all” category. The standard deviation for the teachers was lower in this subgroup; however, it was still higher than the standard deviation for the principals.

**ENCOURAGE THE HEART:**
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The last subgroup, “Encourage the Heart” repeats the pattern of earlier subgroups. The mean scores of the principals on all questions and the “all” category were higher than the teacher scores. Additionally, the standard deviation was higher for the teachers on all questions and in the “all” category than the standard deviation for the principals.

**Research Question #1:**

What is the relationship between administrator and teacher perception of leadership using the Leadership Practices Inventory in a sample of Missouri school districts? Following the example of the Leadership Practices Inventory software’s indication that a difference of 1.5, or greater, is noteworthy, the researcher applied this to the overall statistical data for all items on the
survey. Considering all answers for the principals there was a mean score on each item of 8.16 with a standard deviation of 1.58 and a confidence score of 0.017 at the 95% level. The teachers showed a mean score of 6.92 with a standard deviation of 2.95 and a confidence score of 0.023 at the 95% level. Thus, there is a difference in the mean scores of 1.24 affirming that the difference in the scores of the principals, when compared with those of the teachers, on the Leadership Practices Inventory survey is not noteworthy.

The 1.37 difference in the standard deviation scores is indicative of the possibility that teachers will score a principal with greater diversity (due to differences in inter- and intra-personal interaction with their principal), thus, creating a more diverse collection of data related to how a principal does on each of the questions in the survey. It also should be considered that there is greater potential for dissatisfied instructors to complete a survey of this nature and, thus, skew the data collected when comparing principals and teachers who are not in a direct relationship (as the Leadership Practices Inventory was designed to assess).
Chapter V: Recommendations and Conclusions

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a significant difference between a principal’s perception of their leadership practices when compared with instructor’s observed assessment of the same leadership practices. The study was supposed to focus on principals and teachers from the same school building, but the data returned to the investigator left only three (3) of these relationships to review. An analysis of this data is included in this paper for comparison. The investigator then looked at the scores on individual items to determine if there was a difference between what principals self report and what teachers report of their principals. The Leadership Practices Inventory software states in its reports that a difference of 1.5 in a score for an item is noteworthy. Therefore, data was reviewed to determine if the differences between the principals’ self-evaluation and the teachers observed evaluation were noteworthy.

Conclusions

From the data received it is concluded that there is not a noteworthy difference between the scoring of the principals in their self evaluation and the teachers in their observer evaluations. There is a difference in scoring on individual and sub group items with the principals tending to score themselves higher than teachers rate their principals in effectively using the leadership practices as measured by the Leadership Practices Inventory. The statistical analysis also notes that the standard deviation for scores of the teachers is greater than the standard deviation for scores of the principals.
Analysis of Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Research Question #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model The Way</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sets a personal example of what is</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes certain that people adhere to</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed-on standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows through on promises and</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commitments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks for feedback on how his/her</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actions affect people’s performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds consensus around organization's</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is clear about his/her philosophy</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of leadership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of the mean scores for principals and teachers in the “Model the Way” subgroup indicates three statements had notable differences. (REMEMBER: according to the Leadership Practices Inventory a difference of 1.5, or greater, is noteworthy.) These differences are also the greatest differences in any subgroup review, with a single exception. Two of the statements are also close to the 1.5 difference mark. Thus, overall the mean scores for principals are different from the mean scores for the teachers rating of their principal.

How do administrators and teachers assess “modeling the way” in educational leadership? There is, in fact, a noteworthy difference between the education leaders’ “self” assessment of modeling the way for her/his staff through clarified personal values and aligning one’s actions with shared values and the observation of teachers.
The above chart shows a graphic depiction of the mean scores of principals and teachers for each of the statements related to “Model the Way” for the Leadership Practices Inventory.

### Analysis of Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Research Question #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inspire Shared Vision</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talks about future trends influencing our work.</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describes a compelling image of the future.</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeals to others to share dream of the future.</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows others how their interests can be realized.</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paints &quot;big picture&quot; of group aspirations.</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaks with conviction about meaning of work.</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows the mean scores for principals and teachers in the “Inspire a Shared Vision” subgroup. It is evident that this is one of the stronger categories where principals’ self-evaluation is consistent with instructors’ assessment of their building leader. Some of the smallest differences between principals and teachers scoring occur in this area.
How do administrators and teachers assess “inspiring a shared vision” in educational leadership? The statistics suggest that there is a relationship between principals’ self-assessment and the instructors observed assessment of their educational leader. This is evidenced by the fact that only one statement meets the 1.5 mark for difference. In addition, there is no other score close to the 1.5 mark and the overall difference in mean scores for all entries of principals and teachers is 0.82.

The above chart shows a graphic depiction of the mean scores of principals and teachers for each of the statements related to “Inspire a Shared Vision” for the Leadership Practices Inventory.
Analysis of Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Research Question #4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge The Process</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaks challenging opportunities to test skills.</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges people to try new approaches.</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searches outside organization for innovative ways to improve.</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>6.82</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks, “What can we learn?”</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes certain that goals, plans, and milestones are set.</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiments and takes risks.</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.84</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once again, there is little difference between the mean scores of principals and teachers in the “Challenge the Process” subgroup. The differences in this subgroup are again indicative of the principals’ self-evaluation being more consistent with the teachers’ evaluation of their building principals. There is one area of notable difference. The overall difference for the whole subgroup is 0.96 indicating that this individual item may not be as notable as in other sub-group items when comparing the principals and teachers scoring.

How do administrators and teachers assess “challenging the process” in educational leadership? There is, in fact, no noteworthy difference between the education leaders’ “self” assessment of challenging the process by seeking ways to change, grow, improve, and taking risks and the observations of teachers of their building leaders.
The above chart shows a graphic depiction of the mean scores of principals and teachers for each of the statements related to “Challenge the Process” for the Leadership Practices Inventory.

**Analysis of Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Research Question #5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enable Others To Act</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops cooperative relationships.</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively listens to diverse points of view.</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats others with dignity and respect.</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports decisions other people make.</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives people choice about how to do their work.</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures that people grow in their jobs.</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.80</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.36</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the six statements are significantly different in this subgroup. The highest difference between scores of the principals and teachers is in this subgroup. In addition, another area is close to the 1.5 mark for noteworthy difference. Yet, this subgroup scores within the acceptable range for difference? One of the reasons is a strong correlation between the principals
and teachers in rating the statement, “Ensures that people grow in their jobs.” Another statement, “Gives people choice about how to do their work” also rated close by the principals and teachers.

How do administrators and teachers assess “enabling others to act” in educational leadership? Although it appears that the differences would negate the relationship, there is not a notable difference between the education leaders’ “self” assessment of enabling others to act by fostering collaboration and sharing power and discretion and the observation of teachers.

The above chart shows a graphic depiction of the mean scores of principals and teachers for each of the statements related to “Enable Others to Act” for the Leadership Practices Inventory.
Analysis of Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Research Question #6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encourage The Heart</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praises people for a job well done.</td>
<td>8.34</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expresses confidence in peoples’ abilities.</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatively rewards people for commitment to shared values.</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes people for commitment to shared values.</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finds ways to celebrate accomplishments.</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives team members appreciation and support.</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.47</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This subgroup has some of the highest scoring in terms of principal ratings, but there is more of a gap between the principals and the teachers. Two statements are notably different in the subgroup; however, overall the difference proves to be close to noteworthy without crossing the 1.5 mark.

How do administrators and teachers assess “encouraging the heart” in educational leadership? Although the difference is close to noteworthy, there is not a notable difference between the education leaders’ “self” assessment of encouraging the heart of supervisees by recognizing contributions and celebrating values and victories and the observations of teachers.
The above chart shows a graphic depiction of the mean scores of principals and teachers for each of the statements related to “Encourage the Heart” for the Leadership Practices Inventory.

**Recommendations**

On the basis of the findings of this study the following recommendations are proposed:

1. With the importance of the education leaders’ leadership practices in the success of today’s school environment it is imperative that an instrument like the Leadership Practices Inventory be used to assess building-level perceptions of educational leader effectiveness. Principals need to know how they rate themselves, as well as, how their direct reports rate them in the subgroup areas of the Leadership Practices Inventory. The investigator recommends two types of training for education leaders because of this study. First, education leaders need to be trained in self-assessment techniques that emphasize objective, reflective and honest appraisals of one’s abilities. Additionally, education leaders need to be trained to seek, accept and embrace direct
report feedback as a source of valuable data for rating one’s effectiveness in using leadership practices.

2. More data needs to be collected of building level surveys (Principal “Self” assessments and direct and indirect reports [instructors] “Observer” assessments) from Missouri’s public schools to make more substantial extrapolation of trends and patterns across various demographic characteristics (male/female; urban/suburban/rural; small/medium/large building; etc.)

3. In the future, the input of students, community and business leaders and Board of Education members should also be used in evaluating the leadership practices of today’s educational leaders. With the diverse input from all stakeholder groups, educational leaders can become more aware of the perceptions, and realities, that they are being held accountable for in today’s school buildings.

4. Finally, the investigator recommends that principals gather data regarding communication with external and internal constituents.

**Limitations**

1. The investigator does not recommend that this data be used to draw conclusions in relation to the principal and teacher relationship. Although the data does afford some insight into the relationship, the fact that few of the teachers were rating the principals that completed and returned the survey should be considered a draw on the interpretation of the data.
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Appendix A

**Informed Consent (Teacher):**

You have been selected as a possible participant in an educational leadership research project. Your participation is voluntary. As such, you have rights that I, David A. Ruhman (researcher), wish to clearly communicate to you. The information you provide will be confidential and not reported to your school district, your supervisor, or other entities, but is to be used for the sole purpose of a research project to aide in my completion of an Education Specialist’s degree from Northern Michigan University. The results of this survey may be read by individuals in your school district, but care will be taken to ensure that your individual results are kept confidential and are not identifiable as coming from you.

Please carefully consider the statement and decide if you want to proceed in this research project. If you do, then sign the statement, complete the survey, copy the Informed Consent form and mail the survey and the Informed Consent form in the self-addressed, stamped envelope included with the materials that you received.

Please read the following informed consent statement and sign the statement indicating your agreement and understanding of your participation in this research study:

"There will be no action taken against you if you decide that you do not want to participate in this study. Filling out this survey will also not provide any benefit to you. You may choose to fill out all of it, part of it, or none of it. No one will know which survey was completed by you, as the surveys will not be identified by name [only the district/building code will identify where the survey came from]. Results will be used to speak about individual’s assessment of leadership style for their supervisor and not reported as specific from, or for, an individual. I understand that if I have any further questions regarding my rights as a participant in a research project I may contact Dr. Cynthia Prosen of the Human Subjects Research Review Committee of Northern Michigan University (906-227-2300) [cprosen@nmu.edu]. Any questions I have regarding the nature of this research project will be answered by David A. Ruhman (573-546-9700, ext. 4) [druhman@mail.av.k12.mo.us], or Dr. K.C. Holder (906-227-2018) [kholder@nmu.edu]."

Signed:

_______________________________________________________________________

Date:        _____/_____/_____

Thank you for taking the time to consider participating in this survey. You can choose to withdraw from the research at any time during the study. Please make your request to withdraw in writing to the following address:

**David A. Ruhman, Director**  
**Arcadia Valley Career Technology Center**  
**650 Park Dr.**  
**Ironton, MO  63650**
Appendix B

Informed Consent (Principal):
You have been selected as a possible participant in an educational leadership research project. Your participation is voluntary. As such, you have rights that I, David A. Ruhman (researcher), wish to clearly communicate to you. The information you provide will be confidential and not reported to your school district, your supervisees, or other entities, but is to be used for the sole purpose of a research project to aide in my completion of an Education Specialist’s degree from Northern Michigan University. The results of this survey may be read by individuals in your school district, but care will be taken to ensure that your individual results are kept confidential and are not identifiable as coming from you.

Please carefully consider the statement and decide if you want to proceed in this research project. If you do, then sign the statement, complete the survey, copy the Informed Consent form and mail the survey and the Informed Consent form in the self-addressed, stamped envelope included with the materials that you received.

Please read the following informed consent statement and sign the statement indicating your agreement and understanding of your participation in this research study:

“I voluntarily agree to participate in this research study. There will be no action taken against you if you decide that you do not want to participate in this study. Filling out this survey will also not provide any benefit to you. You may choose to fill out all of it, part of it, or none of it. No one will know which survey was completed by you, as the surveys will not be identified by name [only the district/building code will identify where the survey came from]. Results will be used to speak about individual’s assessment of leadership style for their supervisor and not reported as specific from, or for, an individual. I also understand that if I have any further questions regarding my rights as a participant in a research project I may contact Dr. Cynthia Prosen of the Human Subjects Research Review Committee of Northern Michigan University (906-227-2300) [cprosen@nmu.edu]. Any questions I have regarding the nature of this research project will be answered by myself, David A. Ruhman (573-546-9700, ext.4) [druhman@mail.av.k12.mo.us], or Dr. K.C. Holder (906-227-2018) kholder@nmu.edu.”

Signed: _______________________________________________________________________

Date: __/__/____

Thank you for taking the time to consider participating in this survey. You can choose to withdraw from the research at any time during the study. Please make your request to withdraw in writing to the following address:

David A. Ruhman, Director
Arcadia Valley Career Technology Center
650 Park Dr.
Ironton, MO 63650