UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN MARCOS

Transforming a School Culture: Examining the Leadership Behaviors of Successful Principals

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education

in

Educational Leadership

by

Luis Angel Ibarra

Committee in charge:

University of California, San Diego

Professor Alan J. Daly
Professor Carolyn H. Hofstetter

California State University, San Marcos

Professor Delores B. Lindsey, Chair
Professor Jennifer Jeffries

2008

The Dissertation of Luis Angel Ibarra is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication on microfilm:

Chair

University of California, San Diego

California State University, San Marcos

2008

DEDICATION

Teachers never know their true impact on the life of a child. They never know how one word, one lesson, one strategy, one skill will affect the life of one child. This project is dedicated to all of the teachers in my life. No words can express the gratitude I have for the difference that you made in my life. From preschool to graduate school, teachers have had a profound impact on my life. Thank you for all that you have done and will continue to do. And to Donald, although not a teacher by trade, you nonetheless have taught me more than you will ever know. I dedicate this dissertation to you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are so many people who have encouraged me throughout this amazing journey. First and foremost, Conny Ridgeway, you have believed in me and placed the kernel of what was yet to come in my professional life. You told me I would be taking this journey before I did so. To Jennifer Jeffries, I remember our conversation under the tree when you told me, “You need to do this.” To my chair, Dr. Delores Lindsey, you were the perfect mentor and partner throughout this endeavor. I will always cherish our academic discussions and your gentle encouragement that allowed me to grow and transform throughout this process. Thank you. To the rest of my committee members, Dr. Alan Daly and Dr. Carolyn Hofstetter, you were both amazing sources of support throughout my quantitative analysis. Even more importantly, you were both extremely supportive.

I also need to acknowledge all the wonderful people from cohort one. You were all amazing and a true inspiration to me. And to the infamous “Square” Cynthia, Kevin, and Michelle, you three were especially instrumental in providing the emotional and academic support that I needed to get through this.

And last but not least, to Donald J. Rankins. I would not have been able to do this without you. You have taken this journey with me, and I owe a great deal to you. Thank you!

VITA

1990	Bachelor of Arts, Liberal Studies California State University, San Bernardino
1991-1996	Teacher, Rialto Unified School District
1995	Master of Education, Educational Leadership Azusa Pacific University
1996-1999	Teacher, Victor Elementary School District
1999-2001	Principal, Victor Elementary School District
2001-2005	Principal, Oceanside Unified School District
2005-2007	Director, Human Resources Oceanside Unified School District
2007	Associate Superintendent, Human Resources Oceanside Unified School District
2008	Doctor of Education, Educational Leadership University of California, San Diego California State University, San Marcos

PUBLICATIONS

Lindsey, D. B., Daly, A.J., & Ibarra, L. (2008, April). *Leadership in program improvement settings: The need for confluent leadership*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Transforming a School Culture: Examining the Leadership Behaviors of Successful Principals

by

Luis Angel Ibarra

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

University of California, San Diego, 2008

California State University, San Marcos, 2008

Professor Delores B. Lindsey, Chair

High-stakes accountability reform has mandated that schools ensure that all of their students meet minimum proficiency standards or risk being identified as program improvement (PI) schools under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). School leaders are required to transform the existing cultures of their schools in order

to meet the minimum criteria set forth by this new mandate. Transformational leadership behaviors may be the key to transforming school culture. This study explores the change initiatives and behaviors of principals whose schools have been designated PI schools and those of principals whose schools have recently exited PI designation. Schools that educate underserved populations and need increased support are more likely to be sanctioned under NCLB and be at risk of losing resources. NCLB mandates require that school leaders transform school systems of failure to systems of support, which requires a transformational approach based on the appropriate social processes, skills, affect, and intellect. This study proposes that leaders who have successfully exited PI designation have engaged in more transformational leadership practices. Using a mixed method approach that obtained data through the administration of the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) and open-ended survey prompts and the conduction of principal interviews, the researcher found that leaders whose schools had exited PI designation engaged in more transformational initiatives and consistently backed those initiatives with transformational action.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The most important, and probably the most difficult, job of a principal is to change the culture of a school (Barth, 2001a, p. 7)." Organizational cultures are in part created by leaders, one of whose most decisive challenges is the creation, management, and in some cases, destruction of culture (Schein, 1992). By requiring that all students, including minority and economically disadvantaged students, meet minimum proficiency requirements or risk federal sanctions, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) ushered in a new era of accountability and motivated schools to implement strategic reform efforts to reach the goals set forth by this federal mandate.

In 2005, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction released a list of 1,772 California schools that had been designated Program Improvement (PI) schools under NCLB (Slater, 2005). In 2006, the number of PI schools increased to 2,257 (California Department of Education [CDE], 2006). PI is a designation for schools that fail to demonstrate that a required percentage of students have obtained academic proficiency in language arts and math for 2 consecutive years. Schools that remain in PI status go through different levels of sanctions each year that become increasingly prescriptive. Remaining in PI status for an extended period could ultimately result in school closure or the replacement of all school staff, including the principal.

According to Fullan (2001), the new era of accountability and reform ushered in by NCLB requires skillful leaders with the knowledge and skills necessary to mobilize groups of people to face complex problems that have never been successfully resolved. Today's leaders must face problems that have never been addressed and for which there are no easy answers. In other words, today's effective leaders are those

who transform the existing culture of their schools into a culture in which all students are successful. As leaders strive to transform their existing cultures, they may benefit from the identification and description of the common leadership behaviors of leaders who have successfully met the demands set forth by NCLB.

Context of the Problem

As the number of schools that are designated PI schools increases, more school must assume the daunting task of implementing change within their organizations. As they do so, they must remain aware that "every school has a culture . . . and all school cultures are incredibly resistant to change . . . . Unless teachers and administrators act to change the culture of a school, all innovations will have to fit in and around existing elements of the culture (Barth, 2001a, p. 8).

Such resistance to change was evident in one particular case study that chronicled the change efforts of the principal of an elementary school in Houston, Texas (Charles A. Dana Center, 1999). The principal's proposed change initiatives were met with opposition from numerous groups; a group of parents even developed a campaign to have the principal removed. However, the principal persevered in his determination to create change. Had he not, his school would not have made the dramatic transformation from a low-performing school to among the highest achieving schools in the state.

Although this case study is helpful in identifying several major strategies that improve academic achievement in a school with a high percentage of minority and economically disadvantaged students, the study's focus was not specifically on the leaders but rather the reform efforts that they employed. Several other studies

(Butterworth & Weinstein, 1996; Edmonds, 1979; Lezotte, 1997; Pollard-Durodola, 2003; Reeves, 2004) have also identified key leadership behaviors in successful reform efforts. These studies emphasize the importance of examining leadership as a construct within the context of successful schools.

Although the importance of finding quality principals cannot be overemphasized (National Association for Schools Excellence [NASE], 1999), identifying leaders who can lead successfully within the context of PI is equally important. When a school is designated as a PI school, its instructional program must be improved, which requires a change in the status quo. Leadership within the context of change may present additional challenges to school leaders. One of these challenges is helping teachers deal with the pressures of high stakes testing and the instructional changes that will inevitably transpire.

Barth (1990) and Fullan (2001, 2003) have alluded to the enormous pressures teachers are experiencing in today's schools. Teachers are facing more difficulties and challenges today than in perhaps any other period in American history (Barth, 1990). Many teachers are leaving the profession defeated because of their inability to reach all of their students (Frase, 2004). With so much at stake, designation as a PI school adds additional challenges unforeseen prior to the implementation of NCLB.

> In a crisis . . . we [often] call for someone with answers, decision, strength, and a map of the future, someone who knows where we ought to be going, in short someone who can make hard problems simple. . . . Instead of looking for saviors, we should be calling for leadership that will challenge us to face problems for which there are no simple, painless solutions, problems that require us to learn new ways. (Fullan, 2001, p. 3)

This study will attempt to identify the common leadership behaviors of successful leaders within the context of PI.

Purpose of Study and Rationale

The purpose of this study is to identify the common leadership behaviors of successful leaders that, if adopted by principals of PI schools, may assist them in implementing the necessary reform efforts needed under NCLB. The California Department of Education (CDE) predicts that by the year 2011, 90% of schools will fail to meet minimum proficiency requirments under NCLB (Packer, 2004). If this alarming forecast become reality, more school leaders will find themselves assuming responsibility for leading a school out of PI designation. This study is intended to not only inform leadership training and assistance for those leaders where school reform is needed but also inform district practices in the recruitment and selection of principals. To examine the phenomenon of successful leadership, the following research questions will be addressed in this study: (a) As measured by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) 5X developed by Avolio and Bass (2004), what similarities or differences exist in the leadership behaviors of PI principals? (b) Are there differences in the leadership behaviors of PI principals and non-PI principals? and (c) In what types of reform efforts do PI principals engage?

These research questions will be examined using a mixed method research design that employs both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The use of this mixed approach is encouraged by other researchers because it employs a variety of data collection methods within a study drawing on all possibilities both statistical and text analysis (Antonakis, Avolio, & Sivasubramaniam, 2003; Creswell, 2003).

Definition of Terms

The following terms will be used throughout this study:

1. *Change* is broadly defined as any difference or alteration.
2. A *change effort* refers to any improvement initiative or effort employed by participants of this or any study. This word will be used interchangeably with *reform* or *reform effort.*
3. *Culture* is defined as the basic underlying beliefs of a person, group, or organization.
4. *Economically disadvantaged students* are defined as all students who qualify for the free or reduced lunch program.
5. *Leadership factors* are limited to those nine specific leadership behaviors identified by the MLQ.
6. *Reform or reform effort* refers to any improvement initiative or effort employed by participants of this or any study. This word will be used interchangeably with *change effort*.
7. *Traits* are distinguishing qualities of leadership. This word will be used interchangeably with *characteristics*.
8. A *transformation* is limited to any change focusing on basic underlying beliefs.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature on the major theoretical constructs from which this study will be approached. First, the construct of culture will be explored from the perspective of how this phenomenon can be defined and studied. Second, the research on change theory will be explored within the context of changing school culture. Finally, relevant theories and studies on leadership will be reviewed with a particular focus on transformational leadership. One of the propositions of this study is that transformational leadership behaviors are present when there is success in the transformation of school culture.

School Culture

Fullan (2001) asserted, "What makes humans different is culture . . . [which] can be passed on by direct infection from one person to another" (p. 15). Parents, teachers, and administrators sense that there is something unique about their school, "something extremely powerful but difficult to describe" (Deal & Peterson, 1999, p. 2). This uniqueness, this powerful force that causes groups to behave and act in a certain way, is *culture.* Traditionally, the term culture has been used by social anthropologists to describe behaviors among different tribes, societies, and national or ethnic groups. The concept of culture was later adopted by social scientists to describe patterns of behavior and thought within a formal work setting (Deal & Peterson, 1999). Developing a broadly accepted definition of *culture* has been extremely difficult because even anthropologists disagree over the meaning of the term and how it is conceived, leaving us with a "fuzzy understanding" of the concept (Erickson,

1987). Part of the difficulty is that culture refers to the tacit, unstated, undiscussed values and beliefs that guide actions but remain invisible to even members of the group to which it refers. Another contributing factor to the "fuzzy understanding" of the concept is that most organizations, including schools, may have several subcultures that underlie typical patterns of behavior.

In spite of its vagueness, it is important to review prominent cultural theory as a construct to arrive at a working definition of culture for this study. Schein (1992) described three distinct levels at which the culture of an organization can be analyzed: *artifacts, espoused values,* and *underlying assumptions.* At the surface level, artifacts, which include all the phenomena that one sees, hears, and feels when one encounters an organization, are the most visible structures of the organization. Espoused values, which comprise the second level of culture, are the day-to-day-operating principles by which the members of a group guide their behavior. Although this level of culture provides much information about what motivates individuals or what they believe, it is important to distinguish between what Argyris and Schön have called the *stated theory* of espoused values, which describes what people profess, and the *theory in action* of espoused values, which describes what people will actually do (as cited in Smith, 2001). The third level of culture consists of basic assumptions, unconscious beliefs, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings, which, although often taken for granted, motivate an individual or a group. This level is what Schein (1992) referred to as the true "essence of culture" (p. 26). The following section expands on Schein's levels of culture to arrive at a working definition for this research study.

Exploring Culture Through Artifacts

Case studies of effective schools commonly explore culture through the level of artifacts. Reeves' (2004) 90/90/90 schools study, which studied schools in which more than 90% of the students were from low-income families, more than 90% from ethnic minorities, and more than 90% had met or achieved high academic standards, is a well-known case study that captured this level of culture. While collecting data on instructional successful practices and strategies, he identified five common characteristics: a focus on academic achievement, clear curriculum choices, frequent assessment of student progress and multiple opportunities for improvement, an emphasis on nonfiction writing, and collaborative scoring of student work.

Similarly, research conducted by the Charles A. Dana Center (1999) examined nine high-performing, high-poverty urban elementary schools to identify similar patterns in the strategies used to improve academic achievement. Some of the key strategies identified were the following:

- The principal identified and pursued an important, visible, and attainable first goal from which to gather momentum to move towards more ambitious goals.
- School leaders redirected time and energy being spent on conflicts between adults toward the teaching and learning of students by appealing to teachers, support staff, and parents to set aside their own interests and replace them with those of the students.
- School leaders created a sense of shared responsibility for school improvement.
- Principals created opportunities for teachers to work, plan, and learn together around instructional issues.

Although the focus of both Reeves' (2004) and the Charles A. Dana Center's (1999) studies was not the principal, they identified several key leadership behaviors instrumental in the transformation of existing cultures. Both studies found that successful leaders were focused on their goals, knowledgeable about the curriculum, skilled in their ability to assess what needed to be done, and able to rally their teachers to do what needed to be done. Other case studies that examined successful schools and districts (Butterworth & Weinstein, 1996; Pollard-Durodola, 2003; Porter & Soper, 2003; Schwartz, 2003) obtained similar findings. Although these case studies captured the visible organizational structures and processes that led to the success of the organization, they did not provide a deeper analysis. The inherent beliefs and values—the espoused values—that motivate a group to act or behave a certain way is an area that merits closer attention to gain understanding of how effective organizations operate.

Exploring Culture Through Espoused Values

One way to gain understanding of the espoused values, norms, and rules of a group is to live among its members for a sufficient period to attain a clear understanding of what these artifacts mean to them (Schein, 1992). However, the time constraint on most researchers leads them to use interviews and questionnaires rather than research immersion. The espoused values of an individual or organization can be ascertained by collecting and analyzing artifacts. However, Schein cautioned researchers about inferring deeper assumptions from artifacts alone because of the biases created by the researchers' feelings and reactions. For example, in a case study that chronicled the transformation of one inner-city elementary school in Texas,

Pollard-Durodola (2003) collected artifacts and identified the principal's values, and then asked the participants to verify the accuracy of the findings. From this research method, the researcher was able to identify 9 factors that significantly impacted success at this school: (a) strong instructional leadership by the principal, (b) a core reading and math program, (c) a safe and structured school environment, (d) high expectations for both teachers and students, (e) frequent and systematic evaluation of teachers and students, (f) a well-planned curriculum that addressed student needs, (g) innovative staff development that was attentive to specific teacher needs, (h) a plan for preventing academic problems, and (i) a common vision. These findings, although clearly identifying factors that contribute to success, did not address the process: How did the principal achieve success? Was it the things he did or the way he did them? A deeper understanding of the process used as well as the leadership traits or values that a leader should possess in order to accomplish such a task is necessary.

Because the espoused level of culture reflects original values and sense of what is expected, this level can often be identified when initiating a new change effort because the organization can still account for or recall the original idea or values. Another way that this level can be explored is through the use of a leadership questionnaire or instrument tool, such as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Antonakis et al., 2003; Bass, 1997). This instrument was initially developed by requesting senior executives to identify an influential person who had increased their motivation or moved them to go beyond their self-interest for the good of the group. These statements were then sorted into whether they described a *transactional* or *transformational leader*. Transactional leaders, commonly described as using a carrot

or a stick approach to make subordinates cooperate, use their power to reward subordinates for their compliance in attaining a certain task or behavior (Antonakis et al., 2003). On the other hand, transformational leaders motivate their followers to work for "transcendental goals and go beyond immediate self-interests" (Antonakis et al., 2003, p. 133) to achieve what is right and good. If used alone, the MLQ may provide a good deal of insight into a leader's espoused values, and if used in conjunction with interviews or observations, may uncover the basic underlying assumptions of an individual or organization.

Basic Underlying Assumptions and the Definition of Culture

Basic assumptions begin by being consistent with espoused values; however, when espoused values are inconsistent with existing basic underlying assumptions, tension and stress arise as the human mind seeks cognitive stability (Schein, 1992). When espoused values become engrained by repeated success and confirmation, they become part of basic underlying assumptions and thus the essence of culture: the unconscious, taken-for-granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts, and feelings of an individual or an organization. Therefore, transforming the culture means changing basic assumptions, which is difficult, time consuming, and anxiety provoking. If one understands the basic assumptions of a person or organization, the espoused values and artifacts can be also explained and understood.

Social Cognitive Theory and Culture

The one theory that offers insight into basic underlying beliefs is *social cognitive theory*, which seeks to explain the relationship among and mutual influence of peoples' behavior, their environment, and their internal cognition (Wood &

Bandura, 1989) or basic assumptions (Schein, 1992). Rather than explaining behavior in terms of one-sided determinism, Bandura's (1997) social cognitive theory accounts for environmental as well as internal cognitive factors (Wood & Bandura, 1989). The extent of the influence of environmental and/or internal cognitive factors on behavior can vary substantially. Behavior itself also has influence over an individual's cognitive functioning and environment; indeed, "people are both products and producers of environment" (Wood & Bandura, 1989, p. 362).

This theory could explain why leaders obtain different results when using the same strategy for implementing an intended change. The level of influence on a single teacher's behavior can vary depending on his or her internal beliefs as well as environmental factors. For example, if a teacher is asked by her principal to teach all of her students at a higher level but the teacher's inherent belief is that some of her students cannot learn at such a level, her cognitive beliefs will have a great influence on her behavior. Likewise, if the teacher begins to behave according to her leader's direction and this behavior produces positive results, the behavior begins to influence the teacher's belief system.

Deal and Peterson (1999) asserted that the prevailing culture of a school is often taken for granted and thus overlooked in discussions on school reform. Social cognitive theory can provide a framework of reference when conducting a study on school reform. For this study, the theory of social cognitive theory will guide the researcher in developing the interview protocol. When investigating the basic underlying beliefs, the researcher will consider the environment, cognition, and behavior, the three factors of influence.

Summary of School Culture

The construct of culture in this study will be based on Schein's (1992) three levels of culture: abstractions, espoused values, and basic underlying assumptions. Because they are at the deepest level of school culture, basic underlying assumptions and beliefs constitute the essence of culture, and therefore this study's working definition of culture will be based on these assumptions and beliefs. *Transforming culture* is therefore defined as changing the basic, underlying beliefs of people within an organization. The application of social cognitive theory is the best manner in which to uncover basic underlying beliefs by probing into the mutual influences of the environment, cognition, and behavior. These three factors will serve as a framework for developing the interview protocol for this study. The concept of change and change theory is addressed in the following section.

Change Theory

Fullan (2001) explained, "Change consists of great rapidity and nonlinearity on the one hand and equally great potential for creative breakthroughs on the other" (p. 31). Schools that find themselves in PI status will inevitably go through a change effort. Although change is complex and unmanageable, many scholars believe that change can be successfully undertaken (Barth, 1990; Bridges, 2003; Fullan, 2001; Lezotte, 1997; Senge, 2000). The key to leading a successful change effort is in fully understanding the complexities of change (Bridges, 2003; Fullan, 2001; Schein, 1992).

Change is a process that proceeds through phases or steps (Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Bridges, 2003). Bridges (2003) argued that change proceeds through three distinct phases. In the *ending zone*, the first phase, the old identity or ways of doing

things is relinquished, and if a change effort is to be successful, a leader must assist others in dealing with the feeling of loss. This is also the stage where resistance begins; therefore, the fear of relinquishing the old and accepting the new must be communicated and accepted by those going through the change effort. The *neutral zone*, the second phase, is the intermediate zone wherein the old has been relinquished yet the new is not yet fully operational. Because conflict naturally arises during this stage, it is often the most challenging phase of any change effort (Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Bridges, 2003; Fullan, 2001). If left unmanaged, some organizations never emerge from this zone (Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Bridges, 2003). During the new beginning, the final phase, a new identity is developed and a newfound energy and sense of purpose put into action. This is when the existing culture has been transformed. Successfully leading others through this change effort requires very skilled leaders with the knowledge and understanding of the change process (Barth, 2002; Fullan, 2001).

Once a change effort has been initiated, resistance is inevitable (Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Bridges, 2003; Fullan, 2001; Senge, 2000). Resistance to change is a natural phenomenon caused by fear of the unknown or change, loss of control, sense of mistrust, or negative reactions from prior unsuccessful experiences. Although resistance is very common in any change effort, most theorists believe that its effects can be managed through communication (Bridges, 2003; Fullan, 2001) and trust (Barth, 2002; Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Bridges, 2003; Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Cash, 1997; Fullan, 2001).

Trust

Relational trust is an essential ingredient in leading a change effort and transforming the existing school culture (Barth, 2000, 2001b; Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Cash, 1997; Fullan, 2001; Rooney, 2003; Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni, 2005). Unfortunately, the fear of punishment associated with learning new concepts or new strategies has often been coupled with punitive measures (Barth, 2002). Teachers, like students, often associate learning with sanctions and punishment, making it difficult for them to distinguish between learning and punishment. The message that is often related is "learn . . . or else." Fear of retribution, making mistakes, and trying something new is part of human nature.

When leaders promote change, their subordinates often unconsciously think of the consequences if they fail to change (Barth, 2002). Sharing the rationale for an intended change based on a *moral purpose* is the best strategy for gaining trust from subordinates. Sergiovanni (2005) and Fullan (2001) defined a moral purpose as a leadership action that struggles to do the right thing based on a sense of values. Moral purpose concerns the process that leaders undertake in accomplishing their purpose; it provides the underlying means by which teachers seek to accomplish their intended results.

Many researchers stress the importance of leaders maintaining their integrity through their actions (Barth, 1990, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2002; Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Cash, 1997; Collins, 2001; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Fullan, 2001; Lezotte, 1997; Rooney, 2003; Sergiovanni, 2005). Integrity also demands that moral and ethical values guide the individual's work (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Sergiovanni, 2005;

Spillane, 2005). Argyris (as cited in Smith, 2001) called the leader's behavior the *theory-in-use*. When the theory-in-use witnessed by teachers contradicts the espoused theory, the integrity of the leader is compromised. Developing trust in leaders is dependent on perceptions of their integrity (Bryk & Schneider, 2003).

However, developing trust in the leader is just the beginning; successful leaders also create a climate of trust (Cash, 1997). Spillane (2005) asserted that leadership cannot be maintained through the actions of only one individual but requires the interactions of multiple leaders. Believing that the principal is the only leader within a school is naïve. Spillane argued that multiple leaders, with and without formal leadership positions, exist within a school. Successful principals tap into the resource of teacher leaders and coordinate efforts through a shared vision (Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Cash, 1997; Lambert, 2002; Spillane, 2005). A shared vision not only creates a common goal and direction for everyone in the organization but also a sense of trust among all stakeholders when actions are in line with the vision of the school.

Without a common purpose and relational trust, genuine conversation among colleagues remain unlikely (Bryk & Schneider, 2003). Fear of conflict keeps many organizations from having difficult conversations (Barth, 1990, 2002; Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Sergiovanni, 2005). Barth (2001b) reported that most faculties lack the group skills necessary to engage in healthy conversations about their craft. In fact, several researchers agreed that only through engaging in healthy conflict and facing tough issues together can a positive and productive organization be created (Barth, 2001b, 2002; Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Cash, 1997;

Collins, 2001; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Fullan, 2001; Lambert, 2002; Lezotte, 1997; Rooney, 2004; Sergiovanni, 2004).

Magnitude of Change

The theoretical literature on leadership and change (Barth, 1990, 2002; Bradford & Cohen, 1998; Bridges, 2003; Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Fullan, 2001; Fullan, 2003; Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003) suggests that not all change is the same and can be interpreted differently by different stakeholder groups. For example, one group of teachers might interpret one change effort as a huge shift in practice, while another group of teachers across town might view the identical change as minor. Waters et al. classified change into *first-order* and *second-order change*. First-order change, which builds on past or existing models, is consistent with existing values and paradigms. A change is first-order when it can be implemented primarily with existing knowledge, skills, and resources (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2004). First-order changes are primarily minor adjustments to existing practices, beliefs, or structures. On the other hand, a second-order change challenges existing models, norms, and values. When a change questions or threatens basic underlying assumptions or the school culture, this change is considered second-order because it will require a transformation of the school culture. Transformation will be presumed when there is a change in the basic underlying assumptions of an individual, group, or organization.

The concept of first-order and second-order change is analogous to Argyris and Schön's concept of *single-loop* and *double-loop learning* (Smith, 2001). Single-loop and double-loop learning both involve the detection and correction of error. When something goes wrong, many seek another strategy that will address and work with the

governing variables. This process is considered single-loop learning because it involves correcting an action within the existing goals, values, and paradigms; the corrective action is not questioned and becomes automatic without any critical scrutiny. An alternative response is to question the governing variables themselves and subject them to scrutiny in a process involving double-loop learning because it doubles back to the governing variables themselves.

Knowing what to focus on changing is also a critical element in any reform effort. Elmore (2003) suggested that leaders can make fatal errors, even while guiding their schools toward making the correct changes that are likely to have positive impacts on student achievement, and thus some changes geared toward improvement can actually have a negative impact on student achievement. The results of a meta-analysis by Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) identified 21 categories of leadership behaviors, referred to as *responsibilities*, that have a direct impact on student achievement. Table 1 lists the 21 leadership responsibilities, their descriptors, and their correlation (*r*) with student achievement in order from those responsibilities that have the greatest correlation with impact on student achievement to those that have the least.

Table 1:

The 21 Leadership Responsibilities and their Correlation with Student Achievement

Responsibility	Average correlation (*r*)
Situational awareness	.33
Flexibility	.28
Monitoring and evaluating	.27

Table 1: *(continued)*

Responsibility	Average correlation (*r*)
Outreach	.27
Discipline	.27
Input	.25
Knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment	.25
Order	.25
Resources	.25
Change agent	.25
Culture	.25
Focus	.24
Intellectual stimulation	.24
Contingent rewards	.24
Communication	.23
Ideals and beliefs	.22
Involvement of curriculum, instruction, and assessment	.20
Optimizer	.20
Visibility	.20
Affirmation	.19
Relationships	.18

Adapted from "The 21 Leadership Responsibilities and Their Correlations with Student Academic Achievement," by R. J. Marzano, T. Waters, and B. A. McNulty, 2005, *School Leadership That Works,* pp. 42–43.

All 21 leadership responsibilities are found in first-order change and 7 are likely to be found in second-order change (Marzano et al., 2005). These responsibilities are (a) knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; (b) optimizer; (c) intellectual stimulation; (d) change agent; (e) monitoring/evaluating; (f) flexibility; and (g) ideals/beliefs. Second-order change situations require a different approach to leadership because the situations are perceived as a huge shift in current practice. Whereas knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment requires an understanding of best practices within first-order change situations, this responsibility requires an understanding of how the selected change initiative will affect current

practices in second-order change situations. For example, researchers from the Consortium on Chicago School Research found that schools with coherent instructional programs are more likely to achieve higher levels of student learning than are schools with less coherent programs (Cawelti & Protheroe, 2003). Bringing alignment and coherence to instructional programs has implications regarding what and how teachers deliver the curriculum. If a teacher is accustomed to having great academic freedom, this type of change would challenge his/her basic underlying assumptions about teaching.

Within first-order change situations, the responsibility of optimizer requires that the leader be a generally positive influence in the school. Within second-order change situations, the role of the leader becomes much more focused and intense; the school leader becomes the driving force behind the change initiative and takes responsibility for its success. In a qualitative case study, Brown and Anfara (2003) explored leadership in action by focusing on the strategies of middle school principals. They found that the principals who engaged in dialogue with various stakeholders by sharing their passion for continuous improvement and growth while working diligently at laying the foundation for the proposed change prior to its implementation were successful in instituting reform.

Intellectual stimulation within the context of first-order change involves fostering knowledge of research and theory on best practices among staff through reading and discussion. As with that of the optimizer, first-order change has a broad and general focus. The thrust of intellectual stimulation within second-order change is to stimulate the intellectual curiosity of the staff regarding the intended innovation.

This responsibility becomes second-order when the innovation challenges the status quo of the organization.

The responsibility of the change agent in first-order change situations is challenging existing school practices that have been in place for some time. The responsibility of the change agent in second-order change situations is generating new ideas for future consideration through constant exposure and education. Sending staff to conferences and encouraging them to take risks are examples of actions that the change agent may take (Brown & Anfara, 2003). The crux of the responsibility in second-order change situations is inspiring staff to operate at the edge of their competence (Marzano et al., 2005).

The responsibility of monitoring/evaluating in first-order change situations is keeping track of students' progress at a general level. If data indicate that students are not achieving, adjustments are made in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. In second-order change situations, the responsibility is the careful monitoring of the effects of the change initiative with a focus on continuous improvement.

Given the uncertainty associated with second-order change situations, it is vital that the leader maintain flexibility to adapt his/her leadership behaviors according to the demands of the current situation. In some instances, the demands may be to increase communication, in others to provide inspiration, and in yet others to provide input or guidance. Providing for flexibility allows the dynamics among the staff to play out on their own as the leader adapts to new needs.

The final elements important in second-order change situations are ideals and beliefs. Identifying shared ideals and beliefs among the staff is critical in establishing

a purposeful organization. Within second-order change situations, the focus is narrowed in that the leader explicitly outlines how the intended change initiative is consistent with shared values and beliefs. Because staff may lose sight of the alignment between the reform effort and their ideals and beliefs, the leader keeps ideals and beliefs at the forefront of discussions regarding the initiative.

Second-order change situations are distinguished from first-order change situations in that they are specific to the intended reform initiative, involve new ideas and innovations, and challenge and inspire the staff to new depths of their competence. Given that second-order change involves transforming existing models, norms, and values (Marzano et al., 2005; Waters et al., 2004), thereby challenging basic underlying beliefs (Marzano et al., 2005; Schein, 1992; Waters et al., 2004), second-order change is analogous to transforming the existing culture of an organization.

Summary of Change Theory

Bridges (2003) categorized the process of change into the three distinct transitions of the ending zone, the neutral zone, and the new beginning. Although change is very complex and unmanageable, many scholars believe that leadership can make a difference in moving an organization through these stages (Barth, 1990; Bridges, 2003; Fullan, 2001; Lezotte, 1997; Senge, 2000). Creating and maintaining a climate of trust is an essential element in leading an organization through change (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Cash, 1997; Fullan, 2001; Rooney, 2003; Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni, 2005). Equally important is the focus of change as well as the magnitude to which the intended change is perceived by the stakeholders (Marzano et al., 2005; Waters et al., 2004). First-order and second-order change situations require different

leadership approaches (Barth, 1990; Fullan, 2001; Marzano et al., 2005). The following section focuses on leadership and the leadership traits conducive to transforming the culture of an organization.

Leadership

Fullan (2001) asserted that finding solutions to complex problems is a responsibility of leadership. Describing how leaders are often placed in complicated situations in which they are expected to succeed using simple, one-sided solutions, he argued that leadership requires confronting problems that have never yet been successfully addressed. Although one might assume that leadership would inspire a vast amount of research, the topic has been far less studied than one would believe it to have been (Marzano et al., 2005). Furthermore, in the latest comprehensive review of the literature over the past 35 years, Marzano et al. found that only 69 out of 5,000 articles actually examined the relationship between leadership and academic achievement. They also found that the research that has been conducted on school leadership is "quite equivocal or perceived as such" (p. 6). These findings make it clear that further study is still needed to identify those leadership attributes important in the academic achievement of students.

Recent studies that focused on identifying outstanding characteristics of principals (Morris, 1999; Waters et al., 2004; Wendel, Hoke, & Joekel, 1993) suggested that certain leadership traits can be identified when searching for quality instructional leaders for the 21st century. Some common actions of good leaders are that they rock the boat, set high expectations for their teachers and themselves, and demand and get results (Morris, 1999; Waters et al., 2004; Wendel et al., 1993).

One question on which many research studies have focused is "Does leadership matter?" Many studies that have attempted to answer this question have obtained mixed findings (Hallinger, Bickman, & Davis, 1996; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999b, 1999c; Sheppard, 1996). Examining survey data from 1,762 teachers and 9,941 students, Leithwood and Jantzi (1999c) found that the effects of principal leadership on student engagement were weak but significant. Seeking to identify the elements of leadership that directly impact student engagement, the researchers performed a regression analysis to determine the strength of the relationship between principal leadership and purpose- and goal-setting, culture, planning, structure and organization, and information collection. They found principal leadership to be significantly related to all of these school conditions, suggesting that although leadership is weakly related to student engagement, leadership is strongly related to the overall condition of a school.

In an earlier study, Hallinger et al. (1996) found no direct effect of principal leadership on student achievement but did find that the direct actions of the principal had an indirect effect on school effectiveness. These findings suggest that principal leadership is directly related to school effectiveness, which in turn indirectly influences student achievement. One dimension that Hallinger et al. accounted for that Leithwood and Jantzi (1999a) did not was the impact of environmental variables on the principal. In most studies of principal leadership, antecedent variables such as school socioeconomic status, parental involvement, gender of the principal, and teaching experience were not examined. Likewise, the context of PI status should be factor for consideration in further leadership studies.

Leadership and Change

Although Hallinger et al.'s study (1996) highlighted the importance of contextual influences on leadership, which would include the contextual influence of PI status, there remains limited data on the experience of schools designated as PI schools. An explanation for the lack of studies examining the perspectives of schools undergoing external sanctions may be the difficulty in gaining access to such sensitive social contexts (Nicolaidou & Ainscow, 2005). In addition, much literature is focused on helping rather than investigating these schools.

Nicolaidou and Ainscow (2005) addressed this gap in the literature by investigating four schools in the United Kingdom placed under "special measures," equivalent to being placed under PI status. The interviews and observations that the researchers conducted for over 2 years allowed them to identify the unique characteristics and challenges of schools facing extreme difficulties. At the beginning of their study, the major concerns facing all four participating schools were related to the core functions of teaching and learning. Later in the study, a number of other significant issues were identified. It was evident that the period of study was a very emotional time for all of the schools; personal attitudes and beliefs towards "special measures" had negatively influenced working relationships and hampered improvement efforts. The researchers observed a culture of denial in which many staff members refused to acknowledge the reality of their situation, disengaging themselves from any responsibility. Viewing the entire identification process as the responsibility of others, mainly "administration," they were extremely hostile towards change and

mistrusted the external consultants and support services provided. Many staff members also reported feelings of uselessness and failure.

Nicolaidou and Ainscow's (2005) findings suggested that the experience of being in “special measures” had added a whole new dimension to the existing culture and underlined the importance of organizational culture in fostering improvement and development. Although this study was not intended to be as study of leadership, leadership became a significant theme, thus reinforcing the argument that leadership is at the heart of organizational culture and change.

Transformational Leadership

One leadership theory whose practices suggest to aid in organizational culture and change is *transformational leadership* (Bass, 1997; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999b; Sheppard, 1996). Referred to as the *new leadership*, this conceptualization of leadership behaviors was derived from Burns (1978) and elaborated by Bass (1997). Burns (1978) distinguished between *transactional leaders,* who motivate their followers through extrinsic rewards, and *transformational leaders*, who motivate their followers through intrinsic rewards. Transactional leaders determine the rewards that their followers want from their work and ensure that their followers receive these rewards if their performance merits them. Because transactional leaders exchange rewards and promises for efforts, they must remain responsive to those self-interests of their followers that they can fulfill contingent upon the completion of a task.

On the other hand, transformational leaders are visionaries who appeal to the better nature of their followers by motivating them to perform for the greater good (Doyle & Smith, 2001). Transformational leaders encourage their followers to look

beyond themselves and their own self-interests for the sake of the team or greater good by raising their followers' level of awareness and consciousness of the significance and value of the work outcomes. Transformational leaders alter the need level according to Maslow's hierarchy and expand their followers' range of wants and needs (Bass, 1997; Doyle & Smith, 2001).

Bass (1997) divided the construct of transformational leadership into the four interrelated components of *idealized influence* (or *charisma*)*, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation,* and *individualized consideration*. Idealized influential leaders have strong convictions; emphasize trust; take stands on difficult issues; and emphasize the importance of purpose, commitment, and the ethical consequences of decisions. Such leaders are admired as role models generating pride, loyalty and a sense of shared purpose. Inspirational motivational leaders are instrumental in articulating a vision of the future, challenging followers with high standards, maintaining optimism, and providing encouragement and meaning for the work that needs to be none. Intellectual stimulatory leaders question old assumptions, traditions, and beliefs; stimulate new perspectives and ideas of tackling challenges; and encourage the expression of ideas and reasons. Individualized considerate leaders deal with others as individuals; consider their individual needs, abilities, and aspirations; listen attentively; and further their followers' development through advisement, teaching, and coaching.

Bass (1997) elaborated that the style of transactional leadership can be based upon *contingent rewards, active management by exception, passive management by exception,* and *laissez-faire leadership.* Leaders that have a strong tendency towards

contingent rewards can be characterized as engaging in a constructive incentive system for performance. These leaders set clear expectations, offer promises and resources for support, arrange mutually satisfactory agreements, negotiate for resources, exchange assistance for effort, and provide rewards for successful performance. Active management by exception leaders monitor followers' performance, take corrective action if there is any deviation from standards, and enforce rules to avoid mistakes. In comparison, passive management by exception leaders only intervene when problems become serious; they do not take corrective actions immediately but wait until they are brought to their attention. Laissez-faire leaders avoid accepting responsibility, are absent when needed, fail to follow-up on requests for assistance, and resist expressing their views on important issues.

Whereas Burns (1978) conceived of transactional and transformational leadership as being polar opposites on a leadership continuum, Bass (1997) argued that they are complementary leadership styles. Rather than recommending that transformational leadership be replaced by transactional leadership, Bass recommended that transactional leadership assume increased levels of personal commitment to become more like transformational leadership (Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999b). In other words, both transactional and transformational leadership qualities can exist at the same time, but transformational components are required within certain contexts. The one context for which transformational leadership has been found to be most effective is in organizational change (Antonakis et al., 2003; Bass, 1997; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999b, 2006; Leithwood, Steinbach, & Jantzi, 2002; Sheppard, 1996).

In one study, Sheppard (1996) sought to determine whether instructional leadership behaviors were positively related to the characteristics of effective schools. After analyzing survey data from 624 teachers, Sheppard concluded that there was a strong correlation between certain transformational leadership behaviors and school characteristics, suggesting that characteristics of transformational leadership facilitate school improvement. In a study conducted to identify the leadership behaviors consistent with what had been theorized as the essential leadership traits needed for the complex conditions of today's schools (Barth, 1990, 2002; Fullan, 2001, 2003; Senge, 2000; Sergiovanni, 2004, 2005), Leithwood and Jantzi (1999b) found that transformational practices contributed to the development of capacity and commitment. In fact, many studies (Charles A. Dana Center, 1999; Hallinger et al., 1996; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999c; Leithwood et al., 2004; Pollard-Durodola, 2003; Sheppard, 1996) have suggested that there is a relationship between leadership, organizational change, and enhanced organizational outcomes.

Full Range Leadership Model

Previous leadership models have failed to explain the full range of leaders, from charismatic and inspirational leaders to avoidant and laissez-faire leaders Antonakis & House, 2002; Antonakis et al., 2003; Avolio & Bass, 2004). The *full range leadership model* was developed to broaden the range of leadership behaviors typically investigated in the field of leadership. The model was labeled *full range* in an effort to encompass the full spectrum of behaviors typically found in leadership studies (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Because most research has only focused on charismatic and inspirational leadership, considered transformational leadership styles,

Bass developed the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) to assess the full range of leadership behaviors (Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). The MLQ was developed to measure both transactional and transformation leadership behaviors and investigate the nature between these behaviors and work unit effectiveness and satisfaction. The instrument was conceptually developed and empirically validated to reflect the complementary dimensions of transformational and transactional leadership based on subscales that further differentiate leader behavior.

As previously discussed, the initial pool of 142 questions on the MLQ were derived from a review of the literature and an open-ended survey asking 70 executives for their descriptions of the attributes of transformational and transactional leaders (Antonakis et al., 2003). After factor analysis indicated that 5 of the subscales had achieved an acceptable level of reliability, 3 of the 5 subscales were identified as characteristic of transformational leadership (charisma or inspirational leadership, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation) and 2 as characteristic of transactional leadership (contingent reward and management by exception; Lowe et al., 1996). The MLQ has been examined in over 75 research studies and used to study leaders in a variety of organizational settings, including manufacturing, military, educational, and religious institutions (Lowe et al., 1996). The MLQ has been used extensively in field and laboratory research to study transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant leadership behaviors (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The instrument is also accepted for use in the investigation of selection, transfer, and promotion activities.

Research findings of studies using the MLQ have generally reported statistically significant relationships between leader effectiveness and the transformational scales of charisma/inspirational stimulation, individualized stimulation, and intellectual stimulation (Lowe et al., 1996). The transactional scale of contingent reward has been associated with effectiveness, but less so than have the transformational scales. The transactional scale of management by exception has been found to have a generally weak correlation with effectiveness and to have a negative correlation with effectiveness when statistically significant. Given these findings, it appears that the MLQ is the most appropriate instrument for assessing transformational leadership behaviors.

Summary of Leadership

Transforming the culture within a school requires a certain type of leadership (Barth, 1990; Fullan, 2001; Marzano et al., 2005) that can withstand the challenges of overcoming PI status. Research studies have confirmed that leadership can have a direct impact on the overall conditions of a school. Although the direct impact of leadership on student achievement is still being debated, the direct impact of school conditions on student achievement is irrefutable (Hallinger et al., 1996; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999a, 1999b; Morris, 1999; Waters et al., 2004; Wendel et al., 1993). Hence, PI schools require leadership that transforms the existing culture under difficult circumstances (Fullan, 2001; Nicolaidou & Ainscow, 2005). It is hypothesized that principals in PI schools will have more transformational leadership behaviors than do principals in non-PI schools. In order to test this hypothesis, the MLQ instrument will be used to assess transformational behaviors.

Conclusion

The review of the literature has revealed that PI schools may require leaders who can change the organizational culture of the school to change its basic underlying assumptions, which are the foundations upon which the school culture is based. The review of literature on change revealed that second-order change is associated with changing culture as this study has defined it. With this in mind, the proposed study will seek to identify the types of changes school leaders seeking to exit PI must undertake. The literature on leadership has identified transformational leadership as the leadership style most likely to transform the culture of a school. Therefore, this study will survey principals whose schools are currently designated as PI schools (*PI principals*), principals whose schools have never been designated as PI schools (*non-PI principals*), and principals whose schools have successfully exited PI designation (*exited principals*) using the MLQ to identify their common leadership behaviors. The following chapter reviews the specific methodology proposed for this research study.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

Schools designated as PI schools will inevitably be required to undertake a change initiative to meet NCLB requirements. The review of the literature revealed that change can be categorized into first-order and second-order change (Marzano et al., 2005). Second-order change, which challenges the underlying assumptions of the staff, is associated with transforming the existing culture. With this in mind, this study sought to identify the leadership behaviors of principals seeking to exit PI status. Leadership theory suggests that transformational leadership might be the most effective leadership style for leaders striving to transform the culture of a school. To examine this theory, PI, non-PI, and exited school principals were surveyed using the MLQ form 5X to identify their common leadership behaviors.

Overview

The focus of this study was identifying the common leadership behaviors of principals whose schools had successfully exited PI status. In order to examine these phenomena, 4,253 principals were invited to complete an online survey that measured those leadership behaviors that are aligned with transformational leadership practices. The particpants were asked to complete a series of questions that collected both demographic information and information regarding leadership behaviors and outcomes as measured by the MLQ 5X. PI principals and exited principals were also asked to respond to two prompts intended to gather information on the change initiatives and actions that they utilized to support their schools. Additionally, 4 exited principals were interviewed to futher identify those leadership behaviors related to reform.

Prior to the end of the 2006-2007 school year, invitations to participate in the survey were e-mailed to 4,253 California primary and secondary Title I public school principals for whom e-mail addresses were available (CDE, 2007). Because 1,184 e-mail addresses were invalid or inaccessible, only 3,069 invitations were delivered, to which 659 participants responded. The response rate of 22.6% was calculated by dividing the number of delivered questionnaires, 3,069, by the number of completed questionnaires, 695 (Babbie, 2001). Of the 695 questionnaires completed, 146 were eliminated because the respondent did not fit the criteria of being a principal of a Title I public institution. Of the remaining pool of participants, 4 principals were identified as exited principals and invited to participate in an interview. At the end of the 2006-2007 school year, the survey results were subjected to a series of statistical analyses and the open-ended responses and interview transcripts were analyzed.

Purpose of Study and Research Questions

The CDE predicts that by 2011, 90% of schools will fail to meet the minimum proficiency requirments under NCLB (Packer, 2004). If this alarming forecast becomes reality, more school leaders will find themselves attempting to lead their schools out of PI status. This study is intended to inform the leadership training and assistance necessary for those leaders where school reform is needed and inform district practices in the recruitment and selection of principals. To address these concerns, the following research questions were used to guide this study:

Research Question 1: As measured by the MLQ 5X, what similarities or differences exist in the leadership behaviors of PI principals?

Research Question 2: Are there differences in the leadership behaviors of PI principals and non-PI principals?

Research Question 3: In what types of reform efforts do PI principals engage?

From the review of the literature, the following hypotheses were developed to address the research questions:

Hypothesis 1: PI principals will display more transactional behaviors, as measured by the MLQ 5X, than will non-PI and exited principals.

Hypothesis 2: Exited principals will display more transformational behaviors, as measured by the MLQ 5X, than will PI and non-PI principals.

Many researchers (Bass, 1997; Fullan, 2001; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999b, 2006; Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni, 2005) have asserted that major change initiatives require leaders with the moral fortitude to motivate teachers to see beyond their self-interests and recognize their moral obligation to reach all students, an important component of transformational leadership. Bass (1997) argued that transactional leadership is only sufficient for either maintaining the status quo or motivating teachers to work harder. Based on these assertions and the change and leadership literature, the following propositions were furthered:

Proposition 1: PI principals will exhibit more transactional behaviors than will exited principals.

Proposition 2: Exited principals will exhibit more transformational behaviors than will PI principals.

Proposition 3: Principals involved in first-order change will generally display more transactional leadership behaviors whereas principals involved in second-order change will generally display more transformational leadership behaviors.

Barth (1990), Bridges (2003), Fullan (2001), Marzano (2005), Schein (1992), and Sergiovanni (2005) have all asserted that for schools to be successful in making the necessary changes required to change a school culture, they must become involved in deeper, more systemic changes that get to the very core of the system.

General Research Design and Rationale

This research study focused on the leadership behaviors and practices of PI, non-PI, and exited California principals. A convenience sample of 4,253 principals for whom e-mail addresses were available was invited to complete the MLQ Form 5X. In addition, a sample of principals who had exited PI status within the last year were interviewed to gather further data regarding their leadership behaviors and identify the types of change initiatives they had implemented. The MLQ instrument was chosen because it examines the full range of leadership dimensions, including transactional and transformational leadership behaviors (Bass, 1997; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999b) as well as laissez-faire and other nontransactional leadership traits (Antonakis et al., 2003). A mixed method approach was used based on the recommendation of prior research studies that had used the MLQ Form 5X to address the "what and why of leadership" (Antonakis et al., 2003, p. 286).

Quantitative Sample/Participants

Prior to the end of the 2006-2007 school year, study invitations were e-mailed to 4,253 California primary and secondary Title I public principals for whom e-mail

addresses were available (CDE, 2007). Because 1,184 e-mail addresses were invalid or inaccessible, only 3,069 invitations were delivered, to which 659 participants responded. The response rate of 22.6% was calculated by dividing the number of delivered questionnaires, 3,069, by the number of completed questionnaires, 695 (Babbie, 2001). Of the 695 questionnaires completed, 146 were eliminated because the respondent did not fit the criteria of being a principal of a Title I public institution. Although this study did not reach a generally acceptable response rate of at least 50% (Babbie, 2001), the distribution of the acceptable responses was representative of the larger population of Title I California public school principals. Table 2 displays the number of participants and their corresponding representation of the total sample compared to the percentages of the target population within each PI status.

Table 2:

Comparison of Sample Size to Population

PI Status	*N*	Percentage of *N*	Percentage of population
Total	549		
Never in PI	180	54.5%	63%
In PI	275	35.6%	37%
Exited PI	50	9.9%	7%

N = number of sample participants

As shown in Table 2, the differences between the percentages of study participants of each status and the percentages of principals of each status in the target population are minimal. Specifically, participants identified as *never in PI* represented 54.5% of the participant sample, comparable to 63% of principals within the target

population, participants identified as *in PI* represented 35.6% of the sample, comparable to 37% of principals within the target population, and participants identified as having *exited PI* represented 9.9% of the sample, comparable to 7% of principals within the target population. Additionally, based on the available data the researcher determined that this study's sample is representative of the larger population of California Title I public school principals.

Qualitative Sample/Participants

A sample of 4 participants from schools identified as having exited PI status by the 2006 Title I Program Improvement data files (CDE, 2006) was selected to participate in an interview (Merriam, 1998). The participants were required to have been the principal of the school at which they currently taught for at least 2 years prior to exiting PI status. Preliminary analysis of the data identified 105 principals who met some of this criteria. Of the 105 principals whose schools had exited PI status within the past year, 49 had done so during the first year of PI status (year 1), 35 during the second year (year 2), 11 during the third year (year 3), and 10 during the fourth year (year 4). The researcher attempted to contact potential participants from years 1, 2, 3, and 4 for an interview via e-mail.

Four principals identified as having exited PI during the 2005-2006 school year were interviewed. Three participants were elementary school principals and 1 a junior high school principal. One principal had exited from PI during year 1, 1 had exited during year 2, and 2 had exited during year 4. All of the participants served in schools comparable in size, student ethnicity, and percentage of economically disadvantaged students. Due to the limited population size that met the aforementioned criteria, this

researcher was not able to interview any principal whose school had exited PI during year 3. However, the limits imposed by convenience sampling have been deemed acceptable, being factors that all researchers must consider in selecting their sample size (Creswell, 2003; Kvale, 1996).

Measures/Instrumentation

The participants were asked three sets of questions. The first set constituted a 20-question demographic survey (see Appendix D) modeled after a recent leadership study on effective learning environments (Smith, Guarino, Strom, & Adams, 2006). The demographic survey was designed to gather potentially significant data regarding each participant. The second section consisted of the MLQ Form 5X (see Appendix E), a 45-item Likert-scale leadership questionnaire that asks participants to judge how aptly a series of statements describes them using a 5-point scale that ranges from *not at all* to *frequently, if not always*. The instrument is used to produce a mean score for nine different leadership behaviors: (a) idealized influence (attributed), (b) idealized influence (behavior), (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual stimulation, (e) individualized consideration, (f) contingent reward, (g) management by exception (active), (h) management by exception (passive), and (i) laissez-faire. Additionally, the MLQ provides a score for three perceived leadership outcomes: (a) extra effort, (b) effectiveness, and (c) satisfaction.

The first five leadership behaviors are characterized as transformational leadership behaviors because of their ability to influence and motivate followers to achieve and optimize performance for the greater good. The first transformational leadership behavior, idealized influence, is separated into two distinct categories based

upon the admired attributes or behaviors of the leader. Idealized influence (attributed) leadership instills pride in others by their association with leaders who display a sense of power and confidence and act in ways that build others' respect for them. These leaders' attributes motivate and inspire followers to emulate them. Idealized influence (behavior) leaders influence followers through sharing their most important values and beliefs and emphasizing the importance of having a strong sense of purpose and collective mission and considering the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. Leaders using inspirational motivation, the third transformational leadership behavior, act in ways that motivate those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their work. They talk optimistically about the future, articulate a compelling vision, and express confidence that goals will be achieved. Leaders using intellectual stimulation, the fourth transformational leadership behavior, stimulate their followers to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and offering differing perspectives. They invite participation in the process of finding solutions to existing problems and promote creativity as well as differing perspectives. Leaders using individual consideration, the fifth transformational leadership behavior, behave as coaches and mentors by determining and remaining aware of individuals' needs to assist them in developing their strengths.

The remaining four leadership behaviors assessed by the MLQ 5X are considered transactional leadership behaviors (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Transactional leaders engage in behaviors that are associated with constructive (contingent-reward based) and corrective (management-by-exception) transactions. Contingent-reward behavior, the sixth leadership behavior measured by the MLQ 5X, clarifies

expectations and goals and offers recognition in exchange for effort. Leaders displaying this behavior provide clarity regarding expectations and offer rewards for meeting expectations and goals. Management-by-exception transactional leadership behaviors are divided into two distinct categories based upon whether they require an active or passive response from the leader. Leaders using management-by-exception (active) behaviors clearly articulate expected standards, actively monitor for compliance, and take corrective action when followers deviate or make mistakes. Focusing attention on irregularities, mistakes, and exceptions from standards, these leaders concentrate their full attention on resolving errors, complaints, and failures. In contrast, leaders using management-by-exception (passive) behaviors are more passive and reactive. These leaders do not respond or intervene until problems become chronic or serious. Laissez-faire leadership behavior is the ninth type of leadership style measured by the MLQ 5X. Laissez-faire leaders avoid getting involved when important issues arise. They are absent when needed and avoid making decisions. Both laissez-faire and management-by-exception (passive) leaders are considered passive-avoidant.

In addition to measuring nine leadership behaviors, the MLQ 5X measures three outcomes of success. Success is measured by how often leaders perceive themselves to be motivational, effective in interacting with others, and satisfied with their methods of working with others (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The first outcome measured is *extra effort*, the degree to which leaders motivate others to put forth the extra effort to do more than what is expected and heighten their desire to succeed. The second outcome is *effectiveness,* leaders' perception of how effective they are in

meeting others' job-related needs, representing the group to a higher authority, meeting organizational requirements, and leading a group that is effective. The final outcome is *satisfaction*, the degree to which leaders are satisfied with their leadership methods and work well with others. In this study, The measurements of the nine leadership behaviors and three leadership outcomes served as guideposts when analyzing the qualitative data.

As an instrument, the MLQ has many advantages. One of its primary advantages over other leadership surveys is its emphasis on leadership development. The survey includes items that measure a leader's effect on both personal and intellectual development (Avolio & Bass, 2004). This instrument may measure the bidirectional influences between environment, behavior, and cognition that Bandura (1997) outlined in social cognitive theory. Another advantage of the MLQ is its straightforward design based on the full range leadership model, which determines a leader's performance on a range of leadership styles that have been linked to expected performance outcomes (Dum dum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002). Finally, as the most widely used leadership survey, the MLQ has been validated across a variety of different environmental contexts (Antonakis et al., 2003; Avolio & Bass, 2004).

The third and final section of the leadership questionnaire was comprised of the two following open-ended prompts targeted to PI principals and exited principals: (a) Please describe the most significant change initiative your school has implemented that you believe made or will make a difference in getting your school out of PI and (b) What have been your actions that have had the most impact in successfully facilitating these changes?

For the interview portion of the study, a set of 11 interview questions (see Appendix F) were developed to specifically address the following research question: What types of reform efforts do principals that have succesfully exited PI engage in? The interview questions were structured according to Kvale's (1996) suggestion that interview questions be kept brief and simple and that different types of interview questions, such as introductory and probing questions, be asked.

Data Collection

To begin to gather the sample for the quantitative portion of this study, the School Improvement Status database from the California Department of Education (2006) was downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet and the 2006-2007 California Public School Directory database (CDE, 2007), which contains the names, school addresses, and e-mail addresses of all current principals for the 2006-2007 school year, was purchased. These two databases were merged into an Excel spreadsheet using the school's identification code before the combined information was uploaded onto the SurveyMonkey.com Web site. Utilizing SurveyMonkey.com's applications, e-mails were sent to the 4,253 California Title I school principals for whom e-mail addresses were available on May 16, 2007. The message e-mail (see Appendix A) consisted of an introductory message with a link to the survey directions and informed consent form (see Appendix B). Principals who responded were tracked and e-mail reminders sent to those principals who had not responded. A final e-mail reminder was sent on June 29, 2007. Of the 4,253 principals in the convenience sample, 1,183 addresses were inaccessible, resulting in 3,609 deliverable questionnaires to which 659 participants responded, resulting in a 22.6% response rate.

In preparation for the interview portion of this study, the Excel spreadsheet containing the directory information and the School Improvement Status information was uploaded onto FileMaker Pro version 6. Using this complete database, contact sheets were generated of all principals identified as having exited PI during the 2005-2006 school year. Of the 105 principals identified as having exited during the 2005-2006 school year, only 82 had accessible e-mail addresses. All 82 principals for whom contact information was available were contacted via e-mail, and after multiple attempts, 4 participants consented to participate in an interview. Of the 4 interviewees, 3 were elementary school principals and 1 a junior high school principal; 1 principal had exited from PI during year 1, 1 during year 2, and 2 during year 4. The 4 participants were asked a series of questions focusing on the leadership behaviors that they perceived as significant to their schools' success. All of the interviews were conducted at the principals' schools using the same set of questions (see Appendix F). While obtaining their consent for the interviews, the principals were assured anonymity and informed that the interviews would be recorded. All interviewees agreed to participate in the study and signed the informed consent (see Appendix C).

Pilot Study

A pilot study interview was conducted with one San Diego County principal who had recently exited from the School Assistance Intervention Team (SAIT) program. The interview questions were tested for clarity, validity, and reliability. The interviewer asked the interviewee to provide feedback regarding any of the questions that may have been confusing or problematic. The pilot interview was transcribed and analyzed to develop a preliminary coding of possible themes and categories from the

interviewee's responses. Feedback from the interviewee that provided valuable information regarding the phrasing of each question as well as the order of the questions was used to make minor revisions to the interview questions (see Appendix F).

Data Analysis

After the survey responses had been completed, the survey results were uploaded into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to begin analysis. The survey responses were subjected to a series of tests in order to test the hypotheses derived from the research questions. The data analysis design followed the outline of analysis recommended by Pallant (2005). First, in order to assess the normality of distribution and provide an overview of the sample, a series analysis resulting in descriptive statistics was performed. Secondly, as recommended by the authors that developed and validated the MLQ survey instrument (Antonakis et al., 2003), a factor analysis was conducted to ensure the validity of the responses within the context of educational leadership.

To test the first and second hypotheses, the survey data were analyzed using a series of one-way between-groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) with posthoc tests to examine if there was a statistically significant relationship between the independent variables of PI status and years in PI with the dependent variables of demographic factors and leadership behaviors and outcomes as measured by the MLQ. Next, all open-ended responses were uploaded onto HyperRESEARCH version 2.7. The open-ended responses were grouped together by PI status and year in PI before the data were coded using a constant comparative analysis method (Merriam, 1998). All four

interviews were recorded and transcribed into a more formal written format because the original transcription did not code pauses or repetition or provide linguistic interpretations (Kvale, 1996). The interview transcriptions were uploaded into HyperRESEARCH version 2.7 and the data coded using the constant comparative method recommended by Merriam (1998).

Summary of Methods

The focus of this study was to identify the common leadership behaviors of successful principals within the context of PI. In order to examine these phenomena, 4,253 California Title I principals for whom email addresses were available were contacted via e-mail to complete an online leadership survey divided into three sections. The first section was a 20-question demographic survey designed to gather pertinent information such as gender, age, school demographics, and, most importantly, PI status. The second section consisted of the MLQ 5X, which measured leadership behaviors and outcomes related to transformational and transactional leadership behaviors. The third section, which was targeted to PI principals and exited principals, requested that the participants respond to two open-ended prompts designed to identify the focus of change initiatives and leadership behaviors in which they were engaging or had engaged as part of the PI process. Additionally, 4 principals who had recently exited PI were interviewed using a set of 11 questions to gather data on their PI experience. The following chapter will present the results of the data analysis.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The focus of this study was to identify the common leadership behaviors of principals whose schools had successfully exited PI designation. In order to examine these phenomena, a convenience sample of principals was asked to complete a series of survey questions and the MLQ form 5X to collect information on principal demographics, leadership behaviors, and outcomes. Those principals who were either principals of PI schools or of schools that had successfully exited PI were also asked to respond to two prompts. Additionally, 4 principals whose schools had recently exited PI status were interviewed about their personal journey through PI. The reporting of the results of this study will begin with the presentation of the qualitative findings from the survey results, which were used to identify signposts that assisted in analyzing the qualitative data. The findings based on the qualitative data will then be reported before all of the findings are summarized.

Quantitative Data Results and Analysis

The quantitative portion of this study was designed to answer the following two research questions: (a) As measured by the MLQ 5X, what similarities or differences exist in the leadership behaviors of PI principals? and (b) Are there differences in the leadership behaviors of PI principals and non-PI principals? To address these questions, a leadership questionnaire was sent to a convenience sample of California Title I public school principals. The leadership questionnaire was comprised of a principal demographic survey (see Appendix C), the MLQ form 5X (see Appendix D), and two open-ended prompts. The MLQ was intended to identify

the self-perceived leadership behaviors and outcomes of the California Title I public school principals.

MLQ Survey Results

The MLQ is used to capture a broad range of leadership behaviors, from laissez- faire to idealized leadership behaviors, while also differentiating ineffective from effective leaders. At the ineffective range, the MLQ assesses perceptions of leadership behaviors that indicate avoidance of responsibility and action (laissez-faire leadership behaviors). At the most effective range, the MLQ assesses perceptions of leadership behaviors that generate the greatest amount of influence over and motivation from others (transformational leadership behaviors). The MLQ is suitable for administration across different types of organizations, including educational organizations (Antonakis et al., 2003).

The MLQ is a 45-item Likert-scale leadership questionnaire that asks participants to judge how aptly a series of statements best describes them using a 5-point scale that rangers from *not at all* to *frequently, if not always*. The instrument provides a mean score for nine different leadership behaviors: (a) idealized influence (attributed), (b) idealized influence (behavior), (c) inspirational motivation, (d) intellectual stimulation, (e) individualized consideration, (f) contingent reward, (g) management by exception (active), (h) management by exception (passive), and (i) laissez faire. Additionally the MLQ provides a score for three perceived leadership outcomes: (a) extra effort, (b) effectiveness, and (c) satisfaction.

The first five leadership behaviors, idealized influence (attributed), idealized influence (behavior), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual

consideration, are characterized as transformational leadership behaviors because of their ability to influence and motivate followers to achieve and optimize performance for the greater good. The next two leadership behaviors, contingent reward and management by exception (active), are considered transactional leadership behaviors because they are associated with constructive and corrective transactions. Constructive behavior is labeled contingent reward and corrective behavior is labeled management by exception (active). The final two leadership behaviors, management by exception (passive) and laissez faire, are considered passive-avoidant or nonleadership styles because they result from passive and avoidant tendencies.

In addition to measuring nine leadership behaviors, the MLQ 5X measures three outcomes of success. Success is measured by how often leaders perceive themselves to be motivational, effective in interacting with others, and satisfied with their methods of working with others (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The results and analysis of this study's MLQ 5X responses are presented and discussed in the following sections.

Factor Analysis

Although the MLQ 5X has previously been tested for validity for use within broad organizational contexts, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed as recommended by Antonakis et al. (2003) to ensure suitability for use within this study, specific California public school leaders. The 45 items of the MLQ 5X were subjected to Principal Components Analysis (PCA) using SPSS Version 15. Prior to performing the PCA, the suitability of the data for factor analysis was assessed. Inspection of the correlation matrix revealed the presence of many coefficients of .3

and above. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin value was .89, exceeding the recommended value of .6 (Pallant, 2005). Furthermore, the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity reached statistical significance (p = .000), which supported the factorability of the correlation matrix.

PCA revealed the presence of 12 components with eigenvalues exceeding 1. The first factor explained 22% of the variance in principals' responses, while the remaining 11 factors explained 2.3 to 5.8% of the variance (see Appendix G). To aid in the interpretation of the 12 components, a Varimax rotation was performed (see Appendix H) that revealed a number of strong loadings in several components; however, the item loadings were different from the original instrument structure. The results of this analysis were inconsistent with previous validation studies (Antonakis et al., 2003; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass, 1997; Lowe et al., 1996). For the purposes of this study, the researcher accepted the findings from the previous validation studies due to the following reasons: (a) the instrument is based on sound theory (Antonakis & House, 2002; Burns, 1978); (b) the original structure has been repeatedly tested for validity and reliability (Antonakis et al., 2003; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass, 1997); and (c) the original structure has been nationally normed within the United States, making for a more robust sample than the 23% response rate in this study (Avolio & Bass, 2004). Based on these reasons, the original instrument structure of the MLQ 5X was used in the analysis of this study.

Descriptive Statistics

In order to gain a complete depiction of the participant sample of this study and assess the normality of distribution of the participants, a series of descriptive analyses were performed using the demographic variables collected from the

demographic survey. As recommended by Pallant (2005), frequencies were obtained to study the characteristics of each variable. Table 3 presents the demographic frequencies of this study's sample.

Table 3:

Demographic Frequencies of Study Sample

Independent variable			Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent
Gender:	Valid	Male	210	38.3	40.3	40.3
		Female	311	56.6	59.7	100.0
		Total	521	94.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	28	5.1		
	Total		549	100.0		
Age:	Valid	<30	1	0.2	0.2	0.2
		30-34	16	2.9	3.1	3.3
		35-44	108	19.7	20.7	23.9
		45-49	70	12.8	13.4	37.4
		50+	327	59.6	62.6	100.0
		Total	522	95.1	100.0	
	Missing	System	27	4.9		
	Total		549	100.0		
Ethnicity:	Valid	Other	16	2.9	3.1	3.1
		African American	27	4.9	5.2	8.3
		Asian	8	1.5	1.5	9.8
		Latino	91	16.6	17.5	27.3
		White	379	69.0	72.7	100.0
		Total	521	94.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	28	5.1		
	Total		549	100.0		
Highest degree earned:	Valid	Bachelors	27	4.9	5.2	5.2
		Masters	57	10.4	10.9	16.0
		Masters+30	372	67.8	71.0	87.0
		Doctorate	68	12.4	13.0	100.0
		Total	524	95.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	25	4.6		
	Total		549	100.0		

Table 3: (*continued*).

School level:	Valid	Other	62	11.3	11.9	11.9
		Elementary	321	58.5	61.5	73.4
		Middle	66	12.0	12.6	86.0
		High	73	13.3	14.0	100.0
		Total	522	95.1	100.0	
	Missing	System	27	4.9		
	Total		549	100.0		
Number of years as an educator (including current school year):	Valid	1-3	1	0.2	0.2	0.2
		4-7	5	0.9	1.0	1.1
		8-15	97	17.7	18.6	19.7
		16-23	149	27.1	28.5	48.3
		24-30	120	21.9	23.0	71.3
		31+	150	27.3	28.7	100.0
		Total	522	95.1	100.0	
	Missing	System	27	4.9		
	Total		549	100.0		
Number of years as an educator in current school district (including current school year):	Valid	1-3	46	8.4	8.9	8.9
		4-7	116	21.1	22.4	31.3
		8-15	132	24.0	25.5	56.8
		16-23	114	20.8	22.0	78.8
		24-30	56	10.2	10.8	89.6
		31+	54	9.8	10.4	100.0
		Total	518	94.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	31	5.6		
	Total		549	100.0		
Number of years as a principal (including current school year):	Valid	1-2	32	5.8	6.1	6.1
		3-5	158	28.8	30.3	36.5
		6-10	165	30.1	31.7	68.1
		11+	166	30.2	31.9	100.0
		Total	521	94.9	100.0	
	Missing	System	28	5.0		
	Total		549	100.0		
Number of years as a principal in current school (including current school year):	Valid	1	31	5.6	6.0	6.0
		2	53	9.7	10.3	16.4
		3-5	243	44.3	47.4	63.7
		6-10	136	24.8	26.5	90.3
		11+	50	9.1	9.7	100.0
		Total	513	93.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	36	6.6		
	Total		549	100.0		

Table 3: (*continued*).

School enrollment:	Valid	0-499	174	31.7	33.8	33.8
		500-999	261	47.5	50.7	84.5
		1000-1999	60	10.9	11.7	96.1
		2000-2999	16	2.9	3.1	99.2
		3000+	4	0.7	0.8	100.0
		Total	515	93.8	100.0	
	Missing	System	34	6.2		
	Total		549	100.0		
District enrollment:	Valid	0-249	8	1.5	1.5	1.5
		250-899	26	4.7	5.0	6.6
		900-2499	48	8.7	9.3	15.9
		2500-4999	80	14.6	15.5	31.3
		5000+	355	64.7	68.7	100.0
		Total	517	94.2	100.0	
	Missing	System	32	5.8		
	Total		549	100.0		
Percentage of students on free and reduced lunch:	Valid	0-9%	8	1.5	1.6	1.6
		10-19%	16	2.9	3.1	4.7
		20-39%	52	9.5	10.1	14.8
		40-59%	116	21.1	22.6	37.4
		60%+	321	58.5	62.9	100.0
		Total	513	93.4	100.0	
	Missing	System	36	6.6		
	Total		549	100.0		
Percentage of English learners:	Valid	0-9%	56	10.2	10.9	10.9
		10-19%	60	10.9	11.7	22.7
		20-39%	159	29.0	31.1	53.7
		40-59%	108	19.7	21.1	74.8
		60%+	129	23.5	25.2	100.0
		Total	512	93.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	37	6.7		
	Total		549	100.0		
Percentage of students receiving Special Education services:	Valid	0-4%	60	10.9	11.7	11.7
		5-9%	215	39.2	42.1	53.8
		10-14%	180	32.8	35.2	89.0
		15-19%	39	7.1	7.6	96.7
		20%+	17	3.1	3.3	100.0
		Total	511	93.1	100.0	
	Missing	System	38	6.9		
	Total		549	100.0		

Table 3: (*continued*).

PI status:	Valid	Not in PI	275	50.1	54.5	54.5
		In PI	180	32.8	35.6	90.1
		Exited PI	50	9.1	9.9	100.0
		Total	505	92.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	44	8.0		
	Total		549	100.0		
Current year in PI:	Valid	Year 1 PI	54	9.8	30.2	30.2
		Year 2 PI	33	6.0	18.4	48.6
		Year 3 PI	34	6.2	19.0	67.6
		Year 4 PI	28	5.1	15.6	83.2
		Year 5+ PI	30	5.6	16.9	100.0
		Total	179	32.6	100.0	
	Missing	System	370	67.4		
	Total		549	100.0		
Year entered PI:	Valid	2002-2003	48	8.7	27.7	27.7
		2003-2004	33	6.0	19.1	46.8
		2004-2005	18	3.3	10.4	57.2
		2005-2006	25	4.6	14.5	71.7
		2006-2007	49	8.9	28.3	100.0
		Total	173	31.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	376	68.5		
	Total		549	100.0		
Year exited PI:	Valid	2003-2004	10	1.8	20.8	20.8
		2004-2005	15	2.7	31.3	52.1
		2005-2006	12	2.2	25.0	77.1
		2006-2007	11	2.0	22.9	100.0
		Total	48	8.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	501	91.3		
	Total		549	100.0		

As noted in Table 3, males comprised 40% of the sample whereas males comprise 60% of the total population of PI principals. The ethnic breakdown of the sample was 73% White, 18% Latino, 5% African American, 2% Asian, and 3% other. In terms of school level, 62% were at the elementary level, 13% at the middle school level, and 14% at the high school level. Principals were generally quite experienced,

with 94% having at least three or more years of experience as principals, and 60% had at least six or more years of experience. Additionally, 77% of schools had 20% or more English learners which sets the California sample apart from other states. Of particular interest for this study was the distribution of PI status: 36% were in PI, 54% had never been in PI, and 10% had exited PI.

The MLQ 5X responses were subjected to a series of tests to assess the normality of the distribution of scores for both the perceived leadership behaviors and outcomes. Participant mean scores fell within the range of 3.0 and above for the transformational behaviors of (a) idealized influence, both attributed and behavior; (b) inspirational motivation; (c) intellectual stimulation; and (d) individualized consideration (see Table 4). The mean score of one transactional behavior, contingent reward, was above 3.0., whereas the mean score for management by exception, both active and passive, and laissez-faire behavior was 1.34 and below.

Table 4:

Descriptive Statistics for MLQ 5X Normative Sample of Principals in California, 2007

Behaviors	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	National (US) Percentile
Idealized Influence (Attributed)	458	3.23	.54	70th
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	475	3.51	.43	80th
Inspirational Motivation	476	3.50	.43	75th
Intellectual Stimulation	467	3.24	.48	70th
Individualized Consideration	468	3.19	.49	50th
Contingent Reward	462	3.12	.55	50th
Management-by-Exception (Active)	469	1.34	.78	50th
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	481	0.74	.54	30th
Laissez-Faire	466	0.45	.40	45th

Key of Frequency:
4.0 = Frequently, if not always
3.0 = Fairly often
2.0 = Sometimes
1.0 = Once in a while
0.0 = Not at all

Interestingly, 4 of the 5 transformational behaviors scored at or above the 70th percentile, suggesting that California public school principals perceive their leadership behaviors as more transformational compared to the perceptions other leaders in the United States.

The mean scores for all 3 perceived outcomes of success were in the range of 3.0, which suggests that principals generally perceive themselves as successful in motivating others to put forth extra effort, effective in meeting desired outcomes, and satisfied with their leadership behaviors *fairly often.* Table 5 provides the means scores of the outcomes measured by the MLQ 5X along with the percentile for individual outcomes compared to national self-rating scores within the United States.

Table 5:

Outcome Scores for the MLQ 5X Normative Sample of Principals in California, 2007

Outcomes	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	National Percentile
Extra Effort	474	3.23	.57	80th
Effectiveness	463	3.35	.49	55th
Satisfaction	473	3.42	.52	70th
Key of Frequency:	4.0 = Frequently, if not always 3.0 = Fairly often 2.0 = Sometimes 1.0 = Once in a while 0.0 = Not at all			

As shown in Table 5, the highest mean score of 3.42 suggests that as a group, California Title I public school principals are generally satisfied with their leadership behaviors. Additionally, based on the national mean percentiles for self-ratings within the United States (Avolio & Bass, 2004), the data suggest that as a group, California

Title I public school principals' perceptions of their leadership behaviors are well above the 70th percentile in all three categories. Hence, when compared to all other leaders within other contextual settings, California school principals generally perceive their behaviors as effective at increasing effort among their followers and in obtaining their desired outcomes, and they are satisfied with their methods.

Data Suggest Difference With PI Status

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to explore the influence of PI status on perceived leadership behaviors and outcomes as measured by the MLQ 5X. The subjects were divided into 3 groups according to their PI status: (a) non-PI principal (had never been a PI principal), (b) PI principal, and (c) exited principal. A statistically significant difference was found at the $p <. 05$ level in the effectiveness outcome scores among the 3 groups ($F[2, 458] = 4.0$, $p = .018$; see Table 6).

Table 6:

MLQ Comparison of Mean Scores between PI Status of Principals in California, 2007

MLQ Components		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Idealized Influence (Attributed)	Between Groups	.893	2	.446	1.571	.209
	Within Groups	128.689	453	.284		
	Total	129.582	455			
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	Between Groups	.20	2	.010	.054	.947
	Within Groups	85.986	470	.183		
	Total	86.006	472			
Inspirational Motivation	Between Groups	.266	2	.133	.706	.494
	Within Groups	88.859	471	.189		
	Total	89.125	473			
Intellectual Stimulation	Between Groups	.194	2	.097	.425	.654
	Within Groups	105.727	462	.229		
	Total	105.921	464			

Table 6: (*continued)*

MLQ Components		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Individualized Consideration	Between Groups	.893	2	.447	1.842	.160
	Within Groups	112.239	463	.242		
	Total	113.133	465			
Contingent Reward	Between Groups	.813	2	.406	1.323	.267
	Within Groups	140.361	457	.307		
	Total	141.174	459			
Management-by-Exception (Active)	Between Groups	.862	2	.431	.704	.495
	Within Groups	284.320	464	.613		
	Total	285.182	466			
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	Between Groups	1.114	2	.557	1.891	.152
	Within Groups	140.242	476	.295		
	Total	141.356	478			
Laissez-Faire	Between Groups	.086	2	.043	.263	.768
	Within Groups	75.035	461	.163		
	Total	75.121	463			
Extra Effort	Between Groups	.976	2	.488	1.517	.220
	Within Groups	150.879	469	.322		
	Total	151.855	471			
Effectiveness	Between Groups	1.937	2	.968	4.049	.018*
	Within Groups	109.559	458	.239		
	Total	111.496	460			
SAT	Between Groups	1.225	2	.613	2.269	.105
	Within Groups	126.378	468	.270		
	Total	127.603	470			

* Statistically significant at p<.05

Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores was quite small. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .02. Posthoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for non-PI principals (M = 3.39, SD = .48) was statistically significant compared to that for PI principals (M = 3.26, SD = .53). Table 7 displays the multiple comparisons of all PI

status groups. There was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of PI principals and exited principals and between non-PI principals and exited principals, which supports the hypotheses for this study.

Table 7:

Multiple Comparisons for MLQ Effectiveness Scores by PI Status for California Principals, 2007

PI Status		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Never in PI	In PI	.12846*	.04931	.026
	Exited PI	-.03620	.07769	.887
In PI	Never in PI	-.12846*	.04931	.026
	Exited PI	-.16466	.08109	.106
Exited PI	Never in PI	.03620	.07769	.887
	In PI	.16466	.08109	.106

* The mean difference is significant at p< .05

As shown in Table 7, there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of PI principals and exited principals and between non-PI principals and exited principals. These results suggest that non-PI principals tend to perceive their leadership behaviors as more effective than do PI principals.

However, although the mean of the exited principals (M = 3.43, SD = .41) did not differ significantly from those of the non-PI or PI principals, when the mean scores of all 3 groups are compared, there appears to be a hierarchy. Table 8 lists the mean scores for each PI group.

Table 8:

Descriptive Statistics for MLQ Effectiveness Scores for PI Status for California Principals, 2007

PI Status	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Never in PI	253	3.39	.48
In PI	161	3.26	.53
Exited PI	47	3.43	.41

Key of Frequency:
4.0 = Frequently, if not always
3.0 = Fairly often
2.0 = Sometimes
1.0 = Once in a while
0.0 = Not at all

As demonstrated in Table 8, when the mean scores of all 3 groups are compared, directionality can be seen among them. For example, the exited group has the highest mean score (M = 3.43), followed by the non-PI group (M = 3.39) and the PI group (M = 3.26). Although not statistically significant, these results suggest that exited principals have a greater tendency to perceive their leadership behaviors as more effective than do either PI or non-PI principals.

No other statistically significant differences were found in the mean scores of any of the other leadership behaviors and outcomes as measured by the MLQ 5X (see Appendix I for the multiple comparisons of all measured components). Because there were no statistically significant differences in any of the leadership behaviors, two of the study's propositions were proven: (a) PI principals display more transactional behaviors as measured by the MLQ 5X than do non-PI principals and exited principals and (b) exited principals display more transformational behaviors as measured by the MLQ 5X than do PI principals and non-PI principals.

Although there no other statistically significant differences were found in the mean scores of any of the other leadership and outcomes as measured by the MLQ 5X (Avolio & Bass, 2004), some noticeable patterns were found among the mean scores of all of the attributes measured. Table 9 lists the behaviors and outcomes along with the mean scores for each PI status group.

Table 9:

Descriptive Statistics for MLQ Behaviors and Outcomes by PI Status for California Principals, 2007

Behaviors and Outcomes	in PI Mean	Never in PI Mean	Exited PI Mean
Idealized Influence (Attributed)	3.18	3.27	3.18
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	3.52	3.51	3.53
Inspirational Motivation	3.47	3.51	3.54
Intellectual Stimulation	3.22	3.26	3.24
Individualized Consideration	3.13	3.21	3.26
Contingent Reward	3.12	3.10	3.24
Management-by-Exception (Active)	1.40	1.30	1.34
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	.67	.78	.74
Laissez-Faire	.45	.46	.41
Extra Effort	3.18	3.23	3.34
Effectiveness	3.26	3.39	3.43
Satisfaction	3.35	3.46	3.40

Key of Frequency:
4.0 = Frequently, if not always
3.0 = Fairly often
2.0 = Sometimes
1.0 = Once in a while
0.0 = Not at all

Among the interesting patterns revealed in Table 9 is that the exited and non-PI groups had the highest mean scores in all the transformational behaviors. Additionally, whereas the exited group had the highest mean score in 3 of the 5 transformational behaviors, the PI group had the lowest mean score for 2 transactional behaviors. This finding, although not statistically significant, suggests directionality in that exited

principals may tend to engage in more transformational behaviors than do PI principals. This proposition, supported by the qualitative results, will be discussed further in the qualitative section of this chapter.

Another interesting and somewhat surprising pattern is revealed by comparing the means for contingent reward. In this instance, the exited group had the highest mean score. This finding, although not statistically significant, suggests that exited principals may have a higher tendency to engage in the transactional behavior of contingent reward than do PI or non-PI principals. This finding further foreshadowed the findings from analysis of the qualitative data. However interesting these findings may be, strong caution must be used in making any definitive conclusions based upon them because the differences in mean scores were not within a statistically significant range.

Data Reveals Differences in Principal Experience

To explore the effect of differences of years of principal experience on leadership traits and outcomes as measured by the MLQ 5X, another one-way ANOVA was conducted. The subjects were divided into the following 4 groups according to total years of principal experience: (a) 1 to 2 years, (b) 3 to 5 years, (c) 6 to 10 years, and (d) 11 years or more (see Table 10). A statistically significant difference was found between the means for all 4 groups for idealized influence (behavior), contingent reward, and effectiveness.

Table 10:

MLQ Comparison of Mean Scores between Years of Principal Experience

MLQ Components		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Idealized Influence (Attributed)	Between Groups	1.813	3	.604	2.150	.093
	Within Groups	127.081	452	.281		
	Total	128.895	455			
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	Between Groups	1.486	3	.495	2.757	.042*
	Within Groups	84.254	469	.180		
	Total	85.740	472			
Inspirational Motivation	Between Groups	1.005	3	.335	1.791	.148
	Within Groups	87.870	470	.187		
	Total	88.874	473			
Intellectual Stimulation	Between Groups	1.761	3	.587	2.592	.052
	Within Groups	104.415	461	.226		
	Total	106.177	464			
Individualized Consideration	Between Groups	.672	3	.224	.917	.432
	Within Groups	112.774	462	.244		
	Total	113.445	465			
Contingent Reward	Between Groups	3.968	3	1.323	4.387	.005*
	Within Groups	137.465	456	.301		
	Total	141.433	459			
Management-by-Exception (Active)	Between Groups	2.567	3	.856	1.402	.241
	Within Groups	282.507	463	.610		
	Total	285.073	466			
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	Between Groups	.856	3	.285	.964	.409
	Within Groups	140.513	475	.296		
	Total	141.368	478			
Laissez-Faire	Between Groups	.355	3	.118	.728	.536
	Within Groups	74.766	460	.163		
	Total	75.121	463			
Extra Effort	Between Groups	1.938	3	.646	2.017	.111
	Within Groups	149.916	468	.320		
	Total	151.855	471			
Effectiveness	Between Groups	2.712	3	.904	3.787	.011*
	Within Groups	109.086	457	.239		
	Total	111.797	460			
Satisfaction	Between Groups	2.056	3	.685	2.543	.056
	Within Groups	125.878	467	.270		
	Total	127.934	470			

* Statistically significant at p<.05

A significant difference was discovered at the $p <. 05$ level among the 4 principal experience groups in 3 components: (a) idealized influence (behavior; F[3, 469] = 2.757, p = .042); (b) contingent reward (F[3, 456] = 4.387, p = .005); and (c) effectiveness (F[3, 457] = 3.787, p = .011]. Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was small. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .03.

Using posthoc comparisons that compared the means of the 4 groups, a statistically significant difference was found between the following experience groups: (a) 3 to 5 and 6 to 10 years of experience in idealized influence (behavior), (b) 1 to 2 and 6 to 10 years in contingent reward, (c) 1 to 2 and 11 or more years in contingent reward, and (d) 3 to 5 and 6 to 10 years in effectiveness. Table 11 lists the multiple comparisons using the Tukey HSD test. The mean differences significant at the .05 level are notated by an asterisk.

Table 11:

Posthoc Comparisons (Tukey HSD) of Principal Experience

Dependent Variable	F	df	Sig.	Significant post-hocs*
Idealized Influence (Attributed)	2.150	3	.093	
Idealized Influence (Behavior)	2.757	3	.042*	3-5 yrs/6-10 yrs
Inspirational Motivation	1.791	3	.148	
Intellectual Stimulation	2.592	3	.052	
Individualized Consideration	.917	3	.432	
Contingent Reward	4.387	3	.005*	1-2 yrs/6-10 yrs
				1-2 yrs/11+ yrs
Management-by-Exception (Active)	1.402	3	.241	
Management-by-Exception (Passive)	.964	3	.409	
Laissez-Faire	.728	3	.536	
Extra Effort	2.017	3	.111	
Effectiveness	3.787	3	.011*	3-5yrs/6-10 yrs
Satisfaction	2.543	3	.056	

*Statistically significant at p<.05

As seen in Table 11, the first posthoc comparison using the Tukey HSD indicated a significant difference in the transformational behavior of idealized influence (behavior) between principals with 3 to 5 years of principal experience (M = 3.45, SD = .41) and principals with 6 to 10 years of principal experience (M = 3.59, SD = .43). This finding suggests that principals with 6 to 10 years of principal experience have a greater tendency to perceive themselves as engaging in behaviors categorized as idealized influence (behavior) behaviors. Idealized influential leaders share their most important values and beliefs and emphasize the importance of having a strong sense of purpose and collective mission. This finding suggests that as principals gain experience, they learn the value of sharing their beliefs and values and the importance of having a sense of purpose and mission.

Another significant difference was found in the transactional component of contingent reward between principals with 1 to 2 years of principal experience (M = 2 .86, SD = .76) and principals with 6 to 10 years of principal experience (M = 3.20, SD =. 51). Additionally, a significant difference was found between principals with 1 to 2 years of principal experience (M = 2.86, SD = .76) and principals with 11 or more years of principal experience (M = 3.17, SD = .54). This finding suggests that principals with more than 6 years of principal experience have a greater tendency to engage in transactional behaviors categorized as contingent reward behaviors than do principals with 2 years or less of principal experience. Principals who engage in contingent reward behavior tend to offer rewards and incentives for meeting expectations. This finding suggests that similar to how principals recognize the value

of idealized influence with more years of experience, they recognize the value of providing extrinsic motivation.

The third and final significant difference was found in the outcome component of effectiveness between principals with 3 to 5 years of experience (M = 3.26, SD = .50) and principals with 6 to 10 years of experience (M = 3.43, SD = .48). Again, the data suggest directionality, as principals with more experience scored higher. The effectiveness score indicates how well principals perceive themselves as effectively meeting the demands of the job. This finding suggests that principals with 6 to 10 years of experience tend to have a greater perception of being more effective than do principals with 3 to 5 years of experience.

Summary of Quantitative Results

Although the response rate for the leadership questionnaire was 22.6%, below the target of 50%, the data collected were reflective of the target population of California Title I public school principals. When the MLQ data were analyzed using a confirmatory factor analysis, a 12-component structure emerged. Because the item analysis from the factor analysis was not consistent with the findings of previous validation studies (Antonakis et al., 2003; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass, 1997), this researcher decided to accept the findings from the previous validation studies and utilized the original structure of the instrument.

Descriptive analysis revealed that the principals surveyed tended to perceive themselves as practicing more transformational than transactional leadership behaviors. A one-way ANOVA revealed that non-PI principals had a greater tendency to perceive their behaviors as more effective than did PI principals. Principals with

more than 6 years of experience were found to have a greater tendency to engage in idealized influence and contingent reward behaviors than were principals with fewer years of experience. Additionally, principals with 6 to 10 years of experience had a greater perception of being more effective than did principals with only 3 to 5 years of experience.

Qualitative Data Results and Analysis

The qualitative portion of this study was designed to answer the following two research questions: (a) Are there differences in the leadership behaviors of PI principals and non-PI principals? and (b) What types of reform efforts do PI principals engage in? To answer these questions, PI principals and exited principals were asked to respond to the following two prompts: (a) Please describe the most significant change initiative your school has implemented that you believe made or will make a difference in getting your school out of PI and (b) What have been your actions that have had the most impact in successfully facilitating these changes? In addition to the two prompts, 4 principals who had exited PI during the 2006-2007 school year were interviewed to gain a better understanding of the behaviors the leaders utilized to exit PI.

Open-Ended Data Results

Of the 549 participants who completed the survey, 83% of the combined target group of PI and exited principals responded to the two open-ended prompts. The response rate for this subsample far exceeded the acceptable response rate of 50% (Babbie, 2001). Table 12 compares the participation rate of the principals to open-

ended prompts with the participation rate of the principals to the entire survey sample and the percentage of the total population.

Table 12:

Comparison of Survey Respondents to Open-Ended Questions to Population

PI status	*n*	Percentage of *N*	Percentage of population
Total	190	83%	
Exited	42	8%	7%
In PI	148	27%	37%

N = Number in total survey sample
n = Number in subsample

As demonstrated in Table 12, the exited group comprised 8% of the total survey participants, comparable to 7% of the total population. The PI group comprised 27% of the total survey participants, comparable to 37% of the total population. Although the percentage of the PI group participating was slightly smaller than its percentage of the total population, this researcher determined the range difference to be acceptable.

Transformational vs. Transactional

The open-ended responses were analyzed using a constant comparative analysis method that checked and compared the emerging themes (Merriam, 1998). After carefully analyzing and coding the survey data, two major themes were found to have emerged. Based on the responses to the two open-ended prompts, the researcher discovered that the responses could be categorized into *initiatives* and *actions*. Further analysis revealed that each initiative or action could be further categorized as either *transformational* or *transactional.* Initiatives categorized as transactional included

budgeting money to purchase instructional materials, providing training for all teachers, providing computer programs and onsite counseling for all students, hiring additional intervention teachers, providing double periods of math for all students, and paying teachers to attend staff development. Initiatives classified as transformational included scheduling weekly meetings to share best practices, establishing grade-level leadership teams to share in major academic decisions, building capacity for teachers to become instructional leaders and coaches, providing structured intervention systems to assist students in need, and using data to track students and inform instruction. Transactional actions included being a cheerleader, using disciplinary actions and formal observations, creating a positive environment, seeking funding sources, providing time, monitoring lesson plans, and implementing all corrective actions. Transformational actions included being enthusiastic about change, targeting students for interventions, working collaboratively, sharing in the decisions, helping teachers understand the reason for change, empowering teachers, and building upon success.

The analysis revealed that participants engaged in 394 initiatives and 329 actions that they perceived as having assisted their initiatives. These findings suggest that PI principals were more likely to display more transactional leadership behaviors than were exited principals and that exited principals had engaged in more transformational behaviors than had PI principals. Table 13 illustrates these differences between transactional initiatives and transformational initiatives and between transactional actions and transformational actions by PI status.

Table 13:

Comparison of Initiatives and Actions by PI Status

PI status	TA initiatives	TF initiatives	TA actions	TF actions
Exited	14%	86%	16%	80%
In PI	27%	79%	33%	66%

Legend: TA = Transactional
TF = Transformational

PI principals had engaged in twice as many transactional initiatives and actions than had exited principals (27% vs. 14% and 33% vs. 16%, respectively). These data support the first proposition: PI principals had exhibited more transactional behaviors than had exited principals. Moreover, exited principals had engaged in more transformational initiatives and actions than had PI principals (86% vs. 79% and 80% vs. 66%, respectively). Furthermore, although both groups had a weak tendency to engage in transactional behaviors, the data support the second proposition that exited principals would exhibit more transformational behaviors than would PI principals.

The PI status data were further disaggregated by year in PI to determine if there was a difference in the types of initiatives and actions by length of time in PI. The analysis revealed that the principals had performed twice as many transformational as transactional initiatives and actions (see Table 14).

Table 14:

Comparison of Initiatives and Actions of California Principals by Year in PI

PI status	TA initiatives	TF initiatives	TA actions	TF actions
PI, year 1	24%	85%	33%	62%
PI, year 2	31%	73%	23%	33%
PI, year 3	27%	75%	32%	73%
PI, year 4	30%	81%	33%	70%
PI, year 5+	30%	76%	47%	50%

Legend: TA = Transactional
TF = Transformational

As can be seen in Table 14, each group followed the same trend, engaging in twice as many transformational as transactional behaviors, with the exception of the PI, year 5 plus group, which engaged in roughly an equal percentage of transactional and transformational actions (47% and 50%, respectively). These data suggest that principals who had reached at least year 5 or more of PI status had engaged in roughly the same number of transactional actions and transformational actions. Interestingly, the PI, year two group showed a similar trend. Although this group engaged in more transformational (33%) than transactional (23%) actions, they engaged in only 10% more transformational actions. This finding suggests that principals in their second year of PI and those in at least their fifth year have a tendency to engage equally in transactional actions and transformational actions, indicating that with greater experience in PI, principals develop a tendency to rely more heavily on transactional behaviors. This finding is similar to those of earlier studies that suggested that principals with more experience have a greater tendency to engage in the transactional behavior of contingent reward.

Data Reveal Focus of Change

Further analysis of the data led to the emergence of several themes related to the focus of the initiatives reported. Because the responses from the open-ended prompts were divided into the categories of initiatives and actions, the data were coded separately for each category. The categories of the major themes were coded through the lens of Marzano et al.'s (2005) leadership responsibilities and the transformational and transactional leadership behaviors that appeared on the MLQ (Antonakis & House, 2002; Avolio & Bass, 2004; Bass, 1997). Constant comparative analysis (Merriam, 1998) resulted in the identification of two categorical properties, *extrinsic* and *intrinsic,* that broadly defined the focus of the aforementioned themes. The data revealed that PI principals engaged in 6 initiatives at a greater rate than did exited principals. Of the 6 initiatives, 5 were extrinsically focused and 1 internally focused (see Table 15). Consequently, exited principals had engaged in 10 initiatives, 5 extrinsically focused and 5 intrinsically focused, at a greater rate than did PI principals.

Table 15:

Comparison of Focus of Leadership Initiatives by Principals in PI and Exited PI

Initiative	Focus	Exited	In PI
*Involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment	Extrinsic	48%	80%
*Intellectual stimulation	Intrinsic	48%	58%
*Individual consideration	Intrinsic	45%	33%
Collaboration	Intrinsic	36%	30%
*Focus on interventions	Extrinsic	29%	42%
Focus on using data	Extrinsic	26%	22%
Professional development	Extrinsic	21%	28%
*Ideals and beliefs	Intrinsic	19%	4%

Table 15: *(continued)*

Initiative	Focus	Exited	In PI
*Monitoring/evaluating	Extrinsic	17%	7%
Focus on a subgroup	Extrinsic	17%	11%
Consistency	Extrinsic	14%	6%
Order	Extrinsic	14%	13%
Focus	Extrinsic	12%	17%
Culture	Intrinsic	10%	4%
Input	Extrinsic	10%	8%
*Resources	Extrinsic	10%	22%

* Notable difference of more than 10 percentage points between groups

When the percentages of those notable instances where there was a difference of 10 percentage points or more between the groups were compared, the results suggested directionality towards intrinsic inclinations; the exited principals had engaged in 3 initiatives, 2 intrinsically focused and 1 extrinsically focused, at a higher rate than had the PI principals. The following quotes describe the focus of initiatives engaged in by the exited principals:

> The implementation of regular academic conferences with release time for grade levels to discuss each student—ability, performance, special needs—and then plan interventions/extensions as a grade-level team has been instrumental in changing how we view meeting the needs of all students.
>
> This school got out of PI because we had a new vision—no hay probecitos [no poor babies] in this school.
>
> We are a professional learning community that uses the cycle of inquiry to regularly track student progress and collaboratively work to provide students with the strongest program possible.

These quotes reveal the focus of initiatives that the exited principals perceived as having contributed towards their success. These initiatives were characterized as intrinsically focused because they required teachers to change their internal belief

systems, which is tantamount to engaging in second-order change (Marzano et al., 2005). These findings suggest that exited principals had engaged in more second-order change initiatives than had PI principals. Furthermore, this finding supports the second proposition that exited principals would display more transformational than transactional behaviors, and thus be engaged in more second-order than first-order change.

Conversely, the PI principals had engaged in 4 initiatives, 3 extrinsically focused and 1 intrinsically focused, at a higher rate than had the exited principals. The PI principals had primarily focused on (a) involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment; (b) intellectual stimulation; (c) interventions; and (d) resources. These data suggest that PI principals primarily seek initiatives that will change the external environment by focusing on the external operations of the school. The following quotes illustrate this focus:

> We are currently realigning our reading program and using it as it was intended.
>
> Using pacing guides and common assessments.
>
> Collaboration meetings, assessments, and trying to have results drive instruction.
>
> Training teachers on content standards.
>
> Increased intervention positions—credentialed teachers.
>
> We work with district and county personnel to bring in outside resources.

These quotes suggest that PI principals are primarily extrinsically focused, leading them to practice more transactional behaviors than do exited principals, and thus supporting the second proposition.

Data Reveal Focus of Action (Behavior)

As in the analysis of initiatives, when the data for the focus of leadership actions were subjected to constant comparative analysis (Merriam, 1998), the two broad categories of transformational and transactional actions emerged. Twenty major actions were identified, 13 of which were categorized as transformational and 7 as transactional. Table 16 lists the 20 major actions, their category, and the corresponding percentage of occurrence for each action.

Table 16:

Comparison of Focus of Leadership Actions by Principals in PI and Exited PI

Behavior		Exited	In PI
*Idealized influence attributed	Transformational	74%	35%
*Input	Transformational	40%	20%
Collaborative	Transformational	36%	32%
Intellectual stimulation	Transformational	26%	19%
*Management by exception (active)	Transactional	24%	6%
*Culture	Transformational	21%	4%
*Communication	Transformational	19%	8%
Individualized consideration	Transformational	19%	10%
Professional development	Transformational	19%	22%
Focus on using data	Transformational	14%	10%
Idealized influence behavior	Transformational	14%	10%
Inspirational motivation	Transformational	14%	7%
Monitoring and evaluation	Transactional	14%	9%
Affirmation	Transactional	12%	9%
Focus	Transactional	12%	19%
*Resources	Transactional	12%	28%
School governance	Transformational	12%	5%

Table 16: *(continued)*

Behavior		Exited	In PI
Visibility	Transactional	12%	9%
Consistency	Transactional	10%	2%
Ideals and beliefs	Transformational	10%	8%

* Notable difference of more than 10 percentage points between groups.

As can be seen in Table 16, the exited principals had engaged in 17 actions, 12 transformational and 5 transactional, at a higher rate than had the PI principals. Conversely, the PI principals had engaged in 3 actions, 1 transformational and 2 transactional, at a higher rate than had the exited principals. When the notable differences between both groups were compared, only 6 actions, 5 transformational and 1 transactional, varied by more than 10% between the groups. The exited principals had engaged in 5 actions, 4 transformational and 1 transactional, at a higher rate than had the PI principals. The leadership actions most notable for the exited principals were those that focused on (a) idealized influence (attributed), (b) gathering input from stakeholders, (c) management by exception (active), (d) changing the culture, and (e) communication. These findings suggest that exited principals had engaged in far more transformational behaviors than PI principals. When examined in tandem with earlier findings that suggested that exited principals are more focused on second-order change, these findings suggest that transformational behaviors are supportive of second-order change.

In contrast, PI principals had engaged in 3 actions, 1 transformational and 2 transactional, at a higher rate than had the exited principals. An interesting though not surprising finding was the most notable leadership action displayed by the PI

principals: 28% percent of the PI principals perceived providing resources as a significant action that resulted in success, an action identical to the focus of initiative of the PI principals. This finding suggests that in PI principals, although extrinsically focused, have a greater tendency to engage in transactional behaviors than do exited principals

Summary of Open-Ended Results

Survey participants who were PI principals or exited PI were invited to answer two open-ended prompts. Of the 549 survey participants, 83% that met the criteria answered the questions. Analysis of the data revealed that although both groups had engaged in both transactional and transformational leadership initiatives and actions, the PI principals had engaged in more transactional initiatives and actions than had the exited principals. Conversely, the exited principals had engaged in more transformational behaviors than had the PI principals. Furthermore, analysis of the data revealed that the initiatives of the PI principals were more extrinsically focused whereas the initiatives of the exited principals were more intrinsically focused. The actions in which the exited principals engaged were more transformational than were those in which the PI principals engaged, as the PI principals had a greater tendency to engage in transactional actions than had the exited principals.

Interview Results and Analysis

Four principals, 3 elementary school principals and 1 junior high school principal, identified as having exited from PI during the 2005-2006 school year were asked to participate in an interview. One principal had exited from PI during year 1, 1 during year 2, and 2 during year 4. The 4 participants were asked a series of questions

that focused on the leadership behaviors that they perceived were significant to school success. All of the interviews were conducted at the school sites and asked the same set of questions (see Appendix F).

As part of obtaining their consent for the interviews, the principals were assured anonymity; therefore, they were referred to with unidentifiable initials and their school names were replaced with pseudonyms. The interviews were recorded, transcribed, and coded by the researcher using a constant comparative analysis of emerging themes (Merriam, 1998). As the common themes emerged, it became apparent to the researcher that many of the themes were related to Marzano et al.'s (2005) 21 leadership responsibilities as well as the transformational and transactional leadership behaviors measured by the MLQ 5X (Antonakis & House, 2002; Avolio & Bass, 2004).

Summary of the Interviews

Four principals who had exited PI during the 2006-2007 school year were interviewed. The first participant, an elementary school principals whose school had exited during year one of PI (see Appendix I), focused primarily on inspirational leadership behaviors in order to get her staff to look beyond themselves towards the greater good. She was extremely focused on establishing positive relationships with her staff and developing a cohesive working environment. The second interview participant, a junior high school principal whose school had exited during year 2 (see Appendix J), focused primarily on challenging existing assumptions regarding what students were capable of learning by aligning the curriculum to standards and increasing the rigor of instruction. The third interview participant, an elementary

school principal whose school had exited during year 4 (see Appendix K), primarily focused on creating a collaborative school environment committed to developing and implementing the school plan through a shared governance model. His staff was focused on meeting the needs of their students by working together to deliver the curriculum necessary for the students to become successful. The fourth and final participant, an elementary school principal whose school had exited during year 4 (see Appendix L), focused primarily on the consistent and faithful implementation of instructional programs, regardless of the manner of doing so. Her vision of creating consistency ensured that the students in her school were receiving the instruction that they needed to become successful.

Data Reveal Common Themes

Each of the 4 interview participants engaged in various initiatives and actions that contributed to their ability to exit PI. Analysis of the transcripts revealed several common themes. The first common initiative that all of the participants implemented was the alignment of curriculum to state standards. Secondly, all of the participants focused on parental involvement. Thirdly, all were highly visible in the classrooms. These common initiatives suggest that the participants had engaged in second-order change, such as increasing the rigor of the curriculum taught by aligning it to state standards. This type of change required the teachers to reevaluate their underlying assumptions regarding their expectations of students. According to the interviewees, this paradigm shift resulted in anxiety and discomfort for the teachers. As one principal shared in an interview:

> Many principals believe they have a culture of learning . . . however, when you look at the courses they are offering, it is remedial reading and remedial math. That is not a culture of learning; that is a culture of remediation.

In addition to common initiatives, several common actions were used to support the change initiatives. These common actions were providing (a) honest feedback, (b) collaboration, (c) ongoing affirmation, (d) communication, (e) focus, (f) ongoing monitoring and evaluation of programs, and (g) visibility. These findings suggest that the change initiatives were primarily supported by transformational behaviors, which further supports the proposition that principals involved in second-order change engage in more transformational behaviors.

Conclusion of Results

The purpose of this study was to identify the common leadership behaviors and change practices of successful principals within the context of PI. Using a mixed qualitative and quantitative methodology, this study produced a large data set from which to answer the research questions that guided this study. The first research question asked, "What similarities and differences exist in the leadership behaviors of PI principals? The MLQ 5X revealed that California Title I public school principals, regardless of PI status, had a tendency to engage in transformational behaviors as well as the one transactional behavior of contingent reward. Compared to the national percentiles within the United States, the sample participants scored at or above the 70^{th} percentile in transformational behaviors. These data suggest that California principals have a greater tendency to engage in transformational behaviors than do other leaders in the United States. The quantitative data revealed that principals who had never been

in PI tended to perceive their leadership behaviors as more effective than did principals in PI.

Additionally, statistically significant differences were found among principals with varying years of principal experience. Principals who had between 6 and 10 years and 11 or more years of experience had a greater tendency to utilize the transactional behavior of contingent reward and were more satisfied with their leadership behaviors than were principals with only 2 years of experience. Although not statistically significant, the quantitative data did suggest that PI principals had a slightly lower tendency to engage in several transformational behaviors than did exited principals.

The qualitative data further supported what the nonstatistically significant quantitative data alluded to; exited principals engaged in far more transformational behaviors than did PI principals. Furthermore, although both groups engaged in transactional behaviors, PI principals had a greater tendency to engage in more transactional behaviors than did exited principals. When the PI principals were disaggregated according to the number of years that they had spent in PI, it was found that principals in year 2 and principals in year 5 plus engaged in roughly the same number of transactional and transformational actions. This finding was further supported by an interview with a principal who had exited during year 2; the interview data revealed that the principal had practiced more transactional behaviors than had the other principals.

The second research question that guided this study was asked, “In what types of reform efforts do PI principals engage?” The qualitative data revealed that PI principals overwhelmingly focused on extrinsic initiatives related to curriculum,

instruction, assessment, interventions, and resources. Conversely, exited principals overwhelmingly focused on intrinsic initiatives related to changing individual ideals and beliefs, monitoring and evaluating, and providing individual consideration. This finding was further supported by the interview data that revealed that exited principals had engaged in second-order change by primarily focusing on the alignment of the curriculum with state standards supported by both transactional and transformational behaviors that transformed the basic underlying assumptions of their teaching staff. This finding supports the original premise of this paper that transforming school culture is equivalent to changing the basic underlying assumptions. This premise, along with the other findings, are discussed further in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This chapter restates the research problem and reviews the major methods used in this study before summarizing the results and discussing their implications. Recommendations for future studies are then provided to the reader.

Statement of the Problem

California public schools are faced with the daunting task of ensuring that 100% of their students, including minority and economically disadvantaged students, meet the minimum proficiency results set forth by NCLB (McDonald, 2002b). Schools that fail to meet the minimum proficiency requirements face federal sanctions, which include designation as a PI school. Under PI, schools that continue to fall short of the minimum proficiency requirements incrementally progress through several stages of PI that ultimately can lead to the closure of the school.

As the number of schools that are designated PI schools increases, identifying leaders who can lead successfully within the context of PI becomes even more important. The purpose of this study was to identify the common leadership traits and behaviors of successful leaders, which may assist PI principals to make the necessary reform efforts needed under NCLB.

Review of the Methodology

The focus of this study was to identify the common leadership behaviors of successful principals by examining those principals who had successfully led their schools out of PI status. In order to examine these phenomena, a mixed methods approach that both quantitative and qualitative research methods was used. The following research questions were used to guide this study:

Research Question 1: As measured by the MLQ 5X, what similarities or differences exist in the leadership behaviors of PI principals?

Research Question 2: Are there differences in the leadership behaviors of PI principals and non-PI principals?

Research Question 3: In what types of reform efforts do PI principals engage?

The following hypotheses were proposed to guide investigation of the research questions:

Hypothesis 1: PI principals will display more transactional behaviors, as measured by the MLQ 5X, than will non-PI and exited principals.

Hypothesis 2: Exited principals will display more transformational behaviors, as measured by the MLQ 5X, than will PI and non-PI principals.

Based on the change and leadership literature, the following propositions were also addressed by the study:

Proposition 1: PI principals will exhibit more transactional behaviors than will exited principals.

Proposition 2: Exited principals will exhibit more transformational behaviors than will PI principals.

Proposition 3: Principals involved in first-order change will generally display more transactional leadership behaviors whereas principals involved in second-order change will generally display more transformational leadership behaviors.

To address the research questions, a convenience sample of 4,253 California Title I principals were asked to complete a survey questionnaire that was comprised of

2 subsurveys: a principal demographic survey (see Appendix C) and the MLQ form 5X, which identified perceived leadership behaviors and outcomes (see Appendix D). In addition to these 2 instruments, participants who were identified as either PI principals or exited principals were asked to respond to 2 open-ended prompts that asked them to describe the change initiatives and leadership behaviors they believe had or will have the most significant impact assisting their schools out of PI status. Furthermore, 4 participants who had recently exited PI during the 2006-2007 school year were interviewed using an interview protocol (see Appendix E). The interview questions focused on the initiatives and actions that they perceived to have had the most significant impact in assisting their schools out of PI status.

Summary of the Results

Of the 4,253 principals invited to participate, 22.6% responded. Although the response rate did not reach the intended target of 50%, the distribution of the participants was reflective of the target population of California Title I public school principals. As recommended by Antonakis et al (2003), the MLQ responses underwent a confirmatory factor analysis to determine the validity of the responses within the context of educational leadership. The results suggest that the instrument maintained its validation within this context. Descriptive analysis revealed that the participants as a group tended to perceive themselves as practicing more transformational than transactional leadership behaviors. A one-way ANOVA test further revealed that principals who had never been in PI tended to perceive their leadership behaviors as more effective than did PI principals. Although not statistically significant, comparison of the mean scores of PI principals, exited

principals, and principals who had never been in PI revealed that exited principals had greater perceptions of effectiveness than did PI principals.

Some interesting differences were found among principals with differing levels of principal experience. Principals with 6 to 10 years of principal experience had a greater tendency to perceive themselves as engaging in the transformational behavior of idealized influence behaviors than did principals with 3 to 5 years of principal experience. Additionally, principals with 6 to 10 years and 11 or more years of experience had a greater tendency to perceive themselves as engaging in more contingent reward behaviors than did principals with only 1 to 2 years of principal experience. Furthermore, principals with 6 to 10 years of experience perceived that their leadership behaviors were more effective in meeting the demands of the job than did principals with only 3 to 5 years of principal experience.

Analysis of the responses of the PI and exited principals to the open-ended questions revealed that the PI principals had engaged in almost twice as many transactional initiatives and actions than had the exited principals. Although both groups engaged in more transformational than transactional behaviors, exited principals had engaged in more transformational initiatives and actions than had PI principals. Further analysis revealed that exited principals had focused on intrinsically focused initiatives that were primarily focused on changing basic underlying assumptions regarding how staff view teaching and students view learning. Conversely, PI principals had focused on more extrinsically focused initiatives that primarily focused on changing the programs and curricular structures of their schools. Furthermore, when the leadership actions of both groups were compared, the data

suggest that exited principals had engaged in more transformational than transactional leadership behaviors.

The analysis of the responses of the 4 exited principals led to similar implications. Analysis of the interview transcript from the first principal, who had exited during year 1, revealed that she primarily engaged in inspirational motivation. She focused on encouraging her staff to look beyond themselves towards the greater goal of student achievement. The second principal, who had exited during year 2, primarily acted as a change agent (Marzano et al., 2005). She challenged every existing assumption of how students learned in order to increase the rigor of the curriculum, and even more importantly, the expectations of the teachers. The focus of the third principal, who had recently exited during year 4, was increasing shared governance and responsibility to increase student achievement. The focus of the fourth principal, who had also exited during year 4, was on consistent implementation of instructional practices. Her focus, which to her was irrelevant to her success, was to create a team that could work together without gaps in the instruction, in effect creating order out of chaos to ensure success for her students.

In conclusion, this study set out to identify the common leadership behaviors and change practices of successful principals within the context of PI. The results of this study indicate that, first and foremost, California Title I principals generally engage in more transformational than transactional behaviors. Secondly, PI principals tend to engage in more transactional behaviors than do exited principals. Third, exited principals engage in more transactional behaviors than do PI principals. Fourth, PI principals tend to focus on extrinsically focused change initiatives whereas exited

principals tend to focus on intrinsically focused change initiatives. Finally, exited principals had managed to transform the basic underlying assumptions of their teaching staff, and in effect transform the culture of their schools.

Discussion of the Results

Each of the following sections discusses and interprets each major finding according to the theme that emerged from its analysis. The literature that addresses each theme is also discussed to help explain the results and the theoretical implications that the findings may have on the field of educational leadership. Finally, the results are applied to make recommendations to practitioners and policymakers.

Public School Principals Generally Engage in Transformational Behaviors

This study identified certain common leadership behaviors that exist among the larger population of California Title I public school principals. Although principals generally engage in both transactional and transformational behaviors, they tend to engage in more transformational than transactional behaviors. Previous studies that evaluated different types of leadership behaviors within both educational settings (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005, 2006) as well as broader organizational settings (Dum dum et al., 2002) had similar findings. However, when compared to the national percentiles within the United States, the participants in this study scored at or above the 70th percentile in transformational behaviors. These data suggest that principals have a greater tendency to engage in transformational behaviors than do other leaders in the United States.

Bass (1997) proposed that although transactional and transformational leaders are needed and complement one another, transformational qualities tend to be elevated

during periods when personal commitment levels are elevated (Bass, 1997; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999b). It is apparent from the survey responses and interviews that personal commitment levels are elevated. This finding may be an indication of the enormous pressures that all California public school principals are feeling under NCLB and begs the question, If personal commitments are already elevated, are the punitive and corrective measures utilized within PI counterproductive as well as counterintuitive to what is already known about appropriate motivation? The answer to this question would have implications for policymakers regarding the implementation of PI. Further research on the impact of stress and punitive measures on the principal is needed.

Principals Never in PI Perceive Their Behaviors as Effective

Along with the identification of common leadership behaviors among principals in the context of PI, some significant differences were found. First, PI principals were found to engage in more transactional behaviors than exited principals. A statistically significant significance was found between PI principals and principals who had never been in PI (non-PI principals) in the outcome score for effectiveness. These data suggest that the perceived effectiveness of non-PI principals is significantly greater than that of PI principals. According to social cognitive theory, perceived self-efficacy is positively correlated with positive results (Bandura, 1993, 1997; Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000; Lent, Schmidt, & Schmidt, 2006). This finding may suggest that non-PI principals have greater efficacy than do PI principals.

The comparison of the mean scores of non-PI, PI, and exited principals supported this finding. Although the mean scores did not reach a statistically significant level, the mean effectiveness score of the PI principals was the lowest of all

3 mean scores. Furthermore, the exited mean effectiveness score was the highest of the 3 PI groups, suggesting a hierarchy among the 3 groups. This finding suggests that exited principals are more efficacious than are PI principals or non-PI principals. However, the statistical data do not empirically support this hypothesis and thus further research is needed in this area. The data do support that principals non-PI principals perceive their behaviors to be more effective than do PI principals.

PI Principals Have a Greater Tendency to Perform Transactional Behaviors

Analysis of the qualitative data revealed that PI principals had engaged in twice as many transactional behaviors as had exited principals. Furthermore, when PI principals were grouped by year in PI, it was found that every group had engaged in twice as many transformational as transactional behaviors with the exception of group year 2 and group year 5 plus. Analysis of the actions of these 2 groups of principals revealed that they had engaged in all almost equal proportion of transformational and transactional behaviors. These findings were confirmed by data obtained from 2 interview participants, 1 of whom had exited during year 2 and 1 during year 4, that revealed that they had engaged in an equal number of transactional and transformational behaviors.

These data suggest that although transformational behaviors are utilized by both PI and exited principals, there appears to be an increase in the utilization of transactional behaviors by PI principals. Furthermore, there appears to be an increase in the utilization of transactional behaviors by PI principals during years 2 and 5. This finding may be related to the self-efficacy of the principal as well as the natural change process that occurs when moving through the phases of change (Schein, 1992).

According to social cognitive theory, principals who experience repeated failure have a greater tendency to be less efficacious (Bandura, 1993; Flores, Ojeda, Huang, Gee, & Lee, 2006; Goddard et al., 2000; Wood & Bandura, 1989), which negatively affects their school outcomes. This downward spiral could be disastrous to principals who must keep progressing because behavior is influenced by internal cognition (Bandura, 1997; Wood & Bandura, 1989).

Additionally, change theory has identified a dangerous zone called the *neutral zone* wherein conflict naturally arises, and along with it, the tendency to resort to old ways of practice (Schein, 1992). When leaders perceive resistance from staff, they may become more rigid in their responses, which would explain their tendency to increase their number of transactional behaviors in order to keep progressing. Such resistance may arise more frequently during years 2 and years 5 plus, explaining the tendency for principals to increase their transactional behaviors during these years.

This finding has important implications for PI principals. It suggests that principals who do not exit PI during year 1 may find themselves having to overcome challenges to their self-efficacy as well as challenges to school improvement.

PI Principals Are Extrinsically Focused Whereas Exited Principals Are Intrinsically Focused

This study also aimed to identify the focus of change efforts in which PI principals engage. The data revealed that PI principals primarily engaged in extrinsically focused initiatives that were focused on implementing programs, common assessment methods, intervention programs, and teacher training programs, as well as increasing the number of support staff. On the contrary, the exited principals

primarily engaged in intrinsically focused initiatives focused on increasing individual consideration, changing individual ideals and beliefs, and using monitoring and evaluation as ongoing processes. These latter initiatives were categorized as being intrinsic because they required a change in the internal cognition of the stakeholders.

Although these findings do not suggest that principals should avoid engaging in extrinsically focused initiatives, they do suggest that those principals who were successful focused on changing basic underlying assumptions. The importance of these findings is that they provide understanding of the rationale behind a change initiative. For example, both PI and exited principals reported having engaged in professional learning communities. Those principals who viewed this initiative as a task were extrinsically focused whereas those who viewed it as a vehicle for engaging in academic discussions about teaching and learning were intrinsically focused. If success had been measured by the extent of participation in professional learning communities, then it would have been measured by production of artifacts such as minutes of meetings and attendance reports. However, if success had been measured by change in practice, then it would have been measured by production of artifacts such as increased student test scores. It was this latter measure of success that was assumed by the majority of the exited principals.

The findings of this study differ from those of other research studies that had generated a list of initiatives or strategies for success (Butterworth & Weinstein, 1996; Charles A. Dana Center, 1999; Pollard-Durodola, 2003; Porter & Soper, 2003; Reeves, 2004; Schwartz, 2003). Still, both previous studies and this study found that exited principals ensure that the curriculum is aligned to the standards. However, there

is danger in reporting such findings because, as this study has demonstrated, both PI and exited principals engaged in the same initiatives but with very different outcomes. What was evident from the exited principals was a clear rationale for why the change initiative of alignment of the curriculum was necessary. These principals not only understood the rationale for the change initiative, but they supported this initiative with transformational action. When viewed through the lens of social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997; Wood & Bandura, 1989), transformational action attempts to influence behavior by attempting to change the basic underlying assumptions that influence their behaviors. Therefore, gaining an understanding of the purpose of the intended change will increase the behavior needed to support the change initiative. Thus, the focus for change must be on changing underlying belief systems to influence practice or change efforts rather than focusing only on practice or change efforts.

This finding has important implications for policymakers. Different support needs to be provided to PI schools and non-PI schools. Support given to PI schools must focus on uncovering the basic underlying assumptions of the organizations rather than prescribing rigid structures that call for fidelity of implementation of instructional materials. The focus needs to be on inquiry and questioning rather than on prescriptive programs and strategies.

Transformational Behaviors Supportive of Second-Order Change

On the basis of this study alone, it is difficult to be certain of the type of change initiated by the principals because the determination rests with the perception of all stakeholders involved in the change effort (Marzano et al., 2005). However, the data suggest that exited principals had engaged in second-order change, supported by

the finding that exited principals had engaged in more transformational actions than had PI principals (80% vs. 66%, respectively). Most of the exited principals' notable behaviors were focused on idealized influence (attributed), characterized as the principal motivating others by using his or her attributes and behaviors to encourage them to look beyond themselves towards the greater good (Antonakis & House, 2002; Avolio & Bass, 2004). These attributes can be exemplified by the following quotes of exited principals:

> My solutions are not always the best. I bring concerns and ideas to the table and my staff makes them work for our school.
>
> I feel it is important for each grade level to have a voice and for everyone to know what great work each grade level is doing.
>
> I view myself as a colleague/partner in the teaching of each student in the school.

These quotes show that exited principals primarily exhibit the idealized influential attributes of collaboration and trust. However, they also displayed one transactional behavior that can be coded as a management-by-exception (active) behavior. According to Bruce and Avolio (2004), the creators of the MLQ, management-by-exception (active) behaviors can be characterized as setting clear expectations and providing active monitoring to ensure that expectations are fulfilled. This behavior is best illustrated by the following quotes from exited principals:

> I raised the expectations and they REALLY expected them. I implemented responsibility through accountability.
>
> The principal is in the classroom daily.
>
> Hold stakeholders accountable for their actions in relation to increasing student learning.

These quotes suggest that both transformational and transactional behaviors are necessary to support change, which supports Bass's (1997) assertion that different leadership behaviors are complementary. The findings from this study also support earlier studies that found that transformational components are effective within the context of organizational change (Antonakis et al., 2003; Bass, 1997; Leithwood & Jantzi, 1999b, 2006; Leithwood et al., 2002; Sheppard, 1996). Consequently, the findings suggest that although transformational behaviors can support second-order change, transactional behaviors are also required. This conclusion supports Fullan's (2003) assertion that complex leaders are needed for complex solutions because there are no simple answers to complex problems. The leader must be skilled in understanding change and flexible in adapting to different situations.

This finding has implications for practitioners who expect specific direction regarding the behaviors that best support change. It is recommended that principals gain knowledge of both transactional and transformational behaviors and base their use of a key behavior on their understanding of current staff members. This finding also has implications to policymakers and district-office officials. Although there is no easy answer or clear method that should be used, Fullan (2003) suggested seeking the type of leader needed in the current age of change and accountability: a leader who understands the change process and is flexible in his or her use of methods and actions.

Principals With More Experience Practice More Contingent Reward Behaviors

Although this study did not focus on identifying differences among principals based on their years of principal experience, an unanticipated difference was found among principals with various levels of principal experience. Specifically, principals with more experience were found to have a greater tendency to engage in the transactional behavior of contingent reward. The quantitative data revealed a statistically significant difference in the leadership behavior of contingent reward between principals with 2 years of experience (M = 2.78, SD = .87) and 6 to 10 years of experience (M = 3.20, SD = .51). Similarly, a statistically significant difference was found between principals with 2 years of experience (M = 2.78, SD = .87) and principals with 11 or more years of experience (M = 3.17, SD = .54). Principals with 6 to 10 years or with 11 or more years of experience received a higher contingent reward score than did principals with only 2 years of experience. This suggests that principals with more experience have a greater tendency to engage in the transactional behavior of contingent reward, an unanticipated finding supported by qualitative analysis of the principal interviews. Although this finding suggests that with experience principals obtain greater knowledge of leadership behaviors, future research is needed in this area.

Limitations and Delimitations

Due to its exploratory nature, this study was only intended to identify patterns of leadership behaviors that exist within the context of PI. Given the limited number of schools that have exited PI within the last year, as well as the limited time and resources available to the researcher, one limitation of this study was its sample size.

Because some comparison groups were relatively small, care must be taken in generalizing study findings to the larger population. Similarly, because the interview sample of 4 principals was very small, the findings from the 4 interviews should be seen as supplementary information from 4 individuals who were successful rather than information providing a definitive path towards success. The interview findings only reflect the truth of these 4 individuals. Additionally, the MLQ 5X was only administered to principals. In order to attain a more definitive assessment of the leadership behaviors of principals, the instrument should also be administered to staff members who work with the principals.

Suggestions for Future Research

Because this study was exploratory in nature, further studies on the impact of PI on principals are needed. One suggestion for further study is investigating the impact of stress on the principal with a focus on principal efficacy and behaviors. One of the limitations of this study was the decision to limit participation to principals only. Further studies should include other staff members who work with the principals to ascertain broader perspectives rather than solely relying on the principals' perceptions. Finally, future research is needed on the sustainability of the reform efforts that have been implemented exited schools. One consideration is determining what happens if exited schools are placed in PI status again: Will the school and staff have the resiliency to succeed yet again?

Recommendations and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to identify the common leadership behaviors of principals within the context of PI to aid in the leadership training and assistance of

leaders in schools requiring reform. This study also aimed to inform district practices in the recruitment and selection of principals. First, this study found that principal selection and training should include an understanding of the change process and the importance of using both transactional and transformational leadership behaviors. Second, principals and district officials should be cognizant of the impending psychological pitfalls that naturally arise after the first year of being designated a PI school. As the findings have suggested, the percieved efficacy of principals may be low at the end of year 2; therefore, if district officials are contemplating a change in leadership, it might be best to institute a change in leadership after the first year. The best leader for the second year of PI might be a leader with either a proven track record of exiting PI or one who has never been a leader in a PI school. Third, the support provided to PI schools and districts should be different from that provided to schools not in PI. The support should take the form of a process that aids in uncovering the basic underlying assumptions of the school rather than prescribing rigid structures. The focus should be on inquiry and questioning rather than on prescriptive programs and strategies. Finally and most importantly, the focus of change needs to be on changing the basic underlying assumptions of the teaching staff. In addition to those related to the aforementioned recommendations, this study has implications for policymakers. As the data have demonstrated, many principals with experience may already intuitively understand that the entire premise of the accountability system is predicated upon contingent rewards, which are counterintuitive to transformational behaviors. As Barth (2002) suggested, the message often given to staff is “Learn [succeed] . . . or else.” The message itself is

transactional, being based on the threat of sanctions or rewards. Rather, the focus should be on intrinsic, transformational behavior that promotes accountability; in other words, the message should be “Succeed, because it is the right thing to do.”

Appendix A:

E-Mail Invitation to Potential Study Participants

We would greatly appreciate if you could find about 15 minutes of your time to support our research project on educational leadership. We will be closing our survey on June 30th. We thank you for your consideration and support.

Dear CA School Site Administrator,

You have been selected to participate in a statewide survey that is being conducted as part of a doctoral dissertation study focused on educational leadership. The purpose of this study is to explore the relationship between school leadership factors and Program Improvement accountability measures under No Child Left Behind (NCLB). This research study will provide us with vital information that will inform the educational community about the impact of NCLB on a principal's ability to lead.

Your participation will require you take approximately **15 minutes** to complete an online questionnaire via SurveyMonkey. Your participation is completely voluntary. We realize that this is an extremely busy time for you; however, your participation will allow us to inform the educational community regarding the practice of school leaders. While we cannot guarantee that you will receive any benefits from participation in this study, your participation will allow you some self-reflection regarding your own leadership.

TO COMPLETE THE ONLINE SURVEY, PLEASE CLICK ON THE FOLLOWING LINK: [SurveyLink]

Thank you for your consideration and support.

Sincerely,

Luis A. Ibarra
Director of Human Resources
Oceanside Unified School District

If you are no longer a school site administrator (i.e., promoted, retired, or returned to the classroom), please click on the survey link [SurveyLink] and answer only the first question so we will know not to send you any future reminders.

If you are currently a school site administrator and wish to opt out of the survey, please click on this link: [RemoveLink] and you will be removed from our e-mail list.

Appendix B:
Description of Survey and Consent to Participate

Luis Ibarra, a graduate student at the University of California, San Diego is conducting a study on principal leadership within the context of Program Improvement (PI). You, along with 4,251 other California Title I school principals, have been selected to participate in this very important statewide study.

This study has one main objective: To identify a principal's ability to lead schools within the current accountability climate of No Child Left Behind.

Your participation in this study is voluntary and will take you approximately 15 minutes to complete the following survey. There are no known risks of participating in this study. Your survey responses will be kept confidential and available only to the research team for analysis purposes. If the length of the survey is inconvenient for you, you may discontinue taking the survey at any time without any consequence to you.

Although there is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study, I feel your participation will benefit all Title I principals faced with meeting Adequate Yearly Progress expectations under NCLB.

Survey responses will not be linked to your name or address. Instead, a unique code will be randomly assigned to each survey I collect. Only the research team will have access to the information you give us. We do this to ensure that your responses remain confidential and that you feel free to respond as candidly as possible.

If you have questions about the study, you may direct those to the principal investigator, Luis Ibarra, at 760.966.4002, or the researcher's advisor, Dr. Delores Lindsey, at 760.750.8544. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at UCSD.

By clicking on NEXT you agree to participate in this research study.

The aim of this study is to create a large, statewide sample of CA Title I public school principals in order to receive a representative response of completed surveys by principals within each of the following categories: schools in PI, schools not in PI, and schools that have successfully exited PI, as well as to have balanced representation from principals in elementary, middle, and high schools.

Appendix B: *(continued)*

The purpose of this demographic survey is to gather specific personal and school-level information from you to be able to analyze a variety of variables that may play an impact on your responses to the subsequent questions.

Again, all data used for the study will not be identifiable to specific participants. Random numbers will replace school ID numbers and participant names will not be collected.

Appendix C:
Informed Consent for Interview

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Luis A. Ibarra, a graduate student at the University of California, San Diego, is conducting a study on leadership behaviors within the context of Program Improvement (PI). You, along with 6,063 other school principals who are either in PI or not in PI, have been selected to participate in this statewide study.

This study has one main objective:

> To identify the common leadership behaviors of successful leaders within the context of Program Improvement.

Your participation will require you take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete the attached questionnaire. The questionnaire is divided into three sections. The first section is a demographic survey asking general questions about your school and yourself as a leader. The second and third sections will ask situational questions regarding your perceptions about yourself as a leader. In addition to the survey, you may be asked to participate in an interview. You will be interviewed individually. The conversational style interview will take approximately one to one to two hours and, with your permission, will be audio taped. The interview will take place at your school site or at a location of your choice.

There are no known risks to participation in this study. Your interview and survey responses will be kept confidential and available only to the research team for analysis purposes. If the length of the interview is inconvenient for you, you may terminate the interview at any time without any consequence to you.

Although there is no direct benefit to you for participating in this study, I feel your participation will likely benefit all principals faced with making the necessary changes to their schools in order to meet the requirements under Program Improvement status.

Interview tapes will be locked in a safe place. Only the research team will listen and transcribe the information you give us. The tapes will be erased or destroyed once this study is completed.

Interview responses will not be linked to your name or address, and there will be no follow-up sessions. So that our research team can contact you in the future, we will link your name to a unique identification number. I do this to ensure that your responses remain confidential and you feel free to respond as freely as possible. You should know that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) may inspect study records as

Appendix C: *(continued)*

part of its auditing program, but these reviews only focus on the researchers and the study, not on your responses or involvement. The IRB is a committee that reviews research studies to make sure that they are safe and that the rights of the participants are protected.

You do not have to participate in this study if you do not want to. If you agree to be in this study, but later change your mind, you may drop out at any time. There are no penalties or consequences of any kind if you decide you do not want to participate.

If you have questions about the study, you may direct those to the researcher, Luis Ibarra, at 760.966.4002 or the researcher's advisor/professor, Dr. Delores B. Lindsey, at 760.750.8544. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the IRB at the University of California, San Diego.

☐ I agree to participate in this research study.
☐ I agree to be audiotaped.

_____ _____
Participant's Name Date

Participant's Signature

_____
Researcher's Signature

Appendix D:

Principal Demographic Survey

1. Are you currently a California Title I public school site principal/co-principal/director/principal-superintendent?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

2. Your gender:
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

3. Your age:
- ☐ < 30 years of age
- ☐ 30 – 34 years of age
- ☐ 35 – 44 years of age
- ☐ 45 – 49 years of age
- ☐ 50+ years of age

4. Your ethnicity:
- ☐ African American
- ☐ Asian
- ☐ Latino
- ☐ White
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

5. Highest degree earned:
- ☐ Bachelors
- ☐ Masters
- ☐ Masters + 30 units
- ☐ Doctorate

6. School level:
- ☐ Elementary
- ☐ Middle
- ☐ High
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Appendix D: (*continued*).

7. Number of years as an educator (including this school year):
□ 1 – 3 years
□ 4 – 7 years
□ 8 – 15 years
□ 16 – 23 years
□ 24 – 30 years
□ 31+ years

8. Number of years as an educator in your current school district (including this school year):
□ 1 – 3 years
□ 4 – 7 years
□ 8 – 15 years
□ 16 – 23 years
□ 24 – 30 years
□ 31+ years

9. Number of years as a principal (including this school year):
□ 1 year
□ 2 years
□ 3 – 5 years
□ 6 – 10 years
□ 11+ years

10. Number of years as a principal in your current school (including this school year):
□ 1 year
□ 2 years
□ 3 – 5 years
□ 6 – 10 years
□ 11+ years

11. School enrollment:
□ 0 – 499
□ 500 – 999
□ 1000 – 1999
□ 2000 – 2999
□ 3000+

Appendix D: (*continued*).

12. DISTRICT enrollment:
□ 0 – 249
□ 250 – 899
□ 900 – 2,499
□ 2,500 – 4,999
□ 5,000+

13. School's percentage of students on free and reduced lunch:
□ 0 – 9%
□ 10 – 19%
□ 20 – 39%
□ 40 – 59%
□ 60%+

14. School's percentage of English Learners:
□ 0 – 9%
□ 10 – 19%
□ 20 – 39%
□ 40 – 59%
□ 60%+

15. School's percentage of students receiving Special Education services:
□ 0 – 4%
□ 5 – 9%
□ 10 – 14%
□ 15 – 19%
□ 20%+

16. School's 2006-07 API:
School's API _____

17. Your school:
□ is not / has never been in Program Improvement (leads to next PSES survey)
□ is in Program Improvement (leads to questions 18, 19, then to PSES survey)
□ has successfully exited Program Improvement (leads to question 20, then to PSES survey)

18. Current Year in Program Improvement (PI):
□ Year 1
□ Year 2
□ Year 3
□ Year 4
□ Year 5+

Appendix D: (*continued*).

19. Year entered PI:
- 2002 – 2003 school year
- 2003 – 2004 school year
- 2004 – 2005 school year
- 2005 – 2006 school year
- 2006 – 2007 school year

20. Year exited PI:
- 2003 – 2004 school year
- 2004 – 2005 school year
- 2005 – 2006 school year
- 2006 – 2007 school year

Note. Question 1 was not considered a demographic variable as it screened principals who responded to the survey instrument in order to ensure that the study sample only included principals who were from Title I schools.

Appendix E:

MLQ 5X

Name of Instrument: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X-Short)

Authors: Bruce Avolio and Bernard Bass

Sample Items:

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits you. The word "others" may mean your peers, clients, direct reports, supervisors, and/all of these individuals.

1. I seek differing perspectives when solving problems.
2. I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.
3. I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.
4. I show that I am a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."
5. I heighten others' desire to succeed.

Appendix F:

Interview Questions

1. Briefly, how would you describe what your school was like the year you were first identified as PI?

2. As you reflect back to your first year of PI, what needed to change in order for your school to be successful?
   (Interviewer is listening for the focus of change.)

3. What were your top priorities for the first year? Long-term?
   (Interviewer is listening for the focus of change.)

4. Who or what informed your priorities?
   (Interviewer is listening for motivators or factors that informed the focus for change. Researcher is also listening for leadership behaviors in formulating a plan.)

5. How would you describe the stakeholders for your school community? (Researcher is searching for who the stakeholders are and which stakeholders he/she values.)

6. How do you think your plan was perceived by stakeholders?
   (Interviewer is listening for the magnitude and order of change.)

7. What actions did you as a leader take that you believe had the most significant impact to exiting PI?
   (Interviewer is listening for leadership behaviors.)

8. What accomplishments during the PI movement are you most proud of?
   (Interviewer is listening for focus for change.)

9. What might be some things that challenged you the most?
(Interviewer is listening for the magnitude and order of change.)

10. What advice can you give other principals in their first year of PI?
(Interviewer is listening for primary leadership behaviors and focus of change.)

11. What else might you like to add about your leadership actions as they relate to movement from PI status?

Appendix G:
Principal Component Analysis

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.929	22.064	22.064	9.929	22.064	22.064
2	2.596	5.769	27.833	2.596	5.769	27.833
3	2.317	5.150	32.983	2.317	5.150	32.983
4	1.944	4.319	37.302	1.944	4.319	37.302
5	1.610	3.578	40.880	1.610	3.578	40.880
6	1.405	3.121	44.002	1.405	3.121	44.002
7	1.309	2.909	46.910	1.309	2.909	46.910
8	1.255	2.789	49.700	1.255	2.789	49.700
9	1.137	2.528	52.228	1.137	2.528	52.228
10	1.066	2.369	54.596	1.066	2.369	54.596
11	1.022	2.272	56.868	1.022	2.272	56.868
12	1.005	2.233	59.101	1.005	2.233	59.101
13	.941	2.090	61.191			
14	.922	2.048	63.239			
15	.915	2.034	65.273			
16	.865	1.922	67.195			
17	.836	1.858	69.053			
18	.806	1.791	70.844			
19	.758	1.683	72.528			
20	.737	1.638	74.166			
21	.724	1.610	75.775			
22	.702	1.559	77.334			
23	.649	1.443	78.778			
24	.644	1.432	80.209			
25	.610	1.355	81.564			
26	.594	1.320	82.884			
27	.559	1.242	84.127			
28	.553	1.228	85.355			
29	.545	1.211	86.566			
30	.517	1.149	87.715			
31	.484	1.075	88.790			
32	.479	1.064	89.854			
33	.468	1.040	90.893			
34	.440	.978	91.871			
35	.428	.951	92.822			
36	.408	.906	93.729			
37	.385	.856	94.585			
38	.374	.831	95.416			
39	.371	.825	96.241			
40	.334	.742	96.983			
41	.325	.723	97.706			
42	.315	.700	98.406			
43	.279	.619	99.025			
44	.233	.519	99.544			
45	.205	.456	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Appendix H:
Varimax Rotation

	Component											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
MLQ44 EE	.733	.365										
MLQ38 SAT	.724											
MLQ42 EE	.721	.348										
MLQ41 SAT	.712											
MLQ43 EFF	.711											
MLQ45 EFF	.705											
MLQ37 EFF	.559											
MLQ40 EFF	.547											
MLQ39 EE	.528	.312										
MLQ26 IM		.713										
MLQ14 IIB		.709										
MLQ13 IM		.645										
MLQ34 IIB		.638										
MLQ11 CR		.609										
MLQ16 CR		.582									.361	
MLQ15 IC		.573										
MLQ31 IC	.431	.524										
MLQ32 IS		.487										
MLQ6 IIB		.472		.342								
MLQ36 IM	.415	.461										
MLQ22 MBEA			.759									
MLQ24 MBEA			.749									
MLQ27 MBEA			.688									
MLQ4 MBEA			.577							-.443		
MLQ18 IIA				.658								
MLQ9 IM				.571								

Appendix H: *(continued)*

	Component											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
MLQ23 IIB				.564							-.317	
MLQ21 IIA	.480			.484				.338				
MLQ19 IC					.679							
MLQ29 IC					.642							
MLQ2 IS		.323				.708						
MLQ1 CR						.526		.402				
MLQ8 IS						.509						
MLQ30 IS		.349			.301	.379						
MLQ3 MBEP							.754					
MLQ5 LF					-.307		.591					-.312
MLQ12 MBEP							.585					
MLQ25 IIA								.655				
MLQ10 IIA	.332							.648				
MLQ33 LF									.682			
MLQ28 LF									.678			
MLQ20 MBEP										.722		
MLQ17 MBEP											.409	.311
MLQ35 CR		.303			.348						.391	
MLQ7 LF												.800

Legend:
II(A) = Idealized Influence (Attributed)
II(B) = Idealized Influence (Behavior)
IM = Inspirational Motivation
IS = Intellectual Stimulation
IC = Individualized Consideration
CR = Contingent Reward
MBEA = Management-by-Exception (Active)
MBEP = Management-by-Exception (Passive)
LF = Laissez-Faire
EE = Extra Effort
EFF = Effectiveness
SAT = Satisfaction

Appendix I:
Multiple Comparisons of PI Groups

Dependent Variable	PI Status		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
IIA	Never in PI	In PI	.09102	.05363	.207
		Exited PI	.07940	.08642	.629
	In PI	Never in PI	-.09102	.05363	.207
		Exited PI	-.01162	.08964	.991
	Exited PI	Never in PI	-.07940	.08642	.629
		In PI	.01162	.08964	.991
IIB	Never in PI	In PI	-.00892	.04256	.976
		Exited PI	-.01995	.06665	.952
	In PI	Never in PI	.00892	.04256	.976
		Exited PI	-.01103	.06954	.986
	Exited PI	Never in PI	.01995	.06665	.952
		In PI	.01103	.06954	.986
IM	Never in PI	In PI	.04157	.04314	.600
		Exited PI	-.02919	.06769	.903
	In PI	Never in PI	-.04157	.04314	.600
		Exited PI	-.07076	.07057	.576
	Exited PI	Never in PI	.02919	.06769	.903
		In PI	.07076	.07057	.576
IS	Never in PI	In PI	.04413	.04803	.629
		Exited PI	.02236	.07591	.953
	In PI	Never in PI	-.04413	.04803	.629
		Exited PI	-.02177	.07926	.959
	Exited PI	Never in PI	-.02236	.07591	.953
		In PI	.02177	.07926	.959

Appendix I: *(continued)*

Dependent Variable	PI Status		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
IC	Never in PI	In PI	.08017	.04947	.238
		Exited PI	-.04530	.07680	.826
	In PI	Never in PI	-.08017	.04947	.238
		Exited PI	-.12547	.08027	.263
	Exited PI	Never in PI	.04530	.07680	.826
		In PI	.12547	.08027	.263
CR	Never in PI	In PI	-.02040	.05596	.929
		Exited PI	-.14197	.08731	.236
	In PI	Never in PI	.02040	.05596	.929
		Exited PI	-.12157	.09114	.377
	Exited PI	Never in PI	.14197	.08731	.236
		In PI	.12157	.09114	.377
MBEA	Never in PI	In PI	-.09101	.07825	.476
		Exited PI	-.06378	.12222	.861
	In PI	Never in PI	.09101	.07825	.476
		Exited PI	.02723	.12727	.975
	Exited PI	Never in PI	.06378	.12222	.861
		In PI	-.02723	.12727	.975
MBEP	Never in PI	In PI	.10391	.05344	.128
		Exited PI	.03830	.08527	.895
	In PI	Never in PI	-.10391	.05344	.128
		Exited PI	-.06561	.08866	.740
	Exited PI	Never in PI	-.03830	.08527	.895
		In PI	.06561	.08866	.740

Appendix I: *(continued)*

Dependent Variable	PI Status		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
LF	Never in PI	In PI	.00570	.04069	.989
		Exited PI	.04556	.06293	.749
	In PI	Never in PI	-.00570	.04069	.989
		Exited PI	.03986	.06587	.817
	Exited PI	Never in PI	-.04556	.06293	.749
		In PI	-.03986	.06587	.817
EE	Never in PI	In PI	.05203	.05654	.628
		Exited PI	-.10629	.08839	.452
	In PI	Never in PI	-.05203	.05654	.628
		Exited PI	-.15832	.09228	.200
	Exited PI	Never in PI	.10629	.08839	.452
		In PI	.15832	.09228	.200
EFF	Never in PI	In PI	.12846*	.04931	.026
		Exited PI	-.03620	.07769	.887
	In PI	Never in PI	-.12846*	.04931	.026
		Exited PI	-.16466	.08109	.106
	Exited PI	Never in PI	.03620	.07769	.887
		In PI	.16466	.08109	.106

Appendix I: *(continued)*

Dependent Variable	PI Status		Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
SAT	Never in PI	In PI	.10952	.05190	.089
		Exited PI	.06522	.08098	.700
	In PI	Never in PI	-10952	.05190	.089
		Exited PI	-.04430	.08460	.860
	Exited PI	Never in PI	-.06522	.08098	.700
		In PI	.04430	.08460	.860

* The mean difference is significant at p<.05

Legend:
II(A) = Idealized Influence (Attributed)
II(B) = Idealized Influence (Behavior)
IM = Inspirational Motivation
IS = Intellectual Stimulation
IC = Individualized Consideration
CR = Contingent Reward
MBEA = Management-by-Exception (Active)
MBEP = Management-by-Exception (Passive)
LF = Laissez-Faire
EE = Extra Effort
EFF = Effectiveness
SAT = Satisfaction

Appendix J:
Principal B: Main Street Elementary School, Exited, Year 1

Main Street Elementary School is an averaged-sized elementary school that enrolls 700 students. The school is located in the downtown area in the northern part of San Diego County. Principal B, who has been a school administrator for 9 years, recently completed her sixth year at Main Street Elementary School. She is a Caucasian female serving at a school at which approximately 90% of the students participate in the free and reduced lunch program and 90% of the students have been designated English- language learners. The immediate impressions one receives of Principal B is that she loves her school and has pride in her staff for all of their accomplishments.

Principal B recounted the first time that she discovered her school had been designated a PI school. She and her staff had been working very hard and were all extremely disappointed they had not met the accountability criteria. When she brought the staff together and shared the news, they engaged in much grieving, after she brought everyone together. Utilizing the metaphor of an educational race, she described how each student was starting at a different point and it was the responsibility of the educators to take the students from where they were currently in the race to the finish line. Her first priority as principal was to support the weakest teachers; she believed it was her responsibility to support those teachers through providing coaching, professional development, and encouragement. She stated that her

Appendix J: *(continued)*

main focus with these ineffective teachers was to get them to recognize that they "had the power to make a difference."

In addition to focusing on assisting teachers, Principal B also focused on maximizing instructional time, targeting resources towards students in need, and effectively utilizing data. She solicited assistance from local community agencies by asking their members to read with her students. In addition to focusing on academic deficits, she made a concerted effort to emphasize the areas in which the school was successful. For example, she reminded the staff that they had won accolades for their work with technology.

Principal B's top priority was to ensure that she learned the names of all the students who were not meeting benchmarks as well as the interventions that were in place for them. She targeted her resources towards these students to provide assistance during and after school. She made certain her staff were aware of the content knowledge that her students were expected to learn and how the students would be expected to demonstrate this knowledge. She focused on increasing understanding of academic vocabulary and aligning the curriculum to the standards. Finally, she helped parents assist students by setting up parent meetings and workshops.

Principal B indicated that the journey has not been easy. Before all of these systems could be embraced with tenacity, Principal B had to ensure that specific belief systems were in place. She needed her staff to believe that the school could improve, and even more importantly, believe that their students could learn. Even with a focus

Appendix J: *(continued)*

on supportive systems and structures, the changes would not be embraced without those belief systems. The process of examining beliefs took some time. She first sought to identify each staff members' strength. Even though a strength might not be one that could directly lead them to exit PI, it was still a strength that she could utilize to help the school in some way. She was determined to increase the efficacy of her teachers. She emphasized that this strength-based approach would not allow teachers to escape accountability but rather empower teachers to make a difference.

Initially she found herself explaining and overcommunicating the rationale of all of the initiatives. She stated that although she continues to communicate the urgency of the new processes, such communication leads to the building of trust. Importantly, she modeled behavior for her teachers; although she mourned with them and displayed her disappointment, she never blamed the system. She focused staff away from situations that were beyond their control towards those that were within their control. She conveyed a sense of teamwork and camaraderie. She wanted her staff to look forward to coming to work and fostered an environment of focus, support, and respect. For example, even if she must document a teacher due to unsatisfactory performance, she believes in doing so using a process that sustains mutual dignity and respect.

Principal B is proud of the accomplishments of her school. The school is now receiving such positive press that the parents and community have taken notice. The school has a waiting list of parents and students who want to enroll in the school.

Appendix J: *(continued)*

What is most important to Principal B is that her school is making a difference in the lives of her students. She used to despise NCLB and all of its accountability measures, but now she believes the mandate served as the catalyst to make the changes that were needed at her school.

Appendix K:
Principal M: Grant Junior High School, Exited, Year 2

Grant Junior High School is a large junior high school with an enrollment of approximately 1,100 students. The school is located within a large urban area in the southern part of San Diego County. The student demographic composition is 70% Hispanic, 70% economically disadvantaged, and 32% English-language learner students. Principal M, a Hispanic female, has been in education for 36 years. She recently completed her fourth year as principal of the school. She recalled that when she entered education, the system was very rigid regarding how employees should dress and behave but provided few guidelines regarding what students should learn or teachers should teach. One's immediate impressions of Principal M are that she is focused, relentless, and has a passion for student achievement. She is data driven and willing to take on even the toughest naysayer that gets in the way of what is best for her students or school. She has high expectations for herself, staff, students, and parents, and will accept no excuses.

Principal M was appointed by her superintendent to restructure the school and improve student achievement. The school was in its second year of PI and facing its third year. The first thing Principal M asked her superintendent was "How much noise are you willing to take?" The superintendent asked her what she needed. Principal M knew it was going to be a difficult challenge. Principal M's first priority that first semester was to watch, listen, and collect data. She had worked at the school 25 years earlier and found to her dismay that nothing had changed. The same teachers that had

Appendix K: *(continued)*

had classroom management problems 25 years ago still had problems. The curriculum was still not aligned to the standards and the teachers were continuing to teach in the same way that they had always taught. An immediate concern for Principal M was the various levels of remedial classes that were being offered in reading and math. She referred to these classes as "pretend reading and pretend math" because they were not aligned with the testing for those subjects.

Principal M's first priority the following semester was to work with the leadership team and her parent community to develop their school vision and mission for the school. The mantra became "No hay probecitos [there are no poor babies]." There would "no probecito teachers, probecito students, or probecito parents [no poor teachers, poor students, or poor parents]." In other words, there would be no excuses for anyone. She stated that at first people did not quite understand what this meant until she eliminated all of the remedial classes and academies so that the teachers would be forced to teach content aligned with the standards to all of the students. This action caused major unrest with her teaching staff; the teachers did not believe that the students would be able to handle grade-level content. She recalled sitting down with individual teachers and saying, "I know you have the entire year's curriculum worksheets already copied. Throw them away!"

Because the students had many barriers to overcome, she ensured that they had the proper educational support to access the curriculum. One area that needed support was reading; in order to provide it, the school began to teach reading through content areas

Appendix K: *(continued)*

in science and social studies. She bought everyone on staff a copy of Marzano's *Classroom That Works* and *Assessment for Learning*, which became the vehicles for their professional development. She eliminated the requirement to attend all conferences, workshops, and seminars; all of the teachers would remain in their classrooms, where they needed to be, and would professionally develop themselves. The teachers began to meet in teams to analyze the achievement and progress of their students.

Principal M instituted mandatory afterschool programs for students receiving Ds or Fs and then turned her focus towards the parents. With the mantra "no hay probecito parents," she worked with parents to ensure that they understood that their children had to attend mandatory afterschool programs. To alleviate their concerns for safety, she provided transportation by redirecting the use of the school's categorical funds. A major challenge was student attendance; every Friday afternoon many parents removed their children from classes prior to the end of the school day to avoid traffic on their drive back to Mexico. She began to confront each and every parent about the importance of keeping students in school. She stated that when the parents expressed that she was being too strict, she overcame their concerns by sharing with them her mission to educate their children. In order for her to do the job she was called upon to do, the students needed to be in school. She accepted no excuses.

Appendix K: *(continued)*

By putting interventions in place through implementing afterschool programs and content area changes and increasing the rigor of standards-aligned instruction, Principal M was confident that her students would succeed. She explained, "If students [were] at least exposed to what they would be tested on, at least they had a fighting chance to get some of the questions correct." She worked with the teachers by having them coach each other. During their prep time, she expected teachers to visit each other's classrooms to observe a lesson. When they did this, she compensated them. In fact, she is currently receiving complaints by the teachers union because of this issue. Her response to the association was that it is "her expectation." She even compensates teachers to attend staff development. When asked if staff development is mandatory, she remarked that it has become a standard of practice.

Principal M believes that her hard work and determination has paid off. She is most proud of creating a culture of learning. Her teachers have increased the rigor of instruction, which she believes has contributed to creating a culture of learning. She stated that many people believe that they have a culture of learning but offer many remediation classes for students. To her that is a culture of remediation. Her students are learning what they are expected to learn and that is very important to her. In fact, many of the teachers later stated that their students have succeeded despite initially not believing that they could do so. They did not believe that the students could succeed and they are now believers of that vision. Principal M attributes all of her success to NCLB. She reiterated her belief that a system will only change when mandated to do so.

Appendix L:
Principal A: South Tamarisk Elementary School, Exited, Year 4

South Tamarisk is an average-sized elementary school of approximately 600 students. Nestled in a residential community in what is known as the Inland Empire within San Bernardino County, the school serves a student population of 90% Hispanic, 90% economically disadvantaged, and 60% English-language learner students. Principal A, a Caucasian male with 5 years experience as a principal, has just completed his third year at this elementary school. One's overall impression of Principal A is that he is very charismatic, loves what he does, and is very proud of the accomplishments of his staff. He takes no credit for any success and feels humbled by all of the positive press.

Principal A arrived at the school when it was already in PI year 4. He stated that the staff were not informed of their PI status until they were in year 2. He recounted meeting staff that felt surprised, angry, and victimized. There was much finger pointing and questioning of the validity of the state test and the entire federal accountability system. The first thing that they needed to do was move beyond the venting. He brought the staff together and acknowledged the situation. They had to start thinking about solutions to the obstacles that they were facing. He called it a shift towards beginning to take ownership of the situation and taking responsibility for the solution.

Appendix L: *(continued)*

Many of the initiatives that Principal A, the faculty, and the staff developed emerged from their creation of the school governance plan. With the technical assistance provided from through their county office of education, they were able to break the situation into small, manageable pieces that could be addressed individually. They began addressing the problem though a logical chain of reasoning. The school was in this situation because they had not met their adequate yearly progress. They had not met their adequate yearly progress because their English learners had not met the benchmarks. Their students were not meeting benchmarks probably because they were not developing their English skills. Finally, they were not developing their English skills because they were not faithfully taught English-language skills. Hence, they proposed to consistently teach English-language development skills.

Another area of concern was the faithful implementation of their language arts program. Teachers who had been trained in the whole-language program were now being asked to implement this new program. Principal A felt that it was important to implement something as an entire staff in order to establish a common language. If everyone worked individually, the program may not be successful and the students would develop greater gaps in their learning.

During his first year, Principal A also focused on visiting classrooms. His predecessor was rarely in the classrooms to observe instruction. Principal A made it a point to visit and observe classrooms. He believed that when teachers had someone else in their classroom, their practice improved. This shift in practice was such a shift in what the teachers were used to that he was called down to the district office to meet

Appendix L: *(continued)*

with the association president and the assistant superintendent. Principal A had to explain that he was visiting teachers' classrooms and observing instruction because he felt it was his responsibility as the principal to do so. He was ultimately supported by the district office.

Ultimately, writing the school governance plan became the catalyst for change initiatives. Principal A made sure it was written in collaboration with the major stakeholders—the staff. Therefore, when the plan was unveiled to the faculty, a core group of teachers was already committed to it. In fact, the writing team members welcomed input throughout the process and invited anyone who was interested to come and assist them. When the day came to unveil the plan, it was a collaborative effort. The message on that day was "we need everyone on board." They also stated that they could not have "on board terrorists" who would sabotage the plan. A few staff members commented, "So you're saying, it is my way or the highway?" Principal A corrected them by saying, "No it is OUR way or the highway" in a very honest and direct conversation with the staff. If anyone could not live with the plan, he or she was welcome to teach at another school.

The plan required going above and beyond what they were used to; it meant working collaboratively towards a common goal. It meant team teaching and sharing students to provide the right level of English-language development. When they voted to ascertain public commitment, the plan was approved by 93% of the staff. Only one or two staff members voted against it for personal philosophical reasons. However,

Appendix L: *(continued)*

after the vote, these staff members shared their concerns to the principal but vowed to do everything that was asked of them.

When asked of what he is most proud, Principal A immediately replied the increase in student achievement. He talked about tripling the percentage of students who are now at proficient or advanced levels. Most importantly, he explained how those numbers represent real students who now have a chance to make it in the world. When asked what advice he would give PI principals, he warned them not wait to until they were in year 4 to write their school governance plans. He wanted principals to remember that they could not do this alone; they need to get their teachers behind them in order to create change. Finally, Principal A was very candid about the future of the accountability system. He is realistic that if the accountability system does not change, all schools will eventually be designated PI schools.

Appendix M:
Principal T: Rio Verde Elementary School, Exited, Year 4

Rio Verde Elementary School is a large elementary school with a student enrollment of approximately 925. Located in a residential community within Orange County, the school serves a diverse student population of 85% Hispanic, 85% economically disadvantaged, and 63% English-language learner students. Principal T, a Caucasian female with 26 years experience as a principal, recently completed her fifth and final year at this school and was scheduled to retire at the end of the 2006-2007 school year. One's immediate impressions of Principal T are that she is focused and driven. She is very caring, humble, and extremely proud of the work her teachers have done.

According to Principal T, the word that best describes Rio Verde Elementary school 5 years ago was "chaos." In her opinion, the school is extremely large, having 1,550 students, 75 classroom teachers, and 50 instructional assistants. Principal T used the metaphor of the "Wild West" to describe the previous school environment. The major challenge needing immediate attention was student discipline. Principal T believed that the teaching staff, although hard workers, lacked the knowledge and skills to achieve the goal of student achievement. This issue was compounded by the fact that many teachers were under emergency credentials.

Principal T's primary focus the first year was to address student discipline and classroom management. She purposefully did not initiate a large number of changes that first year but rather gathered as much data as possible through what she described

Appendix M: *(continued)*

as "massive classroom observations." Her goal in visiting classrooms was to learn what was occurring to help develop her first major change initiative focused on instruction. Her goal was to provide students with consistent instructional programs across the grade levels. She admitted that this change initiative was extremely difficult for many teachers to immediately embrace; however, through her persistence, communication, and assistance, the teachers began to understand the importance of offering a consistent program to better serve the instructional needs of their students.

At the conclusion of her second year at the school, another major change occurred with the opening of a new elementary school within the district. Teachers that were reluctant to embrace the direction in which Principal T and the school were moving were afforded an opportunity to transfer. The school lost approximately 25 teaching staff in addition to 600 students. It was during this time that the school began to make some significant progress, with the exception of the English learners. Relying on her knowledge of teaching English learners, Principal T decided the best course of action was to focus on writing. When she invited her staff to research best teaching strategies in writing, a group of her teachers encountered a program called *Step Up to Writing*. When the district began offering training, Principal T and her teaching staff decided to implement this program as a group and began training everyone on staff. The program was implemented consistently throughout the school and the following year all of their students, including their English learners, demonstrated progress in the language arts.

Appendix M: *(continued)*

Another initiative that assisted the school in its progress was participation in curriculum calibration with an outside consultant through Dataworks. The purpose of this initiative was to ensure that the curriculum that the students were taught was aligned to grade-level standards. As painful as this experience was for everyone, the staff embraced the strategies offered and began to increase the rigor of their instruction. Again, Principal T admitted that the transition did not occur overnight and that the entire process was difficult. Principal T attributes the success of the school to persistence and an awareness of when to push harder and when to slow down. When the staff began to witness an increase in student achievement, the change initiatives began to develop momentum. She recounted how motivating it was for the staff to see success after so many years of failure.

Of all the staff she has worked with in her 26 years of principal experience, she is most proud of this teaching staff. She believes that the caliber of instruction offered in the classrooms is by far the highest she has ever seen in her career. She simply stated that her teachers no longer assign work but rather "they teach." Her advice to principals who find themselves in PI is to choose one thing and implement it with fidelity. To her, it does not matter what it is; the focus should be on its consistent implementation.

References

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B. J., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 261–295.

Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2002). The full-range leadership theory: The way forward. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead* (Vol. 2, pp. 3–333). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science.

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Mlqrs3*: Mind Garden.

Babbie, E. (2001). *Survey research methods* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*(2).

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.

Barth, R. S. (1990). *Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barth, R. S. (2000). Building a community of learners. *Principal, 79*(4), 68–69.

Barth, R. S. (2001a). *Learning by heart*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barth, R. S. (2001b). Teacher leader. *Phi Delta Kappan, 82*(6), 443–449.

Barth, R. S. (2002). The culture builder. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 6–11.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the transactional-transformational leadership paradigm transcend organizational and national boundaries? *American Psychologist, 52*(2), 130–139.

Bradford, D. I., & Cohen, A. R. (1998). *Power up: Transforming organizations through shared leadership*. New York: John Wiley.

Bridges, W. (2003). *Managing transitions: Making the most of change* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Da Capo Press.

Brown, K. M., & Anfara, V. A., Jr. (2003). Paving the way for change: Visionary leadership in action at the middle level. *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(635), 16–34.

Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership, 60*(2), 40–44.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: HarperCollins.

Butterworth, B., & Weinstein, R. S. (1996). Enhancing motivational opportunity in elementary schooling: A case study of the ecology of principal leadership. *Elementary School Journal, 97*(1), 57–80.

California Department of Education. (2006). *Title I program improvement status data files*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

California Department of Education. (2007). *California public schools directory information*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Cash, J. (1997). What good leaders do. *Thrust for Educational Leadership, 27*(3), 22–25.

Cawelti, G., & Protheroe, N. (2003). *Supporting school improvement: Lessons from districts successfully meeting the challenge*.

Charles A. Dana Center. (1999). *Hope for urban education: A study of nine high-performing, high poverty urban elementary schools*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great*. New York: HarperCollins.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D. (1999). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Doyle, M. E., & Smith, M. K. (2001). *Classical leadership*. Retrieved December 30, 2006, from http://www.infed.org/leadership/traditional_leadership.htm.

Dum dum, U. R., Lowe, K. B., & Avolio, B. J. (2002). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead* (Vol. 2, pp. 35–66). Oxford, U.K.: Elsevier Science.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 37*(20), 15–24.

Elmore, R. (2003). *Knowing the right thing to do: School improvement and performance-based accountability.* Washington, DC: NGA Center for Best Practices.

Erickson, F. (1987). Conceptions of school culture. *Education Administration Quarterly, 23*(4), 11–24.

Flores, L. Y., Ojeda, L., Huang, Y. P., Gee, D., & Lee, S. (2006). The relation of acculturation, problem-solving appraisal, and career decision-making self-efficacy to Mexican American high school students' educational goals. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*(2), 260–266.

Frase, L. E. (2004). Refocusing the purposes of teacher supervision. In F. English & L. E. Frase (Eds.), *Handbook of educational administration* (pp. 430–462). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2003). *Change forces with a vengeance*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Hoy, A. W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(2), 479–507.

Hallinger, P., Bickman, L., & Davis, K. (1996). School context, principal leadership, and student reading achievement. *Elementary School Journal, 96*(5), 527–549.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lambert, L. (2002). A framework for shared leadership. *Educational Leadership, 59*(8), 37–40.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999a). *The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school*.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999b). The relative effects of principal and teacher sources of leadership on student engagement with school. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*, 679–706.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999c). Transformational school leadership effects: A replication. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 10*(4), 451–479.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). A review of transformational school leadership research 1996-2005. *Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4*, 177–199.

Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2006). Transformational school leadership for large-scale reform: Effects on students, teachers, and their classroom practices. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 201–227.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., Earl, L., Watson, N., Levin, B., & Fullan, M. (2004). Strategic leadership for large-scale reform: The case of England's national literacy and numeracy strategy. *School Leadership and Management, 24*(1), 57–79.

Leithwood, K., Steinbach, R., & Jantzi, D. (2002). School leadership and teachers' motivation to implement accountability policies. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(1), 94–119.

Lent, R. W., Schmidt, J., & Schmidt, L. (2006). Collective efficacy beliefs in student work teams: Relation to self-efficacy, cohesion, and performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68*(1), 73–84.

Lezotte, L. W. (1997). *Learning for all*. Okemos, MI: Effective Schools Products.

Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*(3), 385–425.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning.

McDonald, D. (2002b). No Child Left Behind Act mandates assessment measures. *Momentum, 33*(3), 8–10.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morris, R. C. (1999). School leadership for the 21st century: Seeds for change. *Educational Horizons, 77*(2), 95–100.

NASE. (1999). *Leading America's schools: The critical role of the principal*.

Nicolaidou, M., & Ainscow, M. (2005). Understanding failing schools: Perspectives from the inside. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 16*(3), 229–248.

Packer, J. (2004). *No Child Left Behind and adequate yearly progress fundamental flaws: A forecast for failure*: National Education Association.

Pallant, J. (2005). *SPSS survival manual* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Open University Press.

Pollard-Durodola, S. (2003). Wesley Elementary: A beacon of hope for at-risk students. *Education and Urban Society, 36*(1), 94–117.

Porter, K., & Soper, S. (2003). Closing the achievement gap: Urban schools. *CSR Connection*.

Reeves, D. B. (2004). The 90/90/90 schools: A case study. In *Accountability in action: A blueprint for learning organizations* (2nded., pp.185–208). unknown: Advanced Learning Press.

Rooney, J. (2003). Principals who care: A personal reflection. *Educational Leadership, 60*(6), 76–78.

Rooney, J. (2004). Sharing the decisions. *Educational Leadership, 62*(3), 84–85.

Schein, H. E. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schwartz, W. (2003). Class size reduction and urban students. *ERIC Digest*.

Senge, P. (2000). *Schools that learn*. New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2004). Collaborative cultures and communities of practice. *Principal Leadership, 5*(2), 49–52.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2005). The virtues of leadership. *Educational Forum, 69*(2), 112–123.

Sheppard, B. (1996). Exploring the transformational nature of instructional leadership. *Alberta Journal of Educational Journal, XLII*(4), 325–344.

Slater, P. (2005). *O'Connell releases list of 2005-2006 PI schools and districts; CDE updates 2005 accountability progress reports.* Retrieved September 23, 2006, from http://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/ne/yr05/yr05rel112.asp.

Smith, M. K. (2001). Chris Argyris: Theories of action, double-loop learning and organizational learning. *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education*.

Smith, W., Guarino, A., Strom, P., & Adams, O. (2006). Effective teaching and learning environments and principal efficacy. *Journal of Research for Educational Leaders, 3*(3), 4–23.

Spillane, J. P. (2005). Distributed leadership. *Educational Forum, 69*(2), 143–150.

Waters, J. T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement. A working paper*.

Waters, J. T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2004). Leadership that sparks learning. *Educational Leadership, 61*(7), 48.

Wendel, F. C., Hoke, F. A., & Joekel, R. G. (1993). Project success: Outstanding principals speak out. *Clearing House, 67*(1), 52–54.

Wood, R., & Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Academy of Management Review, 14*(3), 361–384.