THE PRINCIPAL AS LEADER: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTION LEADERSHIP
AND CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

A Dissertation

by

DELMA ALEIDA YZAGUIRRE

BA, Texas A&I University-Kingsville, 1983
MS, Texas A&M University-Kingsville, 1994

DOCTOR of EDUCATION

in

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
Corpus Christi, Texas

May 2017

THE PRINCIPAL AS LEADER: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTION LEADERSHIP
AND CAMPUS ACCOUNTABILITY RATINGS IN THE STATE OF TEXAS

A Dissertation

by

DELMA ALEIDA YZAGUIRRE

This dissertation meets the standards for scope and quality of
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi and is hereby approved.

Randall Bowden, PhD
Chair

Kamiar Kouzekanani, PhD
Co-Chair

Phyllis Robertson, PhD
Committee Member

Mohan Rao, PhD
Graduate Faculty Representative

May 2017

ABSTRACT

In a time when high stakes testing dominates the education environment, leadership is even more imperative for school success. The study examined the relationship between motion leadership traits and demographic characteristics of principals in the state of Texas according to their campus accountability ratings. Using a self-developed instrument, Motion Leadership Questionnaire, 251 principals participated in the study across the state. A correlational research design was utilized to describe the relationship between six motion leadership traits and campus accountability ratings of met standard or improvement required. Motion leadership traits involved (a) love your employees, (b) connect peers with purpose, (c) capacity building prevails, (d) learning is the work, (e) transparency rules, and (f) systems learn. Additionally, relationships between motion leadership traits and demographic characteristics were examined. They included (a) gender, (b) ethnicity, (c) education level, (d) campus type (elementary, middle, high), (e) campus or district classification (rural, urban, suburban), (f) years of experience as an educator, (g) years of experience as a campus principal, and (h) years of experience as the principal. Results showed no statistically significant differences between met standard and improvement required schools among principals. Regardless of demographic characteristics, principals identified the six motion leadership traits in the same order. Implications suggest a high stakes environment as a system can hinder the efforts of the most capable leader. Moreover, no single leadership style can be identified linked to school ratings. Future research should compare various leadership styles of principals and rating outcomes while controlling for demographic characteristics.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Hector. Thank you for your unconditional love and support, but most of all for always being my biggest cheerleader!   Your constant encouragement in all my pursuits has always sustained me and allowed me to pursue all my dreams and aspirations! I love you to the moon and back!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my chair, Dr. Randall Bowden, for your support and leadership throughout this six-year journey. I appreciate you sticking with me through thick and thin for the last six years! I would also like to thank Dr. Kouzekanani for his patience!

Thank you to my daughter, Ciera and my son-in-law, Louis for all your love and support! To my grandchildren, Loki and Samara, I did this for you so that one day you too will be inspired to achieve your greatest dreams! I love you all to the moon and back! Thank you to my parents Maggie and Bruno for teaching me the importance of education, and to my brother Pete who reminds me every day how much he believes in his amazing big sister!

Thank you to my writing buddy, Kandee Richardson, and to her family for allowing me to come over and write every Monday and Wednesday night for the last two years. Thank you for supporting me so that I could accomplish such an integral part of my dissertation writing and this doctorate degree! Thank you to my friends who are like the sisters I never had, Pamela Wright and Dr. Angela Portis-Woodson for all those inspiring words and the "kick in the pants" to finish! Thank you to my friends for always being proud of my endeavors! Thank you to my Barnes Family for the encouraging words and your love and kindness these last four years!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background and Setting

The role of the school principal has always been a demanding one. Principals were once only responsible for maintenance and operation of the school, managing the budget, and dealing with discipline. Today their roles differ since they are now accountable for the scores on high stakes tests and public school reform. Federal and state requirements require no child be left behind or more recently that every child succeed. The new accountability system that has dawned in Texas with the latest version of a high stakes standardized test, the State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) also raises the bar because after two years of failing to meet the state accountability requirements the campus principal along with the whole staff must reapply for their jobs. Moreover, in the 21st century, the demand for a competitive workforce, innovative technologies, social media, and the changing global economy have brought an emergence of diverse and more challenging expectations of the school principal. Rousmaniere (2013) described the role of the principal as someone who wears many hats and moves quickly between multiple roles. They are expected to be a building manager, supervisor, educator, inspirational leader, child advocate, promoter of large-scale initiatives and a crisis-negotiator, all the while raising student's standardized-test performance.

Can a principal fulfill all those responsibilities amid the increased demand for him or her to lead a comprehensive and complex instructional reform of their campus in order to meet the accountability standards required by the state and federal government? The answer is: not very well and not for very long. Thus, the job of the principal is to find and identify the expertise, skills, and abilities of the staff on the campus. The principal then cultivates their expertise, skills

and abilities and glues them together. This allows the principal and the school organization to move forward, be more successful and effective, thus allowing principals the opportunity to keep their sanity and have a life beyond their work at school (Wallace, 2012).

Fullan (2014) suggested that principals are called to be instructional leaders and are expected to spend more time on instruction. However, studies cited by Fullan showed that the time principals are spending on instruction is time not well spent and is not yielding the intended results. Dufour and Marzano (2011) described how the men and women leading our schools are being asked to raise academic standards for all students regardless of race, socioeconomic status, or academic achievement gaps. Dufour and Marzano, in summarizing several studies conducted from 1978 to 2001, arrived at the conclusion that powerful school leadership on the part of the principal has a positive but indirect effect on student achievement. Historically, principals have not focused on how to directly influence what teachers do in their classrooms, and principals do not have all of the knowledge, skills, or energy to fulfill multiple responsibilities simultaneously. In a new era of accountability, and standards-based reform a different conceptualization of the school administrator has emerged, they must become leaders of learning. They are principals who can grow a team of teacher leaders who successfully collaborate to deliver effective instruction to their students (Wallace, 2012).

Public education needs principals who no longer function simply as building managers. Principals must become leaders of learning. Thus, if schools are going to be successful and support students with diverse needs to meet the passing standards of high stakes standardized testing set by the federal and state governments, principals cannot be the only ones in the organization doing the learning and the leading (Fullan, 2010).

High stakes standardized testing has been in place in Texas since 1979 when the Texas State Legislature passed Senate Bill 350 which required the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and every school district in Texas to administer a basic skills test, the Texas Assessment of Basic Skills (TABS), the first statewide test. The purpose of this test was to provide schools with information on the gaps in student's learning. In 1983, for the first time in Texas, the results of the statewide assessment were published. In 1984, the legislature amended the language of the authorizing legislation and required TEA to administer a more rigorous test that assessed student's minimum skills, the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS). For the first time in Texas students were denied their diplomas, if they were unable to pass the graduation-level TEAMS assessment. The results of the TEAMS test were also published in the local newspapers of the respective school districts. In a short period of time, the purpose of assessments had gone from TABS, an assessment that collected information about a student's academic deficiencies, to TEAMS, an assessment of student's mastery of curriculum-specific skills. High stakes testing was the new norm in Texas public education.

In the late 1980s, the language of the Texas Education Code was changed yet again and a new era of assessment and accountability was ushered into public education in Texas. The Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) was first administered in 1990. The TAAS test transitioned Texas public school campuses to an era of accountability based on student performance on the TAAS test. The TAAS when compared to its predecessors, TABS and TEAMS was now the highest stakes assessment in the history of Texas public education. Each campus principal's job performance was now being judged based on the Academic Excellence Indicator System. This accountability system used students' scores to rate the campus as Exemplary, Recognized, Acceptable, or Unacceptable (Cruse & Twing, 2000). High stakes

testing and the role of the campus principal as a change agent and instructional leader were about to shift in a different, extremely accountable direction.

The federal government under President George W. Bush's administration signed the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2001, which now required schools to ensure that students made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading and math and held schools accountable for the academic progress of all students. Additionally, NCLB held schools accountable for closing the gap for certain student groups such as English-language learners, students in special education, and poor and minority children whose achievement has typically lagged that of their peers. If schools failed to meet the AYP standard as detailed in NCLB, then campuses were given a failing grade by the federal government. Thus, the campus principal's ability to lead a campus was also being scrutinized by the federal government. The implementation of NCLB and the newest high stakes test, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), which was designed to meet the requirements of NCLB, led to major concerns among school district superintendents. The concerns included that TAKS and NCLB required too much testing which resulted in the loss of instructional time, there was not enough funding to implement changes, and finally that the testing added too much stress to principals, teachers, and students (Harris, Irons, & Crawford, 2006). Unfortunately, the Texas legislature was about to raise the high stakes test bar much higher.

The Texas legislature was being pressured by businesses because they complained that high school seniors were graduating without the necessary skills to successfully enter the workforce. The Texas legislature was also being pressured by higher education. Colleges and universities criticized public education because high school seniors were graduating and were not college ready as evidenced by the record number of college freshmen enrolling in remedial

courses. If the state of Texas was to continue its competitive edge in the global economy, an educated, competent workforce was needed (Perryman, 2007). This pressure resulted in the Texas Legislature steering a reorganization of the state learning standards, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills, the high stakes standardized test and a new accountability system by which campuses would now be measured (Creusere, Fletcher, Klepfer, & Norman, 2015).

The (STAAR), the fifth and current assessment in the series is, in the opinion of the state legislature, the solution to provide a work-ready workforce and college-ready students. This test ushered in a new era of standardized testing and accountability for campus principals, teachers, and students in Texas. The STAAR, a more rigorous test, assessed the student's readiness for subsequent grades, courses, and ultimately, college and career. The test contained more questions than its predecessor, TAKS. The new more difficult construct of the STAAR test questions would require students to do more thinking and unlike the prior assessments it would have to be completed within a 4-hour time limit. More importantly, to receive a passing score, students would have to get more items correct than on TAKS. Students would receive a score of unsatisfactory, satisfactory, or advanced academic performance.

The accountability standard for campuses under the STAAR also changed. Campuses would be measured by four indexes. Index 1 measured the overall performance of students on all tests administered. Index 2 measured the students' progress from grade level to grade level, in other words, whether the school succeeded in moving the student academically from one grade to the next. Index 3 measured the ability of the campus to close the achievement gap between economically disadvantaged students and the largest ethnicity group on the campus. Index 4 measured whether the students who took the STAAR test were ready to learn the standards at the next grade level, thus ensuring that they would be college ready. If the campus

met the standard in all indexes, they are scored as a *met standard* school. If the campus failed to meet the standard on any one of the indexes, the campus would be rated as does not meet the state standard; therefore, rated as an *improvement required* school. Should a campus fail to meet the standard for 2 consecutive years, TEA requires that the school campus be reconstituted. Reconstitution requires that every member of the staff, including the principal, on an *improvement required* campus must reapply for their position (TEA, 2013).

In 2015, the Texas Legislature passed House Bill 2804 which changed the accountability system yet again. The new accountability system would assign letter grades of A, B, C, D or F on each of five domains. A campus receiving an A would be considered exemplary, a B would be considered recognized, a C would be acceptable but a D or F would be considered unacceptable, much like the accountability system that was in place several years ago when TAKS was the state assessment and schools were rated exemplary, recognized or unacceptable. The domains include measuring student achievement on all tests, student's progress, closing the gap for low socio-economic students, post-secondary readiness and the level of parent and community involvement. The school and the district would also receive an overall letter grade. This accountability system will debut August of 2018 (TEA, 2017). Opponents of this accountability system are concerned and believe that this new letter grade rating of a school would stigmatize schools and communities, especially when receiving a D or an F.

In 2015, President Obama signed Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) a reauthorization of NCLB. This act goes into effect for the 2017-2018 school year. The ESSA also requires states to test students once a year in grades 3-8 and once in high school in reading and math. States will also be required to identify those groups of students that are the furthest behind and close gaps in achievement and graduation rates (Klein, 2016). Additionally, principals are

responsible for the success of the campus and if they are unable to turn the school around after four years the principal can be fired and the school taken over by the state education agency (Klein, 2016).

How is a principal supposed to effectively lead change on his or her campus to meet the demands of a new accountability system? More importantly, how can a principal effect change instructionally so that his or her teachers and students are prepared for whichever accountability system Texas implements? Most principals are not equipped with the knowledge and skills to be the sole instructional leader or change agent needed to successfully lead 21st century campuses in this new era of standards based reform and accountability (Wallace, 2012). It is unreasonable to expect that one individual, the principal, can accomplish change on his or her own (Green, 2010). Principals, as the main source of leadership influence in the school building only have a indirect impact on improved student achievement. Yet principals are given the responsibility in this era of accountability to ensure academic achievement for all students. However, the challenge that principals are faced with daily is that they do not have all the knowledge and skills needed to achieve academic success for all students. Thus, when individuals assume the role of a principal of a school in the 21st century, they cannot expect to move the needle forward toward academic success for all students without collaboration. Collaboration requires principals and teachers to work together and when they do improved student achievement occurs (Wallace, 2013).

Improving school leadership ranks high on the list of priorities for school reform. In a survey, school and district administrators, policymakers, and others declared the importance of principal leadership as among the most pressing matters on a list of issues in public school education (Wallace, 2012). Teacher quality stood above everything else, but principal leadership

came next, outstripping subjects including dropout rates, science, technology, engineering and math education, student testing, and preparation for college and careers (Wallace 2012). Traditionally, the principal resembled a middle manager, an overseer of buses, boilers, and books. School districts in the process of public education reform planning had come to realize that the campus principal would now have to be an integral part of the reform movement (Wallace 2012). The effective principal could not only be a transformational leader or an instructional leader, but a *leader of learners* (Fullan, 2014).

In a rapidly changing era of standards-based reform and accountability, a different concept was emerging, away from the transformational or instructional leader. It was one closer to the model suggested by Collins' (2001), which draws lessons from contemporary corporate life to suggest that leadership should focus with great clarity on what is essential, what needs to be done, and how to get it done. This shift brings with it dramatic changes in what public education would need from principals. Principals would no longer be building managers. Their primary role would no longer encompass adhering to district policies and carrying out those regulations and avoiding mistakes. They must become leaders of learners who can develop a team delivering effective instruction resulting in student success (Wallace, 2012).

Fullan (2014) also maintained that the roles and responsibilities principals must fulfill have changed dramatically in the last decade. Principals must learn how to effectively lead in a culture of change. Bringing about positive change on a large scale is very complex, and requires a different type of leader than those described by Bass (1985).

Bass (1985) described three types of instructional leaders, the transactional, transformational, and laissez-faire principal. The transactional leader is passive and creates systems for rewarding followers for their efforts and recognizes superior performance but if the

8

followers do not meet the expected goals for achievement then the transactional leader intervenes using corrective action to improve performance. The transformation leader seeks to transform the campus through a shared mission that raises the bar, inspires teachers, and closes the gaps for students. This type of leadership has short-lived results because creating the idea of a shared vision and motivating teachers to do the same is not specific enough to produce results. Laissez-faire leadership, as explained in Bass's (1985) leadership model, is referred to as a lack of leadership within the organization. Principals avoid making decisions and solving problems and are absent when needed, failing to follow-up with requests for assistance.

Fullan (2014) explained that principals who are instructional leaders have a narrow focus on instruction and, as he illustrated, the principal becomes a micromanager of instruction, which is counter-productive to a school's success. The principals, as instructional leaders, are expected to supervise individual teachers into better performances. This is not an easy task when a campus has 20 to 30 teachers to support and who find the principal in their classroom is a nuisance or not needed. The principal's time is not utilized effectively in an era of accountability where the stakes are high, attempting to influence one teacher at a time is counterproductive and ineffective. Unfortunately, when forced to make a choice, principals resort to managing rather than leading (Dufour & Marzano, 2011).

Statement of the Problem

If today's principals are to move beyond being a transformational or instructional leader to a leader of learners, they should know, learn, and utilize the leadership traits that allow them to do so (Fullan, 2014). However, to encourage principals to move in this direction, there needs to be data-based evidence to show the relationship between principals as leaders of learning, who organize their teachers cooperatively. The results of this type of leadership should be measured

9

by instructional outcomes on high stakes standardized tests. Although Fullan stated that principals who implement the six traits of motion leadership have successful outcomes, in Texas there is a lack of data to support this assertion.

Theoretical Framework

The study was grounded in Michael Fullan's (2010) theoretical framework of motion leadership, which he explained as the ability of a change savvy leader to bring about reform and change in the status quo. Motion leadership is the ability to move individuals, institutions, and whole systems forward. The motion leader thinks of change as movement, positive motion, all of which occur in new and improved directions on a school campus.

The principal must be change savvy and know how to change the campus' direction for the better. Fullan (2008) outlined six secrets of change that the best leaders have employed to ensure that their organizations survive and thrive. Fullan's first secret describes the importance of loving employees. Leaders must invest in their employees as well as build relationships and trust. They must give employees an opportunity to continuously learn and find meaning in their work. Additionally, the employees must find meaning in the relationships they have with their coworkers and with the campus or district.

Fullan's second secret is connecting peers with purpose. The leader must implement strategies that foster continuous and purposeful peer interactions. Change will occur and take effect when the employees fall in love with their peers, not their leaders. Therefore, the role of the leader is to enable, facilitate, and cause peers to interact with a purpose. The leader will also participate as a learner and assisting the teacher to achieve school-wide improvement and reform. Capacity building allows for an increase in effective instructional practices and a shared sense of purpose.

Fullan's third secret is capacity building prevails. Leaders hire talented people with the potential and capacity to continue to learn and acquire skills. The leader can then invest in the development of the individual as well as the whole group to accomplish significant improvements. Employees are provided with opportunities for continuous learning that equals continual capacity building.

Fullan's fourth secret is learning is the work. Learning the work is defined as the way that organizations address their core goals and tasks with relentless consistency. Effective organizations acknowledge that working and learning to work better are one in the same.

Fullan's fifth secret is transparency rules. Transparency is defined as assessing, communicating, and acting on data pertaining to the what, how, and outcomes of change efforts. There must be a clear and continuous display of results and the instructional practices that produce the results.

Fullan's sixth secret is systems learn which is defined as continuous learning or sustained learning within the organization. People acquire new knowledge all the time and should be motivated to deepen their commitment. Therefore, the role of the leader is to sustain the learning.

Fullan (2011) described the best way to keep these secrets is to share them. The principal models the secrets and grows more leaders who also understand the secrets and use and teach them. Implementing these strategies and developing new leaders become one in the same. Once a culture of leaders is created within the organization they support one another and change will be sustained. It does not have to be lonely or stressful in the principal's office, change can be accomplished even during these challenging times in education (Gill, 2012).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to (a) document the motion leadership characteristics of Texas public school principals and (b) examine the relationships between the traits of motion leadership and selected demographic characteristics of the principals with the accountability rating of their campus. The study will be guided by the following research questions.

1. What are the motion leadership characteristics of Texas public school district principals?

2. What are the relationships between Texas public school principals' motion leadership traits and their selected demographic characteristics and the accountability rating of their campuses?

Operational Definitions

For the purpose of the study, the following operational definitions were employed:

Motion leadership is measured by the respondents' responses to the 36-item Motion Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), which is explained in Chapter 3.

Accountability rating was measured as a binary variable: (a) met standard and (b) improvement required.

The study's demographic characteristic variables are gender, ethnicity, age, education level, years of experience as a campus principal, years of experience as an educator, and years of experience as the principal on the campus with the accountability rating. The study also added two more demographic characteristic variables of type of campus (elementary, middle, high) and district or campus classification (rural, urban, suburban).

Public school principals refer to all elementary and secondary principals as listed in the TEA's directory as of 2016-2017 school year.

Glossary of Terms

Love your employees. The construct definition of love your employees' states that administrators should build relationships equally with teachers, students, and parents; for example, I provide emotional support for my teachers to do their work, (Fullan, 2014).

Connect peers with purpose. The construct definition of connect peers with purpose states that administrators must recruit, hire, train, and retain the best teachers (Fullan, 2014). An example of an operational statement is: I foster purposeful peer interactions for my teachers to learn from one another.

Capacity building prevails. The construct definition of capacity building prevails entails that the administrator encourages the teachers to work with a shared purpose using the knowledge and skills they have individually and collectively to get things done (Fullan, 2014). An example of an operational statement is: I create opportunities for my teachers to develop their content knowledge.

Learning is the work. The construct definition of learning is the work is defined as the process in which the administrator and teachers address their core goals and tasks with fidelity and relentless consistency (Fullan, 2014). An example of an operational statement is: I create systemic behaviors that allow us to consistently monitor the effectiveness of the campus goals based on the perspective of the teachers.

Transparency rules. The construct definition of transparency rules asserts that is very important that administrators and teachers use data to assess, communicate, and then act on the information to impact the what, how, and outcomes of the change efforts (Fullan, 2014). An example of an operational statement is: I share state assessment data about our campus with my teachers.

Systems Learn. The construct definition of learning is the work states that the teachers and administrators provide sustained learning on the campus and the principal is primarily in charge of sustaining the learning (Fullan, 2014). An example of an operational statement is: I am a confident campus principal, open to new ideas.

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations

The study was limited to the principals that completed the survey, which were 239 principals from the met standard campuses and 12 from the improvement required campuses for a total of 251 completed surveys. There was a homogeneity of results, because there was not a wide variance of responses of the principals from either the met standard or improvement required campuses. Principal's schedules might have limited the time they spent responding to the survey or not responding at all. Principals are tasked with running a campus and it leaves little time or possibly interest in other matters. Additionally, the principal's interest in the topic of the survey could have influenced participation. Moreover, the assumption that the principals would complete the survey instrument honestly was a limitation because the researcher's survey could not control for types of responses. The validity of the researcher's survey was also a limitation. The results of the sixth trait of Fullan's Motion Leadership, systems learn, was not used because it did not meet the internal reliability of Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha.

Delimitations

The timing of the distribution of the survey was chosen as it fit with the researcher's schedule. The study was delimited to all Texas public school principals at elementary, middle, and high schools for the 2015-2016 school year. The survey was distributed November 2016. There tends not to be a best time to distribute a survey given the types responsibilities principals have in an academic year. The variables of interest were delimited to Fullan's six motion leadership traits, the accountability rating of the campus, and selected demographics of the respondents. These variables have not been previously examined in the state of Texas. The statistical analysis of the results should have examined the difference of the mean scores of motion leadership traits among the met standard schools to determine if the traits differed statistically, as traits were rank ordered. Finally, the researcher provided alternative explanations of why the results might have occurred as they did, since Fullan's (2008) motion leadership as the theoretical framework did not reveal statistical significance. Thus, alternative theories and concepts were explored as possible insights into the data and results.

<div align="center">

Significance of the Study

</div>

The role of the educational leader has changed dramatically and is wrought with all types of issues, each one with its own challenges. Wallace (2012) presented that issues such as accountability, building maintenance or keeping up with technology as issues that need to be taken on one at a time with solutions found for each one, but that approach is neither realistic nor a best-practice approach. The increasing complexity of the principal's job makes distributing leadership a survival tactic as well as a good organizational strategy. There must be a combined effort and shared responsibility for leadership if sustained change is going to occur. The school leader cannot accomplish it alone, even as a superhero. Looking for the panacea for each of the

issues is not practical and the solutions do not usually yield long-term results, which are not sustainable (Supovitz, 2000).

Upon completion of this study the researcher will gain important knowledge regarding the extent of the use of motion leadership by campus principals in Texas and the relationship between principals who implement motional leadership and the accountability rating of their school campus. There is a gap in the research on the use of motion leadership by a campus principal to effect positive change on the campus. The results of this study will benefit campus principals as they work to effect sustained, positive change on their campuses as they work to improve their campus accountability rating and the success of their campus, teachers and students.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Much information is available on leadership styles of principals and the effects of those styles on student achievement. Chapter II is organized into the following areas: history of the principalship; leadership styles; transactional leadership; transformational leadership; laissez-faire leadership; instructional leadership and motion leadership; love your employees; connect peers with purpose; capacity building prevails; learning is the work; transparency rules; systems learn; history of standardized testing in Texas; and summary.

History of the Principalship

The role of principals and the training they have received over the last 150 years are as varied as the roles the principal has assumed in the school building. In the earliest period, between 1820 and 1899, principals were not a recognized profession and did not require training (Lashway, 1999). The first position to be created was that of a principal teacher. This person had teaching duties, but also performed administrative duties that kept the school in order. These included assigning classes, taking attendance, assessing consequences to students for the violation of school rules, maintenance of the building, and making sure that school started and ended on time (Kafka 2009). The role of the principal was considered vital and in the larger cities was recognized as an important head of the school. A superintendent of schools in Chicago declared that the role of the principal was so significant he was solely responsible for the success of the school (Kafka, 2009).

From 1900 to 1946, development of formal leadership programs occurred wherein professors, who had once been school district superintendents trained individuals who aspired to

be principals. The preparation programs centered on the leadership skills required for a principal in that time, not necessarily a preparation program for the principalship as it might exist in the future (Lashway, 1999). From 1947 to 1985, a more theoretical approach to training of principals replaced the accepted norm of decision-making by principals. Finally, from 1986 to 1999 a transformation of administrator preparation programs began to occur, which included rigorous standards and accountability of school administrators by the districts (Lashway 1999). Principal preparation and training programs were modified to create principals as instructional leaders (Hallinger & Hausman, 1993).

Leadership Styles

Although the principal's role did not change much for nearly a century, a shift in the principal's responsibility and more importantly in their expected leadership role began to emerge. In the 1980s and early 1990s principals began to move from being managers to instructional leaders. This new role was essential because the primary focus of the principal shifted to student achievement and preparing students for the 21st century (Leithwood, 1992). Bass (1985) developed a model that identified three types of leadership styles adapted by principals: transactional; transformational; and laissez-faire.

Transactional Leadership

The transactional leadership style is sometimes referred to as bartering where services are exchanged for rewards. According to Bass and Avolio (1994), transactional leaders share many of the same characteristics as the principal who was the building manager prior to the 1980s. As a transactional leader, the principal is the dominant leader, and the teachers are the followers. For transactional leadership to be effective, both parties must agree with the work that is to be performed (Burns, 1978). Hackman and Johnson (2013) described the transactional leader as

being most concerned with the basic needs of the followers, such as their physiological needs, safety and their need to belong. The transactional leader is passive and creates systems for rewarding followers for their efforts and recognizes satisfactory performance. Conversely, if the followers do not meet the expected goals for achievement then the transactional leader intervenes using corrective action to improve performance. The transactional leader rejects change and strives to maintain the status quo. This style of leadership fails to motivate others to improve (Leithwood, 1992).

Northouse (2013) indicated that transactional leaders have two major characteristics. First, contingent rewards are a fundamental component. The relationship between leaders and followers is based on specific transactions. Subordinates agree to specific performance behaviors in exchange for precise rewards. Second, transactional leaders manage by exception. It involves "corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement" (p. 195). The transactional leader monitors followers' actions and looks for mistakes or noncompliance of rules. Once identified corrective action is taken by the leader. Moreover, Sugiyama et al. (2016) related that in the past a transactional style in school leadership tended to be gender based. They reported males are more transactional whereas females are more transformational. They found transactional leaders in education to be business driven, self-wellness instead of other-wellness oriented, and advancement centered. It is important to note that transactional leadership is not a masculine identity or relationship-oriented dependent (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003). It often is a matter of creating an educational environment where operations are focused on business impact (Sugiyama et al., 2016).

Since the 1980s education has been transformed toward an accountability system to measure performance and ensure competition and efficiency based on a business model (Hayes,

2016).   Milligan (2015) wrote the business model is framed with accountability. Whereas school performance is ultimately placed within the principals' realm of responsibilities, they are accountable for standards placed on them (Wiecsorek, 2017) in the high stakes test evaluated system as the central indicator to assess public school effectiveness (West, Peck, Reitzug, & Crane, 2014).   In this environment, principals have been elevated to key players for school improvement, as reflected in standardized test scores.   Additionally, they have been positioned as central figures responsible for policies and practices meant to turn around the nation's 5000 poor performing schools (West, Peck, Reitzug, & Crane, 2014).   With a heightened level of accountability thrust on principals, they have been forced to change their organizational routines (Spillane, Parise, & Sherer, 2011).   In environments of limited control and relentless accountability (West, Peck, and Reitzug 2010), school leaders tend to focus on maintaining the status quo and expect followers to meet expected goals characteristic of transactional leadership, such as those found in test scores (Knapp & Feldman, 2012).   It is suggested that the high stakes test evaluated environment is based on a transactional system where corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative reinforcement are necessary for success.   For example, in Texas either schools meet standards or are placed on improvement required status and after two years of this rating the complete staff (principals and teachers) must reapply for their jobs, strict improvement plans are implemented by state and district officials and curricular modifications are mandated (TEA, 2013).

Transformational Leadership

A transformational leader is defined as a style of leadership that a principal or leader of an organization adopts. The principal, who is defined as a transformational leader, works with

the teachers and staff to identify a need in the organization and then creates a mission and vision to guide the change by restructuring the system for goal accomplishment (Leithwood, 1992).

The role of the principal changed once again in the 1990s to the transformational approach to leadership which is the second type of leadership described in Bass's (1985) leadership model. The principal was no longer viewed as being the sole leader within the school, instead, all employees were deemed as having leadership capabilities, which needed to be cultivated by the principal. Leithwood et al. (1999) considered the transformational leader as having the power to persuade others to change. By acting as a change agent, a shared vision is created for the school (Howell & Avolio, 1993). Additionally, Sergiovanni (1999) noted that transformational leadership motivates staff members to have a higher level of commitment to the organization.

Transformational leadership has been criticized because it can be used as a vehicle by the leader for control over the teachers (Bush, 2007). The successful transformational leader has been defined as an individual with charismatic traits. These charismatic traits can lead the transformational leader to potentially abuse their power, which is counterproductive to the success of public schools (Bush, 2007).

Charismatic leaders tend to be dominant and self-confident, have an immense desire to influence others, and have high moral standards. They are highly motivating and competent as they set ambitious standards and expectations for followers to meet. Followers tend to adopt a charismatic leader's ideology without question. They identify with the leader and are emotionally invested. Whereas transactional leadership focuses on expected results, transformational leadership is centered on performance that exceeds expectations (Northouse, 2013).

In organizations, transformational leadership attempts to change system values to exhibit standards of fairness and justice. The expectation is that leaders and followers will develop a stronger set of moral values. Often, this is done by encouraging followers to develop innovative ways to deal with organizational issues, whereas transactional leaders maintain the status quo (Northouse, 2013). Nevertheless, transformational leadership theory remains immensely popular as a preferred style among principals in school settings. "Transformational leadership, though a theoretical model originating in studies of corporate and political leadership, appeared suitable to the needs of schools as they evolved and restructured in response to academic needs across the nation" (Ross & Cozzens, 2016, p. 163).

Transformational leadership's effectiveness, however popular, has come under scrutiny in the school setting. Allen, Grigsby, and Peters (2015) found that transformational leadership was not correlated to student achievement as defined by standardized testing according to federal and state mandates as viewed by teachers assessing their principals from six elementary school campuses in southeast Texas. Ross and Cozzens' (2016) research results disagreed with Allen, Grigsby, and Peters when they studied 314 teachers from elementary and high schools in Tennessee. Their study stated that transformational leadership was an ideal management style and school leadership must support their teams to do their best. McCarley, Peters, and Decman (2016) found mixed results. In a study of 399 teachers' views of their principals from five high schools in southeast Texas, McCarley, Peters, and Decman (2016) found a positive relationship between transformational leadership factors and teacher engagement. However, they found there was a negative relationship between leadership factors and teachers sense of frustration, regardless of the presence of transformational leadership. Overall, transformational leadership

cannot be viewed as the best leadership style for principals and their influence on campus performance.

Laissez-Faire Leadership

Laissez-faire leadership, as explained in Bass's (1985) leadership model, is referred to as a lack of leadership within the organization. Principals who assume this approach to leadership avoid making decisions and solving problems, are absent when needed, and fail to follow-up with requests for assistance. Hackman and Johnson (2013) stated that laissez-faire is a French word that translated means leave them alone or is considered a non-leader. The laissez-faire leader offers little or no guidance, feedback or support to their followers. Instead they provide their followers a high degree of autonomy and self-rule. Usually the laissez-faire leader does not make decisions unless they are asked by their followers or if a task needs to be completed. Of the three leadership styles described in Bass's model, laissez-faire leadership has been found to be the least effective (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

The hands-off leader does not build relationships nor supports their followers. Unlike the transformational leader or the instructional leader, followers with a passive leader will have low levels of motivation. These low levels of motivation can lead to other non-productive behaviors such as absenteeism and decreased productivity (Webb, 2007). Additionally, the laissez-faire leader does not accept responsibility for decisions, is not available when needed, does not follow up on requests for assistance and does not provide an opinion on important issues in the organization. In fact, the laissez-faire leader leaves the decision making to the followers, assuming they are intrinsically motivated and believing that they should be left alone to accomplish tasks. So, goals for campus are decided upon by the followers because they believe them to be important and in some instances, they might be missing the real needs of the campus.

The laissez-faire leaders do not provide direction or guidance to the campus (Jones and Rudd, 2008).

According to Kadi (2015), the leader of the school can be a determining factor as to whether a school will be successful. Thus, the laissez-faire leader who utilizes a hands-off approach would not be effective in today's high stakes testing and accountability environment. If leaders cannot solve problems alone and in isolation, followers cannot solve problems without collaboration and input from their leaders. Teachers want to feel supported, want to grow as a professional and want to be part of the decision-making process. A negative relationship exists between teachers and laissez-faire leaders (Kadi, 2015).

Instructional Leadership

During the effective schools' movement in the 1980s a different type of leadership evolved. Hallinger, (2003) created the instructional leader model that is most recognized. This model has three dimensions, defining the school's mission, managing the instructional program, and promoting a positive school-learning climate. The instructional leadership model identifies the principal as the primary source of educational expertise (Marks & Printy 2003). Principals were expected to be knowledgeable individuals with regards to organizing and coordinating the curriculum and instruction. Principals were also expected to know all the standards for all the academic content taught on the campus (Marks & Printy, 2003). For instructional leadership to be an effective model of leadership on a campus a principal must have certain pre-requisite skills. The principal must maintain exalted expectations for teachers and students. They also supervise the learning that occurs in the classroom, coordinate and ensure that the school's curriculum is being implemented, and monitor student progress. What is known is that most principals do not have the necessary expertise required to instructionally lead a campus because

they must coordinate, control, supervise, and develop the curriculum and instruction on the

campus, and they do not have the knowledge in all content areas to do so (Hallinger, 2003).

Stewart (2006) stated that the problem with the instructional leadership model for setting

the direction of the campus is flawed because the principal is required to be the educational

expert. Moreover, the instructional leader is hands on and works with teachers to make

instructional decisions and implement intervention strategies that will support students and the

campus, thus leading to success (Hallinger, 2003). Unfortunately, one leader alone cannot

sustain the long-term change needed for the organization to continue to thrive. In many

instances the principal is goal oriented and is focused on the improvement of student learning,

but many times this leads to a narrow mission (Hallinger, 2003).

Schools need many leaders at many levels to make the decisions that will positively

impact student achievement. If the goal is sustained continual improvement in that case the

instructional leadership model fails (Fullan, 2002). Additionally, there are principals who

perceive their role as a managerial one and distance themselves from the classroom.

As the roles and responsibilities of the principal and the accountability standards at both

the state and federal government have changed, there has been a shift in the style of leadership

needed to fulfill these demanding roles. In the 21st century, Fullan's (2008) belief is that a

successful leader must learn to manage change. Learning the six traits of motion leadership and

sharing them with the organization is how change can be managed successfully.

Motion Leadership

Fullan (2010) explained motion leadership as the ability of a change savvy leader to bring

about reform and change in the status quo. Motion leadership is the ability to move individuals,

institutions, and whole systems forward. Motion leadership can cause great new things to

happen. The motion leader thinks of change as movement, positive motion, all of which occur in new and improved directions. Motion leadership consists of six strategies that must be implemented in order for school campuses to be effective even though they are weighed down by high stakes testing and accountability.

Love your employees

Fullan (2008) identified the first secret of change as love your employees. For administrators that means loving the students and parents (customers), but equally as important, loving the teachers. Fullan (2001) stated that whether in business or education, leaders should focus on relationships. The first essential issue that educational leaders should attend to is building relationships and trust. Everything else is secondary and nothing will change, not culture or test scores, or even parent involvement if the educator does not build relationships. Relationships make the difference, impact change the most, and should be the number one priority for any educational leader who wants the school to not only survive, but also thrive.

The educational administrator must love the students and teachers. Change will not take place if the only role the principal has is that of manager. Only in the last few decades have academic achievement for every student been at the top of the list of the principal's agenda. Reform in education has called for the education of all children, which is sometimes referred to as *No Child Left Behind* or the reauthorized version, Every Student Succeeds Act, the federal government's call to action. Administrators cannot meet the new demands of educating students on their own. Principals must love their students and they must also love their teachers and value them. For it is only working and leading together that will yield change where both students and teachers will see and feel the success.

The school administrator must create conditions for teachers and students to succeed. Research has been done on the characteristics educational leaders must possess to be successful, such as the importance of having a vision (Leithwood, 1992). However, if the leader fails to create relationships built on mutual respect and trust, and these do not exist in the school environment, students and teachers are less likely to follow the vision and change cannot occur. How does the principal create conditions that can also be referred to as building a sense of community? The principal is seen as the key player in the school and is responsible for how the relationships are created, valued, sustained, and managed within the community (Quick & Normore, 2004).

Relationship building is not always easy. In an era of increased violence in the school setting, either due to bullying or individuals behaving badly, the principal is held responsible for the safety and security of all stakeholders. Established rules for behavior and consequences for misbehavior are important, but sustained change in behavior and the culture only occur when relationships are formed. The principal must continuously work to build relationships to create a climate in which everyone is treated equally and everyone lives by the golden rule. The principal models the expectation for how other members of the community go about building relationships and, like it or not, is the moral compass of the campus (Quick & Normore, 2004).

McGregor (1960) outlined two theories of human motivation concerning behavior in the workplace, Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X asserts that the average employee has little to no ambition, shies away from work or responsibilities, is not very intelligent and requires leaders that are hands on. Theory Y assumes, first, that if the job is satisfying, the result will be commitment to the organization. Second, the average person learns under proper conditions not only to accept, but also to seek responsibility. Finally, imagination, creativity, and ingenuity

can be used to solve work problems by many employees. Fullan (2008) explained that Theory Y

is how individuals want to behave in the workplace. The responsibility of principals is to love

their employees by treating them as professionals. The principal helps them find meaning,

increase their skills, and gives them opportunities to experience personal satisfaction by making

contributions that, at the same time, fulfill their goals and the goals of the community. Barber

and Mourshed (2007) found creating an environment that will unleash the creativity and

innovation of educators and other stakeholder groups is one of the most effective interventions

impacting school reform and student achievement. To that end, educational leaders have to

ensure they are constantly working within the community to build authentic relationships and

engaging all of the stakeholders in a dialogue about the functions of the school (Quick &

Normore, 2004).

If educational leaders are to successfully meet the educational needs of their students, a

reexamination of their priorities should occur. For example, they might point to a lack of funds

as a priority and increased funding to solve the lack of academic preparedness of students.

However, a shortage of funds is not as important as the job satisfaction a teacher will experience

if their principal creates opportunities for them to feel valued and gives them time to grow

professionally. Administrators can identify new interventions, buy technology and resources, but

if they do not take the time to build relationships, the changes will not be sustainable and

teachers and students will not benefit. If principals do not love their employees and do not create

the environment for the students and teachers to thrive, the school itself will not thrive, but more

importantly, change will not occur and the organization will remain stagnant.

Fullan (2001) pointed out that great leaders who build strong relationships are going to be

successful in leading within a culture of change. They do so because they have high emotional

intelligence (EQ). One of the characteristics of EQ is relationship management. Bradberry and Greaves (2009) reported that EQ is the single biggest predictor of performance in the workplace. The amount of EQ that a leader has or develops is twice as important as IQ. Educational leaders have a moral responsibility to make a difference in the lives of their students. However, if principals lack EQ and are seen as indifferent and insensitive or treat teachers unfairly, these educational leaders will find that when they look back, no one will be following them (Fullan 2001). Ultimately, the school principal, as a leader is responsible for shaping a vision of academic success based on high standards for all students and professional fulfillment for all teachers, however, the biggest impact on those two responsibilities is building relationships, trusting and loving the employees.

Connect peers with purpose

Collins (2001) stated that if organizations are going to go from good to great, the good to great leaders need to get the right people on the bus. The second critical issue facing public school administrators and the second item on the list of priorities must be to recruit, hire, train, and retain the best teachers and work to remove those teachers from the school that refuse to change. A study by Boyd, Grossman, Ing, Lankford, and Wyckoff (2009) identified that the influence of school administrators on teacher retention was significant. Teachers are leaving the profession and the lack of strong principal leadership is the primary reason. Schools that serve large populations of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds need to provide the most consistent and positive school experiences. Unfortunately, these are the schools where attrition is occurring, but not because of the students; it is due to the school's lack of leadership. When surveyed, teachers who left the profession explained they did so because they received poor administrative support and the administration did not encourage professional collaboration nor

foster communication. Additionally, teachers reported that the administration failed to motivate teachers and students, did not develop organizational structures to support instruction and learning, and did not have high performance expectations (NAESP, 2009). How do school principals develop organizational structures so that teachers are connected and have a purpose?

Fullan (2008) advised that educational leaders must create collaborative organizations. One such organization where the training of teachers can occur is professional learning communities. The creation of professional learning communities allows teachers to learn from each other. The components of professional learning communities include frequent conversations among teachers about pedagogy, consistent and well-defined learning expectations for children, and an atmosphere in which it is common for teachers to visit one another's classrooms to observe and critique instruction. Dufour and Eaker (1998) stated that if properly implemented, professional learning communities have the power to transform schools. The educational leader must guide the interaction that takes place in the professional learning communities so that the knowledge and skills the teachers are acquiring have a purpose. Additionally, the principal must encourage collaboration and provide time for teachers to work with one another and with the administration on a variety of activities that may include developing and aligning curriculum, sharing instructional practices, writing curriculum-aligned assessments, analyzing data, problem solving, and participating in peer observations. Principals who make collaboration a priority and play a major role in developing the professional community so that teachers can guide one another in the improvement of instruction are connecting peers with a purpose. When principals and teachers share leadership, teachers' working relationships with one another are stronger and student achievement is higher (Wallace 2012).

Theory Y speaks to the importance of professional learning communities and collaboration as they pertain to job satisfaction and commitment to the organization. Given the opportunity, teachers will come together in the organizational structure of a professional learning community to share ideas and find ways to engage students in learning that is rigorous and requires the use of critical thinking skills. They will use student assessment data to inform instruction and have high expectations for their students. Teachers will find job satisfaction through these experiences and will commit to the organization. The educational leader's role is to understand the importance of what motivates the behavior of the employee and to connect peers with a common purpose. Encouraging the teachers to take risks and be creative will impact student's achievement the most. The school principal must create a climate and a culture where a spirit of cooperation exists and flourishes; that is why teachers will commit their time and energy to the success of the school community.

Capacity building prevails

Fullan (2010) defined capacity building as the knowledge, skills, and disposition of people both individually but especially collectively. The educational leader is able to build capacity in teachers by encouraging them to work with a shared purpose and skill to get things done. This is the third issue and the third priority that educational leaders must address. For too long in education the norm has been for educators to shy away from the sharing of ideas and resources, or for leaders to use a top-down leadership approach. Creating teacher leaders is about empowering them to take action that transforms teaching and learning in a school. A central part of being a great leader is cultivating leadership in others by depending on them to accomplish the group's purpose. Principals need to encourage the development of leadership across the organization; the more willing they are to spread the leadership around, the better it is

for students and for their performance on standardized tests. With shared leadership comes a shared responsibility for student progress, which should be the norm in every school environment (Wallace 2012).

For example, transformational leaders create a climate in which teachers engage in continuous learning and in which they routinely share their learning with others. Transformational leaders work with others in the school community to identify personal goals and then link these to the broader organizational goals (Hallinger, 2003) which are commonly referred to as the school's mission and vision. Davis and Leon (2009) stated that leadership in schools must include the teachers as leaders too. When teachers share responsibility for the larger purposes of schooling and for the functions of school operations, and participate in them as members of a professional community, a school is more likely to function with utility of purpose and strategic focus. The 21st century point of view is that the potential to influence others and advance the practice of leadership does not reside solely in the principal's office. Schools thrive when principals play a major role in developing the capacity of all stakeholders. Teachers guide one another in improving instruction and soon this practice becomes part of the culture of the school community. Teachers learn to respect and care for one another.

A new model for leadership that has emerged in the last few years is distributed leadership (Dotson & Floyd, 2012). The work of distributed leadership is at the core of building capacity in others. Distributed leadership is the sharing, the spreading, and the distributing of leadership work across individuals and roles throughout the school organizations. School improvement must be effective, but for this to occur, it must also be with all personnel taking responsibility for improving the whole school. Through a leadership team approach, school leaders can promote all teachers as leaders by empowering their participation in school reform

efforts, inspiring them to become competent in their practice, encouraging their collaboration, and creating partnerships both within and beyond the walls of the school for the benefit of all students. Educators, leaders, and teachers alike, can increase their productivity if they learn to work together as professionals within a learning community (Dotson & Floyd 2012). Teachers as part of the leadership team can create long lasting transformation that will significantly impact student success. Effective educational leaders value the importance of building capacity in their teachers and should be persistent in these efforts.

Learning is the work

The fourth secret of change as described by Fullan (2010) is the way organizations address their core goals and tasks with relentless consistency. Collins' (2001) hedgehog concept is a similar model. If organizations are going to be successful they must confront the brutal facts and determine what they need to do to improve. Once they determine what that one thing that they are good at is, they stick to it. Organizations are then able to move from a good to a great organization. Similarly, campus administrators must determine what their campus' goals and or vision is for the campus, and persist in their efforts to change the campus from good to great.

Educational leaders build relationships within the school community by insuring the goals of the campus are modeled by all the members of the school organization. Additionally, the campus leader is responsible for the unrelenting pursuit of the campus vision created alongside the stakeholders of the campus. Implementation of the vision is a priority. Although the systems are in place, goals are set and the vision is known by everyone, the work is never over. The work of the school is in learning how to get better at determining and implementing what works. The professional learning communities of teachers strive to maintain the same level of collaboration, monitor the students' learning, guide the instruction, and make adjustments

33

based on the data collected. The successes are celebrated and shared with the whole community

and any challenges are addressed.

The demands and the challenges of the 21st century on students' mandates that

educational leaders change the way they lead. Collins (2001) pointed out that good is the enemy

of great. Educational leaders must be great and lead great schools because students and teachers

are deserving of that commitment. One way that principals can be great is to develop *Level 5*

leadership skills and use them every day. A Level 5 leader is ambitious for the school, not

themselves. Level 5 leaders set up their successors for even greater success; the change is

transformational and sustainable. Level 5 leaders are modest and understated. They will give

credit to the teachers and take the blame when something fails. The Level 5 leader is driven to

work hard and do whatever it takes to make the school great. The Level 5 leaders keep their eye

on the prize—student achievement for all. Working together, the principal and the teachers

identify the high-yield learning practices and these best practices then become nonnegotiable

parts of the school culture. The school becomes high performing through relentless consistency

and continuous improvement; the campus leadership, not just the principal, will have the most

direct impact on student success.

Transparency rules

The fifth secret is transparency rules. Fullan (2008) asserted that the characteristics of

transparency rules include assessing, communicating, and acting on data pertaining to the what,

how, and outcomes of change efforts. Transparency rules because everyone has access to data.

It is pointless to try to hide the data because it not acceptable or useful to do so. All data is

useful and should be used as a tool for improvement. A leader must develop a culture wherein

when problems arise they are solved. Educational leaders must be transparent, which is much

like loving your employees. Both are about building trust and mutual respect. If school leaders are not transparent with their community and bury their heads in the dirt like the ostrich, change will not occur. Students, especially those identified as at risk or from low socioeconomic backgrounds will not learn, and teachers will leave the profession. Albeit a painful experience, school leaders must confront the honest truth about what the data says. To ignore the data and make decisions without it is much like agreeing that the emperor's new clothes are stunning. Fullan (2011) suggested that leaders must become assessment literate and proficient at being transparent. If done consistently and correctly, the leader's skills will improve. To not be transparent is to risk becoming unemployed and obsolete.

Systems learn

The sixth secret that Fullan (2008) identified is systems learn which is continuous learning or sustained learning within the organization. The key is for the leader to sustain the learning. The final issue educational leaders' face and the sixth item on their list of priorities is sustainability. Schools need to focus on what Sergiovanni (1999) termed the *life-world* of the school. The life-world of a school focuses on such things as the culture, climate, and community of the institution. The life-world is in contrast to the system-world or the current model of leadership. The system-world describes the political, structural, bureaucratic, and policy aspects of the school, the non-instructional issues, specifically, the pressures that leaders deal with, the everyday realities of schools such as accountability, bullying, violence, irate parents, unfunded mandates, and budget cuts. The life-world focuses on the results of education, which is the establishment of the norms, values, and beliefs of an individual school that focus on educating the whole child. Shared leadership by principals and teachers will improve the school in a sustainable way.

Servage (2008) described collaborative teacher learning as the glue that allows for teachers to develop a strong sense of community and take responsibility for student learning acting on shared norms and values. Through the continued use of the organizational structure of professional learning communities, shared leadership or distributed leadership is how schools will survive and thrive in the 21st century. However, America will not remain a world leader if it only educates 15% to 20% of its children. Leaders must be willing to continually work with their teachers as part of a team to implement a culture and a community that values learning for all students. Meaningful gains in student achievement can only be realized through whole system reform. The shared leadership approach or distributed leadership represents the best alternative to achieving the transformation of teaching and learning (Futrell, 2011).

History of Standardized Testing in Texas

High stakes testing has been in place in Texas since 1979 when the Texas State Legislature passed a bill that required the Texas Education Agency (TEA) to administer a basic skills test, the Texas Assessment of Basic Skills (TABS). For the first time in the history of Texas public education the results of the TABS were published. In 1984, the legislature amended the language and asked TEA to administer a test that assessed minimum basic skills, the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS). A new graduation requirement was added to seniors and they would be denied their diplomas if they were not able to pass the TEAMS assessment. The results of the TEAMS test were also published in the school district's local newspapers. In a short period the purpose of these assessments had gone from TABS, an assessment that collected school-level information, to TEAMS, an assessment of curriculum-specific skills.

In the late 1980s the language of the Texas Education Code was changed yet again and a new era of assessment and accountability for student performance was ushered in. The Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) was first administered in 1990 and became the most high–stakes assessment. Campus administrators' job performance was now being judged according to the Academic Excellence Indicator System, which, based on the students' scores, would rate their campus as exemplary, *recognized*, *acceptable*, or *unacceptable* (Cruse & Twing, 2000). High stakes testing and the role of the campus principal as a change agent and instructional leader was about to shift in a different highly accountable direction.

The federal government under President Bush's administration signed the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act in 2001, which now required schools to ensure that students made *adequate yearly progress* (AYP) in reading and math and closed the gap for all students and certain student groups. If schools failed to meet the AYP standard as detailed in NCLB, campuses were given a failing grade by the federal government. The campus principal's ability to lead a campus was again being scrutinized. The implementation of NCLB and the newest high-stakes test, the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), designed to meet the requirements of NCLB, led to major concerns among school district superintendents. The concerns included that TAKS and NCLB required too much testing which resulted in the loss of instructional time, not enough funding to implement changes, and finally that the testing added too much stress to principals, teachers, and students (Harris, Irons, Crawford, 2006).

The new Every Student Succeeds Act, signed into law December 10, 2015, rolls back much of the federal government's large influence in education policy, from testing to low-performing schools. It gives states more control, which is a substantial change from the No Child Left Behind Act which ESSA replaced. ESSA takes effect in the 2017-18 school year.

However, it does not change the requirement of states to continue to test students in reading and math in grades 3-8 and once in high school. It also does not change the accountability requirements required of the states, such as closing gaps for all students and students making progress each year. Additionally, principals are responsible for the success of the campus and if they are unable to turn the school around after four years the principal can be fired and the school taken over by the state education agency (Klein, 2016).

The State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) assessment, the fifth and most recent, has ushered in a new era of standardized testing and accountability for campus principals in Texas. STAAR is a more rigorous test that assesses the student's readiness for subsequent grades, courses, and ultimately, college and career. The test contains more questions than its predecessor, TAKS. Due to the new rigorous construct of the STAAR test, educators must teach students how to think critically about what they have learned and apply their knowledge. The accountability standard for campuses under the STAAR test has been narrowed to two rating categories. The two ratings are determined by the campus performance on four indexes, which includes the scores of all students tested in all subject areas, did the students meet their yearly progress measure, was the achievement gap closed and are the students college and career ready. The campus either *meets the standard* in all four indexes, or the campus *does not meet the standard* even if the campus fails to meet the passing standard in one index. Should a campus fail to meet the passing standards on the accountability indexes two years in a row, TEA requires that a school campus be reconstituted. Reconstitution requires that every member of the staff at a campus that has been designated as *improvement required* status for 2 years in a row must reapply for their position on the campus, this includes the principal (TEA 2013).

Summary

The role and responsibilities of the principal will continue to change. Next to teachers, principals are the second most important person on the campus that impact student achievement and their scores on standardized tests, albeit indirectly. It is no longer enough for principals to be just a building manager and an instructional leader; instead they must affect and sustain change. The principal should strive to implement motion leadership to become a leader of learners. Thus, the change will be sustained long after they are no longer the principal of the campus.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to (a) document the motion leadership characteristics of Texas public school principals and (b) examine the relationships between the traits of motion leadership and selected demographic characteristics of the principals and the accountability rating of their campuses. The study was guided by the following research questions.

1. What are the motion leadership characteristics of Texas public school principals?

2. What are the relationships between Texas public school principals' motion leadership traits and their selected demographic characteristics and the accountability rating of their campuses?

Research Design

The study was correlational in nature. The correlational research design is used to describe and measure the degree of the association between two or more variables or sets of scores (Creswell, 2008). For the study, the independent variables were six motion leadership traits, namely, (a) love your employees, (b) connect peers with purpose, (c) capacity building prevails, (d) learning is the work, (e) transparency rules, and (f) systems learn. The dependent variable was the accountability rating of the campus. Additionally, relationships between the motion leadership traits and the following demographic characteristics were examined: gender, ethnicity, education level, campus type (elementary, middle, high), campus or district classification (rural, urban, suburban), years of experience as an educator, years of experience as a campus principal, and years of experience as the principal of schools with the accountability rating.

Subject Selection

The participants were the campus principals at the elementary, middle, and high school levels in the State of Texas. Email addresses for administrators were obtained from the TEA. A total of 8,042 email addresses were provided. All of them were invited to participate in the study. There were 296 emails that were not deliverable, resulting in a population of 7,746 principals who could voluntarily participate in the study by completing the on-line survey instrument. Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi. Consent to participate in the study was electronically obtained by the participants.

Instrumentation

A survey instrument, Motion Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), was developed, by the researcher (Appendix A). The survey included 36 items to measure the six motion leadership constructs (Fullan, 2014). A 5-point Likert-type scaling was used: Always = 5, Very Often = 4, Sometimes = 3, Rarely = 2, and 1 = Never. Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was used to estimate the internal consistency of the six scale scores.

Love your employees was measured by (a) I provide emotional support for my teachers to do their work; (b) I provide intellectual support for my teachers to do their work; (c) I provide opportunities for my teachers to find meaning in their work; (d) I provide opportunities for my teachers to make contributions to meet the goals of the campus; (e) I provide opportunities for my teachers to find meaning in their relationships with the campus community such as peers, students, and parents; and (f) I value my teachers as much as I value my students.

Connect peers with purpose was measured by (a) I foster purposeful peer interactions for my teachers to learn from one another; (b) I facilitate purposeful peer interactions which give my

teachers a shared sense of commitment to the success of every student; (c) I provide my teachers with opportunities to learn from teachers from other campuses; (d) I provide my teachers with opportunities to build effective, productive relationships with teachers from other campuses; (e) I provide opportunities for my teachers to take on leadership roles; and (f) I help my teachers sustain their leadership roles on the campus.

Capacity building prevails was measured by (a) I encourage my teachers to effect change through a non-judgmental approach; (b) I create opportunities for my teachers to develop their content knowledge; (c) I am a role model for our campus goals; (d) I encourage my teachers to contribute toward the achievement of the campus goals; (e) I help new teachers develop individually; and (f) I help new teachers develop collectively with other teachers on campus.

Learning is the work was measured by (a) I create systemic behaviors that allow us to consistently monitor the effectiveness of the campus goals based on the perspective of the teachers; (b) I create systemic behaviors that allow us to change the campus goals based on the perspective of the teachers; (c) My teachers and I use data to know the names of every student who is at risk of becoming a potential drop out; (d) I provide on the job professional learning opportunities for my teachers so that they grow individually; (e) I generate an action plan for an area of my growth as a leader; and (f) I evaluate my success in improving my area of growth as a leader.

Transparency rules was measured by (a) I share state assessment data about our campus with my teachers; (b) We use the state assessment data to write goals to improve student success; (c) I show my teachers how to use assessment data to improve individual student success; (d) I provide opportunities for my teachers to understand other campus data; (e) I show my teachers

how to use data to write goals for the campus; and (f) I am transparent in my sharing of all data with teachers.

Systems learn was measured by (a) I am a confident campus principal, open to new ideas; (b) I take all of the credit when the campus is successful; (c) I take all of the blame when the campus is not successful; (d) I take some of the credit and some of the blame when the campus is either successful or not successful; (e) I set goals for the campus; (f) I talk about the future of the campus.

The survey also included 10 questions to collect the data on accountability ratings and selected demographic characteristics of the respondents. Accountability rating was measured as a binary variable: (a) Met Standard; and (b) Improvement Required. The study's demographic categorical variables were gender, ethnicity, education level, type of campus (elementary, middle, high school), and campus or district classification (rural, urban, suburban). The study's demographic continuous variables were age, years of experience as an educator, years of experience as a campus principal, and years of experience as the principal at the campus with the accountability rating.

Data Collection

An online version of the MLQ, utilizing the Qualtrics software program, was used for data collection. The principals were contacted by email. The initial email included the purpose of the study, the link to the online survey along with the online consent form, and was sent on November 5, 2016. The second email was sent on November 11, 2016, thanking those who had already completed the survey and encouraging others to do so. The third e-mail was sent on November 21, 2016, thanking those who had already completed the survey, encouraging others to do so, and informing them that the survey would end on November 28, 2016. Of the 7,746

principals who had been invited to participate in the survey, 251 completed the online survey in its entirety.

Data Analysis

The raw data was exported into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), which was employed for data manipulation and analysis. Data checking was done to make sure that all surveys submitted were complete. The means of the respondents' responses to the 36-item MLQ were used to compute a scale score for each of the six traits of motion leadership. Due to performing a number of statistical tests, the level of significance was set, a priori, at 0.01 to reduce the probability of making Type I errors.

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and organize the data. Specifically, appropriate measures of central tendency and variability as well as frequency and percentage distribution tables were utilized.

A series of Independent Samples t-test (Field, 2013) was used for the comparisons involving a grouping variable with two levels (e.g., met standard vs. improvement required) and a continuous outcome variable (e.g., age). Levene's Test was used to test the homogeneity of variances assumption.

A series of one-way Analysis of Variance (Field, 2013) was performed for the comparisons involving a grouping variable with more than two levels (e.g., school type: elementary, middle, high) and a continuous outcome variable (e.g., the motion leadership traits). Levene's Test was used to test the homogeneity of variances assumption.

At the item level, a series of Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon U Test (Field, 2013) was performed to compare the principals of the met standard and improvement required schools based on their responses to MLQ's items. The test assumes random samples from continuous

populations and that data are at least ordinal. It is analogous to Independent Samples t-test. When both sample sizes are greater than 10, an approximate Z is computed.

A univariate repeated measures analysis of variance was employed to test the differences among the motion leadership traits. The Huynh-Feldt Epsilon and Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon were used to test the sphericity assumption. The assumption requires that the variances of differences for all pairs of repeated measures to be equal, and if the average of the two Epsilons is greater than 0.70, the sphericity assumption is met (Stevens, 2009). The Modified Tukey procedure was performed for the purpose of post hoc analysis (Stevens, 2009).

Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha was used to estimate the reliability/internal consistency of the leadership frames (Crocker & Algina, 1986). Specifically, $\alpha = [k/k-1][1-(\Sigma\sigma_i^2/\sigma_x^2)]$, where k is the number of items on the test, σ_i^2 is the variance of item i, and σ_x^2 is the total test variance (sum of the variances plus twice the sum of the co-variances of all possible pairs of its components, that is, $\sigma_x^2 = \Sigma\sigma_i^2 + 2\Sigma\sigma_{ij}$).

Logistic Regression (LR) was performed to examine the relationship between the motion leadership traits and the binary outcome measure of accountability rating). The LR regresses a dichotomous criterion variable on a set of predictor variables, has a non-linear model, and is used to estimate the probability of an event occurring. The criterion variable is between zero and one (i.e., met standard or improvement required). The LR uses logistic transformation to transform the dichotomous variable in such a way that it ranges from minus infinity to plus infinity, and assesses the likelihood of each of the independent variables contributing to the prediction of the criterion variable while controlling for all other variables in the model. The Likelihood-ratio Chi-square test is used to test the statistical significance of the predication model. The Wald

statistic is used to test the statistical significance of the individual predictor variables (Pedhazur

& Schmelkin, 1991; Field, 2013).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of the study is to (a) document the motion leadership characteristics of Texas public school principals and (b) examine the relationships between the traits of motion leadership and selected demographic characteristics of the principals with the accountability rating of their campus. The six motion leadership characteristics are love your employees, connect peers with purpose, capacity building prevails, learning is the work, transparency rules and systems learn. The relationship between the motion leadership characteristics and the accountability rating of the principal's campus was examined. As analysis relied on performing a number of statistical tests, the level of significance was set, a priori, at 0.01 to reduce the probability of making Type I errors.

A Profile of the Subjects

All principals in Texas who could be contacted via email were invited to participate in the study (N = 7,746), of which 251 (3.24%) provided the usable data by completing the online survey questionnaire. The overwhelming majority of the respondents (n = 239, 95.22%) were the principals of the met standard elementary schools, of which, the majority were female (70.70%), white (62.60%), with graduate education (80.30%), and serving in an urban (34.70%) elementary campus setting (55.30%). Most of the respondents of the improvement required campuses were male (58.30%), white (50.00%), with graduate education (83.30%), and serving in rural school districts (50.00%). Results are summarized in Table 1. There were no statistically significant differences between the met standard and improvement required principals based on age (48.62 vs 46.33), years of experience in education (22.51 vs. 20.67), years of experience as a campus

47

principal (7.72 vs 7.67), and years of experience as the principal at the campus with the

accountability rating (4.78 vs. 2.42). The homogeneity of variances assumption was met in all

analyses. Results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 1

A Profile of the Principals, Categorical Variables

Variable		Met Standard (n = 239)		Improvement Required (n = 12)	
		f	%	f	%
Gender	Male	70	29.30	7	58.30
	Female	169	70.70	5	41.70
Ethnicity	White	149	62.30	6	50.00
	Hispanic or Latino	68	28.50	4	33.30
	Black or African American	17	7.10	1	8.30
	Asian	2	0.80	0	0.00
	American Indian or Alaska Native	1	0.40	0	0.00
	Other	1	0.40	1	8.30
	Missing	1	0.40	0	0.00
Education	Master's Degree	191	79.90	10	83.30
	Doctorate	47	19.70	2	16.70
	Missing	1	0.40	0	0.00
Campus Type	Elementary	131	54.80	5	41.70
	Middle	39	16.30	3	25.00
	High School	67	28.00	3	25.00
	Missing	2	0.80	1	8.30
Campus or District Classification	Rural	78	32.60	6	50.00
	Urban	83	34.70	5	41.70
	Suburban	78	32.60	1	8.30

Table 2

A Profile of the Principals, Continuous Variables

| Characteristic | Met Standard (n = 239) | | Improvement Required (n = 12) | | |
	M*	SD	M*	SD	t
Age [a]	48.62	7.70	46.33	7.12	1.00
Years1	22.51	7.42	20.67	8.49	1.64
Years2	7.72	6.12	7.67	6.89	0.03
Years3 [b]	4.78	4.97	2.42	1.38	1.64

Note: Years 1 = Years of experience as an educator, Years 2 = Years of experience as a campus principal, Years 3 = Years of experience as the principal of schools with accountability rating
[a] ten missing cases in the Met Standard group
[b] three missing cases in the Met Standard group

Reliability of the Scale Scores

The 36-item Motion Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) measured six motion leadership

scales. Each scale consisted of six items measured using a 5-point Likert-type scaling,

5=always, 4=very often, 3= sometimes, 2=rarely, 1=never, was used. The Cronbach's

Coefficient Alpha was used to estimate the internal consistency of the scale scores. As can be

seen in Table 3, all reliability coefficients were acceptable except the one for the systems learn

scale. Consequently, the systems learn scale was not included in the analysis of the data.

Table 3

Motion Leadership Traits, Reliability Coefficients, n = 251

Trait	# of Items	Reliability Coefficient
Love your employees	6	0.76
Connect peers with purpose	6	0.82
Capacity building prevails	6	0.77
Learning is the work	6	0.77
Transparency rules	6	0.80
Systems learn	6	0.18

Motion Leadership Traits – Item Score Level

The principals completed the MLQ. The data were ordinal. A series of Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon U test were performed to compare the met standard and improvement required principals based on their responses. None of the differences was statistically significant. Results are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

Motion Leadership Traits, Item Score Level, Group Comparisons

Item	Met Standard (n = 239) M^a	Improvement Required (n = 12) M^a	Z^b
I provide emotional support for my teachers to do their work.	4.22	3.83	1.91
I provide intellectual support for my teachers to do their work.	4.18	4.00	0.84
I provide opportunities or my teachers to find meaning in their work.	4.05	3.83	0.82
I provide opportunities for my teachers to make contributions to meet the goals of the campus.	4.27	4.17	0.49
I provide opportunities for my teachers to find meaning in their relationships with the campus community such as peers, students and parents.	4.06	4.08	0.12
I value my teachers as much as I value my students.	4.67	4.75	0.33
I foster purposeful peer interactions for my teachers to learn from one another.	4.13	4.25	0.59

Table 4 continued

Motion Leadership Traits, Item Score Level, Group Comparisons

Item	Met Standard (n = 239)	Improvement Required (n = 12)	
	M^a	M^a	Z^b
I facilitate purposeful peer interactions which give my teachers a shared sense of commitment to the success of every student.	4.03	3.92	0.61
I provide my teachers with opportunities to learn from teachers from other campuses.	3.22	3.08	0.49
I provide my teachers with opportunities to build effective, productive relationships with teachers from other campuses.	3.07	3.00	0.19
I provide opportunities for my teachers to take on leadership roles.	4.08	4.08	0.04
I help my teachers sustain their leadership roles on the campus.	4.13	4.00	0.73
I encourage my teachers to effect change through a non-judgmental approach.	4.12	4.08	0.16
I create opportunities for my teachers to develop their content knowledge.	4.26	4.08	0.94
I am a role model for our campus goals.	4.46	4.42	0.16
I encourage my teachers to contribute toward the achievement of the campus goals.	4.51	4.33	1.01

Table 4 continued

Motion Leadership Traits, Item Score Level, Group Comparisons

Item	Met Standard (n = 239)	Improvement Required (n = 12)	
	M^a	M^a	Z^b
I help new teachers develop individually.	4.11	4.25	0.72
I help new teachers develop collectively with other teachers on campus.	4.18	3.92	0.89
I create systemic behaviors that allow us to consistently monitor the effectiveness of the campus goals based on the perspective of the teachers.	3.78	3.92	0.47
I create systemic behaviors that allow us to change the campus goals based on the perspective of the teachers.	3.72	3.67	0.06
My teachers and I use data to know the name of every student who is at risk of becoming a potential drop out.	4.72	4.08	0.17
I provide on the job professional learning opportunities for my teachers so that they grow individually.	4.13	4.08	0.28
I generate an action plan for an area of growth as a leader.	3.99	4.00	0.06
I evaluate my success in improving my area of growth as a leader.	4.17	4.17	0.04

Table 4 continued

Motion Leadership Traits, Item Score Level, Group Comparisons

Item	Met Standard (n = 239) M[a]	Improvement Required (n = 12) M[a]	Z[b]
I share state assessment data about our campus with my teachers.	4.78	4.83	0.77
We use the state assessment data to write goals to improve student success.	4.62	4.92	1.74
I show my teachers how to use assessment data to improve individual student success.	4.40	4.58	1.11
I provide opportunities for my teachers to understand other campus data.	3.96	3.58	1.11
I show my teachers how to use data to write goals for the campus.	3.95	3.67	0.91
I am transparent in my sharing of all data with my teachers.	4.72	4.58	0.26

[a] 5 = always, 4 = very often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, 1 = never. Mean scores are reported for the ease of interpretation. Data were ordinal in nature.
[b] Calculated by the Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon U Test. None was statistically significant.

Motion Leadership Traits – Scale Score Level

On the basis of the mean of the respondents' responses, a scale score was computed for each construct. A series of *t*-tests for Independent Samples showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups of principals on the basis of motion leadership scale scores. The homogeneity of variances assumption was met in all analyses. Results are summarized in Table 5.

53

Table 5

Motion Leadership Traits, Scale Score Level, Group Comparisons

Trait	Met Standard (n = 239)		Improvement Required (n = 12)		
	M*	SD	M*	SD	t^a
Love your employees	4.24	0.42	4.11	0.58	1.03
Connect peers with purpose	3.77	0.52	3.72	0.72	0.33
Capacity building prevails	4.27	0.43	4.18	0.54	0.73
Learning is the work	4.00	0.52	3.98	0.68	0.13
Transparency rules	4.40	0.50	4.36	0.61	0.29

* 5 = always, 4 = very often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, 1 = never
[a] None of the *t*-values was statistically significant.

Since group differences were not statistically significant on the basis of the motion leadership scores, the data were merged and a univariate repeated measures analysis of variance showed that differences among the measures were statistically significant, *Wilks' Lamda* = 0.30, $F(4, 247) = 142.05$, $p < 0.01$. The sphericity assumption was met, as the average of *Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon* (0.88) and *Huynh-Feldt Epsilon* (0.89) was greater than 0.70. Post hoc analyses showed that with the exception of the difference between love your employees and capacity building prevails, all pairwise comparisons were statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Transparency rules had the highest score ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.51$), followed by capacity building prevails ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.44$), love your employees ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 0.43$), learning is the work ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.51$), and connect peers with purpose ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.54$) traits. Results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6

Ranking of Motion Leadership Traits, n = 251

Trait	Mean*	SD
Transparency rules	4.40	0.51
Capacity building prevails	4.27	0.44
Love your employees	4.24	0.43
Learning is the work	4.00	0.53
Connect peers with purpose	3.77	0.54

* 5 = always, 4 = very often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, 1 = never

A series of Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was performed to examine the bi-variate associations between motion leadership traits and the principals' professional experiences. As can be seen in Table 7, none of the simple associations between motion leadership traits and years of experience as an educator, years of experience as a campus principal, and years of experience as the principal of schools with accountability rating was statistically significant.

The principals had been recruited from various elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools. None of the differences based on the motion leadership traits was statistically significant. The homogeneity of variances assumption was met in all analyses. Results are summarized in Table 8.

Table 7

Simple Associations Between Motion Leadership Traits and Principals' Experience, n = 251

Trait	Years1	Years2	Years3
Transparency rules	-0.06	-0.02	0.02
Capacity building prevails	0.10	0.14	0.16
Love your employees	0.05	0.10	0.12
Learning is the work	-0.03	0.01	0.06
Connect peers with purpose	0.10	0.15	0.08

Note: Years 1 = Years of experience as an educator, Years 2 = Years of experience as a campus principal, Years 3 = Years of experience as the principal of schools with accountability rating. None of the associations was statistically significant.

Table 8

Motion Leadership Traits by School Type

	Elementary (n = 136)		Middle (n = 42)		High (n = 70)		F^a
Trait	M*	SD	M*	SD	M*	SD	
Transparency rules	4.42	0.50	4.46	0.51	4.34	0.53	0.87
Capacity building prevails	4.25	0.45	4.28	0.46	4.31	0.43	0.47
Love your employees	4.25	0.42	4.21	0.46	4.22	0.44	0.14
Learning is the work	4.04	0.51	4.05	0.57	3.93	0.54	1.14
Connect peers with purpose	3.72	0.51	3.91	0.60	3.79	0.54	2.06

* 5 = always, 4 = very often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, 1 = never
[a] None of the F-ratios was statistically significant.

The participating principals were serving the rural, urban, and suburban school districts. As can be seen in Table 9, none of the group differences based on the motion leadership traits was statistically significant. The homogeneity of variances assumption was met in all analyses.

Table 9

Motion Leadership Traits by School Region

Trait	Rural (n = 84) M*	SD	Urban (n = 88) M*	SD	Suburban (n = 79) M*	SD	F^a
Transparency rules	4.36	0.52	4.49	0.49	4.35	0.50	2.23
Capacity building prevails	4.26	0.44	4.27	0.45	4.29	0.43	0.11
Love your employees	4.20	0.43	4.27	0.44	4.23	0.43	0.63
Learning is the work	3.98	0.58	4.12	0.51	3.90	0.48	3.80
Connect peers with purpose	3.69	0.58	3.82	0.52	3.80	0.50	1.63

* 5 = always, 4 = very often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, 1 = never
[a] None of the F-ratios was statistically significant.

None of the group differences on the basis of gender, ethnicity (coded as White or non-White), and education level was statistically significant. The homogeneity of variances assumption was met in all analyses. Results are summarized in Tables 10 – 12.

Correlational Analysis

A logistic regression (LR) was performed to examine the correlation between the five motion leadership traits and the accountability rating (met standard or improvement required) of the participating principals' schools. The association was not statistically significant, $X^2(5, N = 251) = 1.56$, $p = 0.91$, and accounted for less than 1.00% of the variation. Results are summarized in Table 13.

Table 10
Motion Leadership Traits, Scale Score Level, Gender Comparisons

| Trait | Female (n = 174) | | Male (n = 77) | | |
	M*	SD	M*	SD	t^a
Love your employees	4.24	0.42	4.24	0.45	0.01
Connect peers with purpose	3.76	0.53	3.80	0.54	0.53
Capacity building prevails	4.27	0.45	4.27	0.43	0.04
Learning is the work	4.02	0.52	3.97	0.55	-0.75
Transparency rules	4.44	0.50	4.32	0.53	-1.75

* 5 = always, 4 = very often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, 1 = never
[a] None of the *t*-values was statistically significant.

Table 11

Motion Leadership Traits, Scale Score Level, Ethnicity Comparisons

| Trait | White (n = 155) | | Non-White (n = 95) | | |
	M*	SD	M*	SD	t^a
Love your employees	4.22	0.42	4.26	0.44	0.74
Connect peers with purpose	3.74	0.55	3.83	0.51	1.39
Capacity building prevails	4.24	0.41	4.33	0.48	1.61
Learning is the work	3.99	0.50	4.04	0.57	0.84
Transparency rules	4.35	0.50	4.49	0.51	2.14

* 5 = always, 4 = very often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, 1 = never
[a] None of the *t*-values was statistically significant.

Table 12

Motion Leadership Traits, Scale Score Level, Education Level Comparisons

| Trait | MS/MA (n = 201) | | Doctorate (n = 49) | | t[a] |
	M*	SD	M*	SD	
Love your employees	4.22	0.43	4.29	0.45	-1.05
Connect peers with purpose	3.74	0.53	3.88	0.52	-1.58
Capacity building prevails	4.25	0.44	4.34	0.46	-1.28
Learning is the work	3.98	0.54	4.10	0.46	-1.30
Transparency rules	4.38	0.51	4.48	0.50	-1.14

* 5 = always, 4 = very often, 3 = sometimes, 2 = rarely, 1 = never
[a] None of the t-values was statistically significant.

Table 13

Logistic Regression Results

	b	Standard Error	Wald	p
Love your employees	-0.84	0.95	0.78	0.38
Connect peers with purpose	0.21	0.78	0.07	0.79
Capacity building prevails	-0.48	1.10	0.19	0.66
Learning is the work	0.49	0.86	0.32	0.57
Transparency rules	-0.06	0.73	0.01	0.93
Constant	0.09			

Summary of the Results

The analysis of the data showed no statistically significant differences between the principals of the met standard and improvement required schools based on the motion leadership traits. The traits were not associated with any of the principals' demographic characteristics. Transparency rules was chosen the most, followed by capacity building prevails, love your employees, learning is the work, and connect peers with purpose.

Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to document the motion leadership characteristics of Texas public school principals and examine the relationships between the characteristics of motion leadership and selected demographic characteristics of the principals with the accountability rating of their campuses. Overall, there were no statistically significant differences between motion leadership characteristics of the principals at met standard schools and principals at improvement required schools.

Conclusions

All the principals in the state of Texas were invited to participate in the study by filling out a motion leadership questionnaire that was developed by the researcher to examine if the principals in Texas utilized motion leadership to lead their campus. Motion leadership is the ability of a change savvy leader to bring about reform and change within his or her campus. Motion leadership is the ability to move individuals, institutions, and whole systems forward. Fullan (2008) outlined six secrets of change that the most effective leaders have implemented to ensure that their organizations thrive. These secrets although numbered one through six are not rank ordered from most important to least important. Fullan clarified that the theory of motion leadership when in use is designed to move whole organizations forward. The six secrets are synergistic and each one feeds off the other one. Moreover, the six traits in unison serve to motivate most of the people in the organization to invest their passion and energy to get the needed results and make these results sustainable.

Research Question One: What are the motion leadership characteristics of Texas public school principals? The principals completed the Motion Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The data were ordinal. A series of Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon U tests were performed to compare the met standard and improvement required principals based on their responses. None of the differences was statistically significant.

Based on the mean of the respondents' responses, a scale score was computed for each construct. A series of t-tests for Independent Samples showed no statistically significant differences between the two groups of the principals based on motion leadership scale scores. The homogeneity of variances assumption was met in all analyses.

Since group differences were not statistically significant on the basis of the motion leadership scores, the data were merged and a univariate repeated measures analysis of variance showed that differences among the measures were statistically significant, Wilks' Lamda = 0.30, $F(4, 247) = 142.05$, $p < 0.01$. The sphericity assumption was met, as the average of Greenhouse-Geisser Epsilon (0.88) and Huynh-Feldt Epsilon (0.89) was greater than 0.70. Post hoc analyses showed that except for the difference between love your employees and capacity building prevails, all pairwise comparisons were statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Transparency rules had the highest score ($M = 4.40$, $SD = 0.51$), followed by capacity building prevails ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.44$), love your employees ($M = 4.26$, $SD = 0.43$), learning is the work ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.51$), and connect peers with purpose ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 0.54$).

There were no significant differences on the use of motion leadership traits by the two groups (met standard, improvement required). Today so much more is expected of principals with regards to their influence on student achievement. Marzano and Dufour (2011) drew the conclusion that powerful school principals do have a positive impact on student achievement but

the influence is indirect. It is the teachers that have the direct effect on student achievement since they are the providers of instruction. The effective principal, however, will not attempt to create the climate for successful student achievement on his or her own. Marzano and Dufour (2011) stated that no one person has all the knowledge, skills, expertise, and energy to create the positive climate of success and accountability. The effective leader creates a strong leadership team that is able to take the lead and identify and solve the problems of the organization. Fullan (2014) similarly stated that if principals are to maximize their impact on whole systems change it must be a collaborative effort in which all the people in the system have the prerequisite skills and they all feel accountable for the results.

Research Question Two: What are the relationships between Texas public school principals' motion leadership traits and their selected demographic characteristics and the accountability rating of their campuses? The study's demographic categorical variables were gender, ethnicity, age, education level, campus type (elementary, middle, high school) campus or district classification (rural, urban, suburban). The continuous variables were years of experience as a campus principal, years of experience as an educator, years of experience as the principal on the campus with the accountability rating. None of the group differences based on gender, ethnicity and education level was statistically significant. The principals were recruited from various elementary, middle and high schools in rural, urban and suburban areas. None of the group differences based on the motion leadership traits was statistically significant. There were also no statistically significant differences between the met standard and improvement required principals based on age (48.62 vs 46.33), years of experience in education (22.51 vs 20.67), years of experience as a campus principal (7.72 vs 7.67), and years of experience as the principal at the campus with the accountability rating (4.78 vs 2.42). The homogeneity of

variances assumption was met in all analyses. The results showed the respondents to be homogeneous. Whereas non-homogenous results were expected, homogenous results suggest conformity to the current system of accountability.

For years, the dominant theory of school leadership success literature revolved around transformational or instructional leadership models. However, as the results apply only to the sample size of this study it may be neither instructional leadership nor transformational leadership are adequate to address a high stakes testing environment where accountability outcomes can have significant outcomes. From a transformational perspective, vision and mission across all campuses are the same: create an environment where testing standards are met. However, the result of this is more consistent with a transactional aspect of leadership. The transformative leader using a vision and attempting to motivate teachers to join the cause are not specific enough to produce actual results (Fullan, 2014). This tends to be evident in the way principals described themselves with regards to their answers on the MLQ the motion leadership model: the importance of data, not relationships, resulted as the more frequently identified characteristic. Even though Fullan (2008) indicated motion leadership can move a campus forward despite standard-based reform, high stakes accountability may not allow for it system wide. This does not mean alternative leadership styles, such as motion leadership are not present at some campuses. However, system-wide an aspect of transactional leadership seems to dominate where everyone would have the same task. This task is to achieve high scores on standardized tests.

The lack of statistically significant differences among all demographic categories is noteworthy. The motion leadership mean scores for each demographic category follow the same rating order. It may suggest an autocratic leadership structure. Autocratic leadership is

characterized as a leader's control over decisions, choices, processes, procedures, and desired outcomes. However, in the instance of high stakes testing and accountability, it is not a principal who may be autocratic, but the system. With no statistically significant differences among every demographic category, leadership may be considered a systemic concern. "Relying on the human agency of individual leaders alone does not work: systems can disable even the most capable leader" (The Institute for Systemic Leadership, n.d., para. 2).

Fullan (2014) described the two current systems of leadership as either too broad transformational leadership or too narrow instructional leadership. The transformational leader creates a vision and instills motivation in teachers to join the cause, but it does not produce actual results. The instructional leader conversely is charged with micromanaging instruction, which can be unproductive and time consuming. Principals focused with a narrow emphasis on instructional leadership and student achievement can negatively impact other aspects of the lead learner. Thus, a principal under intense scrutiny to deliver results will either burn out or be a superficial leader. Motion leadership (Fullan 2014) attempts to strike a balance between transformational and instructional leadership. Neither of these two leadership styles focus on developing the knowledge and skills of the teachers, not individually but by building their collective capacity (Dufour & Marzano, 2011). Although the study showed the presence of motion leadership, there were no statistically significant differences between met standard and improvement required groups. Furthermore, both groups ranked motion leadership characteristics in the same order, suggesting the system, itself, suppresses leadership style (The Institute for Systemic Leadership, n.d.).

Discussion

The best educational leaders are in love with the work they do, with the people they lead and serve, and with the purpose that their work serves (Dufour & Marzano, 2011). The best educational leaders create a collaborative culture on their campus that focuses on building the capacity of the teachers to share responsibility and to be mutually accountable for their professional development and student achievement (Dufour & Marzano, 2011). The best educational leaders facilitate a process for teachers to connect with their peers not only on their campus, but at the district level, or even at the state level (Dufour & Marzano, 2011).

Research Question One: What are the motion leadership characteristics of Texas public school principals? Principals feel an enormous burden of accountability; similarly, their responsibilities have increased immensely over the past 20 years. Principals are expected to run a smooth school. They must manage the health and safety of staff, students, and parents. They are held accountable by the staff, students, and parents to manage the building and all that it entails. Principals must create and innovate without upsetting anyone at the district or campus level, yet at the same time be responsive to parents, the community, and the district. Principals must answer to their districts, and their constituents. They are expected to deliver results and Fullan's Motion Leadership Theory may be one way to help successfully address accountability requirements by a state and district (Fullan, 2014). Although there were no statistical differences among principals at met-standard and improvement required schools, they did describe themselves positively to the use of the six traits.

Fullan's (2008) first secret describes the importance of loving employees. Leaders invest in their employees. They give employees an opportunity to continuously learn and find meaning in their work. Additionally, the employees find meaning in the relationships they have with their

66

coworkers and with colleagues in the district. Principals build relationships with their teachers

and support them to do their work. The data indicated that on average the principals from both

groups (met standard and improvement required) scored this secret third out of the six traits.

Even in a culture of elevated expectations and accountability, when teachers know that their

principal loves and trusts them most will thrive under these conditions (Fullan, 2014).

     The second secret is connecting peers with purpose. The leader embeds strategies that

foster continuous and purposeful peer interactions. Change will occur and take effect when the

employees fall in love with their peers, not their leaders. Therefore, the role of the leader is to

enable, facilitate, and cause peers to interact with a purpose. The leader must also participate as

a learner in helping teachers determine how to achieve school-wide improvement (Fullan, 2008).

The data analysis of this trait showed that the principals in both groups ranked it fifth out of six.

Fullan (2014) stated that very few districts and states understand the difference between focused

collaboration and micromanaging of the instruction that students receive. Documenting the

efforts of the teacher and the progress of the students then becomes a quagmire of paperwork

created to assist the individual student. This becomes a drain on the principal and the teacher

and a negative effect occurs on student learning. Connecting peers with purpose is about

developing the group of teachers individually and collectively to develop their professional

capital.

     Fullan's (2008) third secret is capacity building prevails. Leaders hire talented people

with the potential and capacity to continue to learn and acquire skills. The leader can then invest

in the development of the individual as well as the whole group to accomplish significant

improvements. Employees are provided with opportunities for continuous learning that equals

continuous capacity building. The data analysis indicated that the principals in both groups rated

this secret second out of six. DuFour and Marzano (2009) stated that the principal's most effective use of time is building the capacity of teachers to work in teams rather than principals observing teachers and trying to change them one teacher at a time.

Fullan's (2008) fourth secret is learning is the work. Learning the work is defined as the way that organizations address their core goals and tasks with relentless consistency. Effective organizations acknowledge that working and learning to work well are one in the same. Fullan (2014) stated that as the change agent the principal must work to sustain the results by creating a sense of urgency, which allows teachers and staff to target the core issues and solve them. The principals scored this characteristic fourth out of six.

Fullan's (2008) fifth secret is transparency rules. Transparency is defined as assessing, communicating, and acting on data pertaining to the what, how, and outcomes of change efforts. There must be a clear and continuous display of results and the instructional practices that produce the results. Moreover, as part of the state accountability requirements, principals of improvement required campuses must write turn around plans that include data analysis, needs assessment, improvement planning, and continuous monitoring. Regrettably, the state of Texas and TEA have indicated to principals that if they do not reach the bar of the met standard campus, the schools will be reconstituted, closed or taken over by the TEA, and the administrator is out of a job (TEA, 2017). Although Texas does not have a reward system that ties money to academic achievement, the potential loss of income is a huge motivator to use data to meet the accountability standards as set by the state. This assumes a Theory X approach to leadership at the state level. It promotes an environment of coercion, control, specific directives, and threatening actions to ensure performance (Hackman & Johnson, 2013).

Fullan's sixth secret is systems learn which is defined as continuous learning or sustained learning within the organization. People acquire new knowledge all the time and should be motivated to deepen their commitment. Therefore, the role of the leader is to sustain the learning (Fullan, 2008). This secret was not scored due to the lack of reliability on the Cronbach Coefficient Alpha.

Fullan (2011) described the principal as the leader of learners modeling the secrets, becoming change savvy and growing more leaders who also understand the secrets and practice them and then they in turn grow more leaders. Implementing this leadership model and developing new leaders of learning becomes one in the same. Once a culture of leaders is created within the organization they support one another and change is sustained.

Research Question Two: What are the relationships between Texas public school principals' motion leadership traits and their selected demographic characteristics and the accountability rating of their campuses? The study's demographic categorical variables were gender, ethnicity, age, education level, campus type (elementary, middle, high school) campus or district classification (rural, urban, suburban). The data showed that both female and male principals scored the five characteristics in the same order: transparency rules, capacity building prevails, love your employees, learning is the work and connect peers with purpose. The data showed that principals who were white and non-white scored the five characteristics in the same order: transparency rules, capacity building prevails, love your employees, learning is the work and connect peers with purpose. Principals with masters and doctorate levels of education ranked the characteristics in the same order, transparency rules, capacity building prevails, love your employees, learning is the work and connect peers with purpose. The data showed that the principals from elementary, middle school and high school also ranked the characteristics in the

same order, transparency rules, capacity building prevails, love your employees, learning is the work and connect peers with purpose. Principals from rural, urban, and suburban campuses scored the five characteristics in the same order, transparency rules, capacity building prevails, love your employees, learning is the work, and connect peers with purpose.

The demographics of the principals showed no statistically significant differences among categories. To a large extent the use of data is influencing what teachers and principals do to reach a met standard campus rating. At the outset of this study it was anticipated the results would show that the principals of the met standard campuses were going to indicate they used many of the same traits Fullan (2011) cited for motion leadership theory as most effective when changing the course of the school. Especially those traits that are specific to building capacity in their teachers and connecting peers with purpose. That is not to say principals directly affect student scores on standardized tests; they do not. A principal's actions have an indirect effect on student scores, whereas teachers have the direct affect. It is the principals who have a direct effect on teacher actions in the classroom (Dufour & Marzano, 2011), and that is what impacts student scores more positively. Thus, it was expected that the emphasis on the traits were those that the principal can influence, such as capacity building, which is when teachers improve their individual and collective capacity. Additionally, connecting peers with purpose was expected to be statistically significant. Fullan (2010) described connecting peers with purpose as the teachers collaborating and becoming the leaders of the learning. Instead the principals chose transparency rules, or the use of data to make decisions about the campus. Using data as the most frequently chosen response to make instructional decisions provides a narrowed focus on instruction and student achievement on standardized tests. Some critics of standardized tests and data driven instruction would call that an emphasis toward teaching to the test (Neuman, 2016).

Neuman (2016) made the argument that students do not benefit from data driven instruction, specifically students of poverty. Despite more than a decade of data-driven instruction, reading scores in the United States have not increased and that fact is not lost on educators who want states to lessen the burden of standardized testing, because students are not really learning and are being deprived of content rich instruction.

Implications

Although the study yielded a small sample size of respondents, there are four major implications. Both groups of principals, met standard and improvement required, ranked the motion leadership characteristics in the same order with transparency rules receiving the highest mean score and connects peers with purpose receiving the lowest mean score. Similarly, the principals, regardless of gender, ethnicity, education, campus type, campus or district classification, also scored the motion leadership characteristics in the same order as the met standard and improvement required campus principals.

First, both groups of principals use state assessment data to make decisions about their campus. An implication is that a principal's use of data to drive decision-making is how they lead the campus which might make the focus on instruction too narrow. An implication can be drawn with regards to why the two groups rank ordered the characteristics the same. For example, within a high stakes testing environment, student outcomes on standardized tests are more important than the leadership style of the academic leader. In a high-stakes testing environment principals are judged as effective leaders if their campus is a met standard campus or an ineffective leader if their campus is an improvement required campus, which is why the TEA recommends the removal of the principal of an improvement required campus after two consecutive years at the low performing school (TEA, 2017). Thus, Fullan's (2008)

characteristic of transparency rules is top of the list because it more closely aligns with a data centered environment.

Second, the mean score showed interaction between principals and their teachers as between very often and always. When asked if the principals showed the teachers how to use data to write goals essentially asking if they allowed their teachers to participate in the leading of the campus by identifying the instructional goals, both groups of principals scored it "sometimes." The inference is that principals might be unaware that the goal should be to focus on long lasting reform by building capacity in their teachers. Principals should be focused on providing opportunities for teachers to collaborate with their peers, thus creating a culture of leaders of learning. This is counter to transformational and instructional leadership, where interactions with teachers are not as paramount (Harris, 2004). The implication is that the difference between met standard and improvement required schools is a result of its setting more than leadership. The met standard schools scored higher mean scores on every trait. This does not suggest a school cannot move from improvement required to met standard under other leadership styles. It indicates that the movement may be more difficult than just changing leaders or faculty or altering curriculum. "Individual leaders can be effective only if the system is actively supportive at the same time" (The Institute for Systemic Leadership, n.d., para. 2).

Third, Fullan (2014) stated there is more to accountability than measuring results. Just like the capacity building prevails secret stated, if leaders do not develop the teacher's capacity to achieve results, a counterproductive state of being is created on the campus. Unfortunately, many instances of school officials bowing to the pressure of accountability have utilized illicit means to achieve results. The widely-publicized case of the district wide cheating scandal in the Atlanta public schools from the superintendent to the campus principals spotlighted how

principals were pressured to please their supervisors, creating a culture of cheating (Fullan 2014). Northouse (2013) stated that those types of actions reflect coercive power stemming from one's leadership position, where force is used to effect change. It suggests the environment influences leadership behavior more than expected. With transactional leadership (Bush, 2007), there is a focus on results that conform to existing organizational structures and expectations. The major limitation of transactional leadership is the interaction between the principal and the teachers is usually limited to the immediate gains arising from the transaction, such as how to raise the scores on the standardized tests (Bush, 2007). The success is short-lived. Although Fullan (2014) posited there is more to accountability than measuring results, often the organization is the main factor toward influencing leadership, not the other way around (The Institute for Systemic Leadership, n.d.).

Fourth, respondents leaned toward expressing leadership traits based on data results more than connecting peers with purpose and building capacity. There were no statistically significant differences between met standard and improvement required schools. Additionally, principals at met standard and improvement required schools ranked Fullan's (2008) characteristics similarly. It is possible there is little room for individual leadership styles to influence outcomes. It alludes to both met standard and improvement required schools as possibly operating in environment of crisis or possibly contingency. Met standard schools may operate in fear of losing their ranking and thus be subject to sanctions. Improvement required schools already face sanctions and are under intense pressure and scrutiny to become a met standard school. In both instances, aspects of crisis leadership may be present (Bush, 2007). Crisis leadership exists when there is a threat to the organization, it comes somewhat as a surprise and there is a short time frame for decisions (Seeger, Sellnow, & Ulmer, 1998). According to Hackman and Johnson (2013), a crisis places

73

extraordinary demands on leaders, where they are expected to respond quickly and forcibly. Bush (2007) suggested that leaders should have the time to be able to assess the situation with which they are faced, in this case, high stakes testing and accountability, and respond appropriately rather than rely on a standard leadership model or a one size fits all approach. Leaders in these situations must be strategic, understand the political ramifications, and deal with mistakes they make, avoid pitfalls, and find paths to overcome the crisis (Boin & Hart, 2005). The results of this study suggest both met standard and improvement required schools operate in a setting where by principals' lead based on a situation where data are the most important features of leadership. Principals are focused on the outcomes of high stakes testing and accountability ratings, thus possibly influencing the leadership style.

Recommendations for Future Research

The study raises questions for future research. Given that principals from both met standard and improvement required schools responded similarly, several recommendations for future research are provided. These studies could help clarify the role of the campus leader in today's high stakes testing environment.

The first recommendation for future research would be to compare leadership styles. One would expect to see differences in leadership among met standard and improvement required schools, otherwise why do districts bring in new leadership and teachers when campuses do not meet the standards of accountability set by the TEA? Future research could explore how principals lead. This would require them to respond to different leadership style surveys and then have those results correlated to met standard and improvement required rankings. The leadership surveys could include their use of transformational leadership and instructional

74

leadership. This could provide insight for the school districts with regards to how to build capacity in their campus leaders.

A second recommendation for future research could explore leadership styles and school rankings while controlling for a school's demographics. For accountability purposes the TEA creates a school's comparison group of other similar campuses in the state of Texas based on the level of school (elementary, middle, high), and the school's demographics which includes attendance rates, enrollment percentages by race/ethnicity, percentage of students economically disadvantaged, percentage of English Language Learners, percentage of special education students, mobility rate, and total enrollment. The study could control for the demographics listed above, since they are used by the TEA to create the comparison groups. The research could shed some light on whether high stakes testing environment influences leadership or the other way around. Additionally, the study should control for the intensity of pressure put on teachers to focus on test scores.

A third recommendation for future research would be to add a qualitative component to the study. Interviews and questions would be used to determine the experiences of the principals who responded to the survey. Specifically, this would be done to understand why they rated some of the questions and overall traits as they did. Since both the met standard group and the improvement required campus principals rated transparency rules the highest, it would be important to understand if their use of the data yields long lasting results or if the results are short-term.

Much research has been done in the last two decades to determine what type of leadership style has the most positive effect on student achievement (Harris, 2004). Campus principals want leadership skills that will provide teachers and students with several

opportunities to be successful other than on their standardized test scores. Therefore, it would be beneficial to understand motion leadership in action. With respect to the characteristic of love your employees it would be important to know what activities they utilize and implement to show their love for their employees and how they build relationships. What specific successful team building strategies were used to build mutual respect and trust? What does love your employees look like throughout the school year? How does the principal balance the love and trust of the staff, the students and the community?

There would also be questions about the systems that the principals implemented to build capacity in their teachers. What systems do they implement to allow teachers to grow professionally? Some specific questions would include how the principal determined which professional development to provide. Also, there should be questions about the systems used to connect peers with purpose. Does the principal use a professional learning community model or is there a model that they have developed that is more effective?

Additional questions could include, where do they feel the most pressure for performance as a principal and what is the reason that most of them chose transparency rules as the top trait? Another question would be if the principal had all the time and resources, what would they change in their role as a principal to be more effective? This mixed methods approach might help explain why there was no significant differences in either of the groups and it would help to clarify why they responded the way they did on the survey instrument.

A final recommendation for future research would include a study that has a larger sample size. Larger sample sizes along with more variability of respondents (less homogeneity) provide results with more dependability. Given that major decisions affecting educators' careers, student learning and achievement, and districts' policies are based on high stakes testing results,

a representative sample size would generate more precise results for understanding the leadership style and decision making that impacts the instructional climate the greatest.   It might finally answer the question with regards to which leadership style, transformational, instructional, or motion leadership, or a blend of the three or other styles has the most direct positive effect on teachers and most indirect but encouraging impact on student achievement. In a time when high stakes testing seems to be disassociated with the breadth of learning needed for student development, a more representative sample appears to be imperative. New models of leadership need to be studied that can emerge to bridge high stakes testing outcomes to substantial learning outcomes at all levels of school education.

Summary

        Much research including articles and books has been written on leadership styles and the effect they have on student achievement. In an era of high stakes testing and the pressure to meet the accountability standards designated by state and the federal governments, much of this research centered on answering the question: how does motion leadership relate to met standard and improvement required accountability standards among public schools in the state of Texas? Research supports the idea that what teachers do in their classrooms has the most direct influence on student achievement (Barber & Mourshed, 2007; Hattie, 2009; Marzano, 2003). There is also research that supports that principals indirectly affect student achievement either in the classroom or on state standardized tests (Marzano et al., 2005; Marzano & Waters, 2009; Robinson, 2007). However, what has not been settled is which types of leader do the teachers and students need to produce the systemic change that will impact student achievement the most. Which style of leadership will lead to long term reform and long-lasting success for teachers and

students? In an era of high stakes testing and the pressure to meet the accountability standards,

which are not going away any time soon, what kind of leader does a campus need?

References

Allen, N., Grigsby, B., & Peters, M. L. (2015). Does leadership matter? Examining the

    relationship among transformational leadership, school climate, and student achievement.

    NCPEA International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 10(2), 1-22.

    Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1083099

Barber, M., & Mourshed, M. (2007). *How the world's most improved school systems*

    keep getting better. London: McKinsey & Co.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through*

    transformational leadership. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Blackman, M., & Fenwick, L. (2000). The principalship. *Education Week, 19*(29), 46-48.

    Retrieved from www.edweek.org

Boin, A., Hart, P. & Stern, E. (2005). *The politics of crisis management: Public leadership*

    under pressure. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Ing, M., Hamilton, L., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). The influence of

    school administrators on teacher retention decisions. *American Educational Research*

    Journal, 48(2), 303-333. Retrieved from http://aer.sagepub.com/content/48/2/303

Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional intelligence 2.0*. San Diego, CA: Talent Smart.

Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row, New York.

Bush, T. (2007). Educational leadership and management: theory, policy, and practice. *South*

    African Journal of Education 27(3), 391-406. Retrieved from

Coladarci, T., Cobb, C. D., Minium, E. W., & Clarke, R. B. (2008). *Fundamentals of statistical*

    reasoning. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

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

Creswell, J. (2008). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Creusere, M., Fletcher, C., Klepfer, K., & Norman, P. (2015). State of student aid and higher education in Texas. *TG Research and Analytical Services.* Retrieved from https:// www.tgslc.org/pdf/SOSA/pdf

Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory*. New York: CBS College Publishing.

Cruse, K. L., Twing, J. (2000). The history of statewide achievement testing in Texas. *Applied Measurement in Education*. (13)4 327-331. Retrieved from DOI: 10.1207/S15324818AME1304_02

Davis, S., & Leon, R. (2009). Teaching Gil to lead. *Journal of School Leadership, 19*(3), 266-298. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ916077

Dipaola, M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The principalship at a crossroads: A study of the conditions and concerns of principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, *87(*634*),* 43-65. Retrieved from http://www.principals.org/knowledge-center/publications/nassp-bulletin

Dotson-Vernon, L., & Floyd, L. (2012). Building leadership capacity via school partnerships and teacher teams. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, *85*(1), 38-49. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/ ?id =EJ9 51294

Dufour, R. & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: National Education Service.

Dufour, R., & Marzano, R. (2011). *Leaders of learning*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin, 129*, 569-591. doi:10.1037/0033- 2909.129.4.569

Elmore, R.F. (2000). Building a new structure for school leadership. *The Albert Shanker Institute.*

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

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

Fullan, M. (2002). The Change Leader. *Beyond Educational Leadership*, *59(8)* 16-21. *Retrieved from ascd.org*

Fullan, M. (2008). *The six secrets of change*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Fullan, M. (2010). *Motion leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. San Francisco, CA: Josey-Bass.

Futrell, M. (2011). Redefining leadership: Working together to change America's education paradigm and prepare for tomorrow's world. *Journal of School Leadership, 21(4) 635-648. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ98617*

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. & Borg, W. (2006). *Educational Research: An introduction.*

Gill, J. (2012). *Strength Training, 3*3(6) 24-31. Retrieved from www.learningforward.org

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). *Statistical methods in education and psychology* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Green, R. (2010). *The four dimensions of principal leadership*. Boston, MA.: Allyn & Bacon.

Hackman, M.Z., & Johnson, C.E. (2013). *Leadership A Communication Perspective (6th ed.).*

Long, Grove IL: Waveland Press, Inc.

Harris, S., Irons, E.J., & Crawford, C. (2006). Texas Superintendents' ratings of

standards/assessment/accountability programs. *Planning and Changing*, *37*(3-4), 190-

204. Retrieved from eric.ed.gov EJ756223

Hallinger, P. (2003). Leading education change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and

transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *33(3)*, 329-351. Retrieved

from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ770849

Hallinger, P., & Hausman, C. (1993). From Attila the Hun to Mary had a little lamb: Redefining

principal roles in restructured schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the

American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Howell, J. W., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership,

locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated business unit

performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78*, 891-902. Retrieved from

http://dx.DOI.org/10.1037/0021-9010.78.6.891

Harris, A. (2004). Distributed Leadership and School Improvement. *Educational Management*

Administration & Leadership. *(32),*11-24. Retrieved from DOI:

10.1177/1741143204039297

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to student*

achievement. New York: Routledge.

Hayes, K. (2016). Neoliberalism in historical light: How business models displaced science

education goals in two eras. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and*

Program Development, *27*, 1-19, Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1094418

Jones, D. & Rudd, R. (2008). Transactional, transformational, or laissez-faire leadership: An

    assessment of college of agriculture academic program leaders' (deans) leadership styles.

    Journal of Agricultural Education. 49(2), 88-97. Retrieved from

    https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ839885

Kadi, A. (2015). Investigating teachers' organizational socialization levels and perceptions about

    leadership styles of their principals. *Journal of Education and Training Studies. (3)*4,

    101-109. Retrieved from http:/dx.doi.org/10.11114/jets.v3i4.837.

Kafka, J. (2009). The Principalship in Historical Perspective. *Peabody Journal of Education.*

    84(3), 318-330. DOI 10.1080/01619560902973506.

Klein, A. (2016). Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. Every Student

    Succeeds Act: An ESSA overview. *Education Week.* Retrieved from

    http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/every-student-succeeds-act/

Knapp, M. S., & Feldman, S. B. (2012). Managing the intersection of internal and external

    accountability: Challenge for urban school leadership in the United States." *Journal of*

    Educational Administration 50(5), 666–694. doi:10.1108/09578231211249862.

Lashway, L. (1999). Preparing school leaders. Research roundup. 15(5), 1-5. Retrieved from

    eric.ed.gov ED440468

Leithwood, K. & Poplin, M. S. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership.

    *Educational Leadership, (49)*5, 8-12. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/

    ASCD/pdf/journals/ ed_lead/el_ 199202_leithwood.pdfieved

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (1999). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational

    conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration.*

    1-39. Retrieved from eric.ed.gov ED432035

Marks, H. M. & Printy, S. M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An

 integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration*

 Quarterly. 39, 370-397. Retrieved from

 http://eaq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/39/3/370

Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria,

 VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marzano, R. J., & Waters, T. (2009). *District leadership that works: Striking the right balance.*

 Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From*

 research to results. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum

 Development.

McCarley, T. A., Peters, M. L., & Decman, J. M. (2016). Transformational leadership related to

 school climate: A multi-level analysis. *Educational Management Administration &*

 Leadership, 44(2), 322–342. doi: 10.1177/1741143214549966. Retrieved from

 http://journals.sagepub.com.manowar.tamucc.edu/doi/abs/10.1177/1741143214549966

McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Milligan, C. (2015). School centered evidence based accountability. *Universal Journal of*

 Educational Research 3(7): 460-462.doi: 10.13189/ujer.2015.030705

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2009). Leading Learning Communities.

 Standards for what principals should know and be able to do. 2nd Edition. Retrieved from

 naesp.org

Neuman, S. B. (2016). Code Red: The danger of data-driven instruction. *Educational*

Leadership. 74(3) 24-29. Retrieved from

www.ascd.org/publications/educational_leadership/nov16/vol74/num03/Code_Red

Northouse, P. G. (2013). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (6ᵗʰ ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pedhazur, E. J., Schmelkin, L.P. (1991). *Measurement, Design and Analysis: An Integrated*

    Approach. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Perryman, R. (2007). A tale of two states-and one million jobs. An analysis of the economic

    benefits of achieving the future goals of the closing the gaps initiative of the Texas higher

    education coordinating board. Retrieved from thecb.state.tx.us

Quick, P., & Normore, A. (2004). Moral leadership in the 21ˢᵗ century: Everyone is watching-

    especially the students. *The Educational Forum.68 (4),* 336-347. Retrieved from

    http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ773741

Robinson, V. M. J. (2007). *School leadership and student outcomes: Identifying what works and*

    why. New South Wales Australia: Australian Council for Educational Leaders.

Ross, D. J., & Cozzens, J. A. (2016). The principalship: Essential core competencies for

    instructional leadership and its impact on school climate. *Journal of Educational and*

    Training Studies, 4(9), 162-176. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1106737

Rousmaniere, K. (2013). The principal: The most misunderstood person in all of education. *The*

    Atlantic. Retrieved from www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2013/

Seeger, M. W.; Sellnow, T. L.; Ulmer, R. R. (1998). "Communication, organization and crisis".

    Communication Yearbook. 21: 231–275.

Sergiovanni, T. (1999). *The lifeworld of leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Servage, L. (2008). Critical and transformative practices in professional learning communities. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 35*(1) 63-77. http://www.jstor.org/ stable/ 23479031? seq =1#page_scan_tab_contents

Spillane, J. P., Parise, L. M., Sherer. J. Z. (2011). Organizational routines as coupling mechanisms: Policy, school administration, and the technical core. *American Educational Research Journal 48*(3): 586–619. doi:10.3102/0002831210385102

Stevens J. P. (2009) *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences, Fifth Edition.* New York: Routledge

Stewart, J. (2006). Transformational Leadership: An evolving concept examined through the works of Burns, Bass, Avolio, and Leithwood. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy,* 54 1-29. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ843441

Sugiyama1, K., Cavanagh, K.V., van Esch, C. Billmoria, D. & Brown, C. (2016). Inclusive leadership development: Drawing from pedagogies of women's and general leadership development programs. *Journal of Management Education*. 40(3), 253-292. Retrieved from DOI: 10.1177/1052562916632553

Supovitz, J. A. (2000). Manage less, lead more. *Principal Leadership*, *1*(3), 14-19. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ616311

Texas Education Agency (2012). Retrieved from tea.texas.gov/actress/analyze/1213/gloss 203.html

Texas Education Agency (2013). Retrieved from www.tea.texas.us

Texas Education Agency (2017). Retrieved from www.tea.texas.us

Wallace Foundation. (2012). *The making of the principal: Five lessons in leadership training*. New York: Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from www.wallacefoundation.org

Wallace Foundation. (2013). *The school principal as a leader: Guiding schools to better teaching and learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation. Retrieved from www.wallacefoundation.org

Webb, K. (2007). Motivating peak performance: Leadership behaviors that stimulate employee motivation and performance. Christian Higher Education. (6) 53-71. Retrieved from DOI:10.1080/15363750600932890

West, D. L., Peck, C. M., Reitzug, U. C. (2010). Limited control and relentless accountability: examining historical changes in urban school principal pressure. *Journal of School Leadership 20*(2): 238–266. Retrieved from ds.b.ebscohost.com

West, D. L., Peck, C. M., Reitzug, U. C., & Crane, E. A. (2014). Accountability, autonomy and stress: Principal responses to superintendent change in a large US urban school district, *School Leadership & Management, 34*(4), 372-391, Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.928683

Wieczorek, D. (2017). Principals' perceptions of public schools' professional development changes during NCLB. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 25*(8). Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.14507/epaa.25.2339

Appendix A

Motion Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)

Online Consent Form

You are being asked to participate in a statewide survey regarding leadership traits you implement to instructionally lead your campus. Your participation is crucial to the understanding of the changing role of the campus principal from an instructional leader to a leader of learners. Your responses will be confidential and are used for research purposes only. All information will be reported in aggregate form and no individual identifiers are used as part of the data collection. The survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. If there are any questions, you may contact the principal investigator: Delma Yzaguirre at: delma.yzaguirre@ccisd.us.

Description: The purpose of the study is to document the motion leadership characteristics of Texas public school principals and to understand the relationship between motion leadership and the accountability rating of a Texas public school campus.

Confidentiality: This study is anonymous. The identity of the respondents and individual responses will remain confidential. If the results are published or presented at a scientific meeting, the identity of the participants will not be disclosed. Research records will be stored securely and only the principal investigator and the faculty advisor will have access to the records.

Risks and Benefits: The risks associated in this study are minimal, and are no greater than risks ordinarily encountered in daily life. You will receive no direct benefit from participating in this study; however your participation may be useful to school districts in the development of best practices for the training of campus principals as leaders of learners.

Right to Withdraw: Your participation is voluntary. You may decide not to participate or withdraw your consent and stop participating in the study at any time without penalty or your current or future relations with Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi being affected.

Voluntary Consent: You certify that you have been informed about the study's purpose, procedures, possible risks and benefits. You agree to participate in the study by completing the online survey. Please do not complete the survey, if you do not wish to participate.

This research study has been reviewed by the Research Compliance Office and/or the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you can contact Caroline Lutz, Research Compliance and Export Control Officer, at (361) 825-2497 or caroline.lutz@tamucc.edu.

The survey asks you to respond to various statements to describe your leadership style as a campus principal. While I understand that in an ideal situation as the campus principal you would respond 'always' or 'very often' to these statements, because in a perfect world you would have all the time and the resources needed. However, I ask you to reflect on your role as the

principal on the campus and to indicate how often each of the items below is or was true of you. Please be very selective. Your results will be more helpful to me if you think about each item and distinguish the things that you really do or did all the time as a campus principal from the things you sometimes, rarely or never did. Remember that this survey is anonymous and your responses and identity are confidential.

Please use the following scale in answering each item. You would respond '1'for an item that is or was never true of you, '2' for one that is or was rarely true, '3' for one that is or was sometimes true of you, '4' for one that is very often or frequently true of you, and '5' for one that is always true of you. There is no right or wrong answers. The information is gathered to understand your perceptions.

1 Never

2 Rarely

3 Sometimes

4 Very Often

5 Always

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix B

Motion Leadership Questionnaire

For the 2015-2016 school year, your campus was rated:

❑ Met Standard

❑ Improvement Required

1. I provide emotional support for my teachers to do their work

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

2. I provide intellectual support for my teachers to do their work

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

3. I provide opportunities for my teachers to find meaning in their work

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

4. I provide opportunities for my teachers to make contributions to meet the goals of the campus

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

5. I provide opportunities for my teachers to find meaning in their relationships with the campus community such as peers, students and parents

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

6. I value my teachers as much as I value my students

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

7. I foster purposeful peer interactions for my teachers to learn from one another

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

8. I facilitate purposeful peer interactions which give my teachers a shared sense of

   commitment to the success of every student

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

9. I provide my teachers with opportunities to learn from teachers from other campuses

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

10. I provide my teachers with opportunities to build effective, productive relationships with

   teachers from other campuses

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

11. I provide opportunities for my teachers to take on leadership roles

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

12. I help my teachers sustain their leadership roles on the campus

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

13. I encourage my teachers to effect change through a non-judgmental approach

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

14. I create opportunities for my teachers to develop their content knowledge

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

15. I am a role model for our campus goals

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

16. I encourage my teachers to contribute toward the achievement of the campus goals

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

17. I help new teachers develop individually

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

18. I help new teachers develop collectively with other teachers on campus

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

19. I create systemic behaviors that allow us to consistently monitor the effectiveness of the

   campus goals based on the perspective of the teachers

    Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

20. I create systemic behaviors that allow us to change the campus goals based on the

   perspective of the teachers

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

21. My teachers and I use data to know the names of every student who is at risk of

   becoming a potential drop out

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

22. I provide on the job professional learning opportunities for my teachers so that they grow

   individually

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

23. I generate an action plan for an area of my growth as a leader

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

24. I evaluate my success in improving my area of growth as a leader

   Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

25. I share state assessment data about our campus with my teachers

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

26. We use the state assessment data to write goals to improve student success

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

27. I show my teachers how to use assessment data to improve individual student success

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

28. I provide opportunities for my teachers to understand other campus data

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

29. I show my teachers how to use data to write goals for the campus

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

30. I am transparent in my sharing of all data with teachers

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

31. I am a confident campus principal, open to new ideas

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

32. I take all of the credit when the campus is successful

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

33. I take all of the blame when the campus is not successful

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

34. I take some of the credit and some of the blame when the campus is either successful or

   not successful

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

35. I set goals for the campus

       Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

36. I talk about the future of the campus

Never ❑   Rarely ❑   Sometimes ❑   Very Often ❑   Always ❑

For this final portion of the survey please answer the following questions about yourself and your campus:

1. Number of years' of experience as a campus principal? _____

2. Number of years' of experience as the principal on the campus with the accountability rating for 2015-2016? _____

3. Number of years' of experience as an educator? _____

4. What is your gender?

Male ❑

Female ❑

5. What is your Ethnicity?

❑ American Indian or Alaska Native

❑ Asian

❑ Black or African American

❑ Hispanic or Latino

❑ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

❑ White

❑ Other

6. What is your age? _____

7. Highest Degree attained?

 ❑ Bachelor's

 ❑ Master's

 ❑ Doctorate

8. Please indicate the type of campus?

 ❑ Elementary

 ❑ Middle

 ❑ High

9. What is your campus/district classification?

 ❑ Rural

 ❑ Urban

 ❑ Suburban