CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS

THESIS SIGNATURE PAGE

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

EDUCATION

THESIS TITLE: Analysis of Leadership, Trust and Efficacy Within a Medium District's Middle School

AUTHOR: Tanya Marie Johnson

DATE OF SUCCESSFUL DEFENSE: May 2, 2013

THE THESIS HAS BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE THESIS COMMITTEE IN
PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF
ARTS IN EDUCATION.

Dr. Carol VanVooren	*Carol Van Vooren*	05/02/2013
THESIS COMMITTEE CHAIR	SIGNATURE	DATE
Mark Garner	*Mark R. Gar*	05/02/2013
THESIS COMMITTEE MEMBER	SIGNATURE	DATE

Analysis of Leadership, Trust and Efficacy

Within a Medium District's

Middle School

by

Tanya Marie Johnson

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the

Master of Arts Degree

in

Educational Administration

California State University San Marcos

Spring, 2013

Abstract

There are positive links between principal leadership characteristics, levels of teacher efficacy, and trust. A group of middle school teachers from a rural district in southern California were surveyed. Responses from 24 teachers and one principal were analyzed to determine whether specific principal behaviors affected teacher efficacy as a group and by gender. Analyses examined the correlations between principal leadership characteristics, teacher efficacy, principal trust in teachers, teacher trust in the principal and teacher trust in each other. Findings suggest that the variables examined are significantly related and vary based on gender. Further studies with varying demographics of districts are recommended. This thesis was completed as a graduate requirement for the master's in Educational Administration at California State University San Marcos.

Keywords: middle school, principal leadership characteristics, relationship, teacher efficacy, trust

Acknowledgments

This journey has been accomplished with the support of my mom and dad. Thank you for your flexibility and love during my moments of insanity. To my daughter Jamie, whose patience and smiles got me through. To Dr. Carol Van Vooren, with your support, I am still standing! To CJ, thank you for being my partner through this program and for life!

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Analysis of Leadership, Trust and Efficacy Within a Medium District's Middle School

Relationships shape and define who we are as individuals within a society. Cultivating positive relationships can bring about personal success. Think about the relationships in your professional life. Do you trust your supervisor and colleagues? Do you feel successful and confident in your job? Does your supervisor impact the way you feel about yourself and vice versa? What could your supervisor do to make you better at your job? A school is a diverse community where its very success depends on cultivating relationships. A teacher's ultimate goal is to educate students, but this process starts long before the teacher and student meet in the classroom. A school develops a culture based on several variables, one of which is relationships; however, the variables that impact these relationships remain unclear. This study hopes to help clarify these variables.

Purpose of Research

The purpose of this study is to examine the different variables that impact relationships within a middle school. The variables being studied include principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher self-efficacy. To investigate this problem, the following research questions were analyzed:

1. Which principal leadership characteristics positively or negatively affect teacher self-efficacy?

2. Are the factors of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust in teachers, faculty trust and teacher self-efficacy related?

Previous research (Ryan, 2007 and Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2005) has shown connections between principal leadership characteristics and teacher efficacy. How does a principal impact the school, staff, and student success? I have found little research focusing on

middle school culture and the research reviewed has returned conflicting or non-significant data. How are principal leadership characteristics, teacher efficacy, principal trust in teachers and faculty trust related? How is a school's culture affected by principal leadership and teacher efficacy? Can a faculty's level of trust affect the school's culture? What do we need to create a successful school culture?

The current study will help build upon the research of Tschannen-Moran and Gareis, (2004), who studied the variables of efficacy as related to principals and teachers by analyzing the relationships between efficacy as well as principal leadership characteristics and trust. The researcher will examine the research of Walker and Slear (2011), who studied the relationship between principal leadership characteristics and teacher efficacy as defined by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001). The researchers' study found non-significant data between the two variables as related to middle school teachers. The current study will look at the affect of principal leadership characteristics on teacher efficacy, as well as consider the variables of principal trust and faculty trust at a middle school in one district.

Preview Literature

The following section will provide an overview of the literature, guided by each research question. Question one: What principal leadership characteristics affect teacher self-efficacy? Walker and Slear created the "Rating of Principal Characteristics" scale in 2011 in an attempt to identify key characteristics that affect teacher efficacy. After reviewing the literature, they found a common theme that encompassed 11 specific characteristics that may affect teacher efficacy. The scale allows teachers to rate their principals on how important they feel each characteristic is. The results from this survey were then compared to results from the Teacher's Sense of Efficacy Scale (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). The researchers found little or non-

significant data in relation to middle school teachers, suggesting that principal behavior does not affect how middle school teachers feel about themselves as educators. However, the researchers noted that other variables that were not measured might have affected the results. The current study will use the "Rating of Principal Characteristics" scale (Walker & Slear, 2011) and the TSES short form (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001).

Question two: Are the factors of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher self-efficacy related? The review of the literature found four significant principal characteristics, as examined by Walker and Slear (2011), correlated with characteristics found in faculty trust and principal trust. The characteristics include: communication, consideration, empowering staff, and inspiring group purpose. Walker and Slear (2011) used the principal trust scale developed by Gareis and Tschannen-Moran in 2005 and the Faculty Trust Scales developed by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy in 1999. Another study by Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) found that when a school possesses a high level of trust, the efficacy of teachers is minimally affected by a principal's behavior; and when a school possesses low trust levels, efficacy of teachers is more affected by a principal's behavior. This suggests that there is a complex balance of impacting relationships in a school. The current study will analyze all of the variables using correlational analysis, in hopes of filling in the gaps in the research. Data collection instuments will include the "Rating of Principal Characteristics" scale (Walker & Slear, 2011), TSES short form (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), faculty trust scale (Gareis & Tschannen-Moran, 2004), and principal trust scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

Preview Methodology

In an attempt to answer the research questions and address the hypotheses, the current study used correlational research design. Pearson product-moment correlations were used to

evaluate the relationships between the variables in this study. Four surveys were used to gather data. A compilation of three surveys was distributed to 39 middle school teachers, including the rating of principal characteristics (RPC), teacher sense of efficacy scale short form (TSES), principal trust scale and faculty trust scale. A survey was distributed to one middle school principal for principal trust in teachers. The principal trust scale measures the level of principal trust in three subscales: principal trust in the faculty, principal trust of students, and principal trust in parents. The current study only measures the subscale of principal trust in faculty.

The RPC had teachers rate their current principal on 11 principal characteristics according to level of effectiveness. The TSES measured a teacher's sense of efficacy is three subscales: efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in instructional practices, and efficacy in classroom management. The faculty trust scale measures the level of faculty trust in a school and consists of three subscales: faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in clients (students and parents). The current study only used the faculty trust subscales of faculty trust in the principal (FTP) and faculty trust in colleagues (FTT).

The surveys were distributed to participants through Google Forms. Participants were directed to a website, where they answered the questions. Data was gathered and analyzed using SSPS 20.0 and Microsoft Excel. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson r) was used to calculate the correlation coefficients for the overall scores of each survey as well as each category of each survey compared with each category of the other.

Significance of Research

The study is significant to the field of education in that it builds upon the available body of knowledge relating principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher self-efficacy. There have been several studies that look at the relationships between

combinations of these variables. Ryan (2007) measured teacher efficacy and principal leadership characteristics. Bogler (2001) analyzed principal leadership style and teachers' perceptions of their occupation. Studies have analyzed the affects of principal and teacher relationships (Barnett & McCormick, 2004; Moye, Henkin & Egley, 2004; Price, 2012). Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) studied the relationships between three factors: leadership characteristics, faculty trust in the principal, and teacher self-efficacy. Walker and Slear (2011) analyzed principal leadership characteristics and teacher self-efficacy. This study will analyze the relationship between all of four variables: principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher self-efficacy to create a more complete picture of how different relationships affect one another in middle schools. Gender differences will also be reported as it relates to the affect of principal characteristics on teacher efficacy and the variables of trust.

How can we utilize the knowledge of effective principal leadership qualities to impact principal preparation programs? We start by looking at which leadership qualities teachers view as effective. How is teacher efficacy impacted by these leadership qualities? Do these factors have an impact on faculty trust as a whole? In addition to the significance for the field of education, the study is important to the school district where the study was performed. The study can lead to improvements in the principal support program in order to raise the efficacy level of principals and teachers, which may impact trust levels among faculty. By teaching principals the key leadership qualities needed to positively impact their staff, it may result in a more cohesive school climate. The end goal is to create a successful learning environment for students.

Limitations

Limitations to the current study may include a low return rate. Teachers may answer more or less positively, if they believe the principal will have access to the answers. The length

and amount of surveys may cause participants to quickly and thoughtlessly answer the questions, in order to complete the surveys. Participants may have answered questions according to their responses on other survey questions. By not having qualitative data, it is difficult to know why participants answered in the manner they did. Since only one school is being surveyed, the findings may not be generalizable.

Conclusion

Many questions have been asked regarding the complex system known as education. How do we know which factors affect these relationships? Researchers have looked at these relationships by examining the variables: principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher self-efficacy. However, no study has examined all of these factors together in one school. The current study will examine how principal leadership characteristics may affect teacher self-efficacy and how the factors of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust and teacher self-efficacy are or are not related.

The researcher will disperse electronic surveys to teachers and the principal through email. The data gathered through an online survey will be analyzed using a statistical software package. Pearson r correlations will be performed between surveys and among categories within the surveys, in an attempt to answer the research questions. The research results may give the educational community insight on how to create a more productive educational environment for students by nurturing the relationships between faculty members. Chapter two will discuss the literature that analyzes the current researcher's variables of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher self-efficacy.

Definitions

- Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS): This is a software package used for conducting statistical analysis.

- Teacher's Self-Efficacy: Teachers' beliefs in their ability to have a positive impact on student learning (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993).

- Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES): This is a measurement tool designed by Tschannen-Moran of the College of William and Mary and Woolfolk Hoy of Ohio State University to measure the total efficacy of teachers as well as efficacy constructs of student engagement, classroom management and instructional strategies.

- Trust: is an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open (Hoy & Tschannen- Moran, 2003).

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Conversations among the educational community continuously question the relationship between teacher efficacy and student achievement. Changes occurring in society, policy, and practice challenge teachers more and more. Students come into the classroom with a wide variety of socioeconomic backgrounds, educational preparation and home lives. Teachers are faced with high-level accountability requirements, such as No Child Left Behind (Kelley, Thornton, & Daugherty, 2005). Researchers have shown that teacher efficacy is linked to the level of professional commitment, the likelihood to try new teaching strategies, and the likelihood to remain in the teaching profession (Bogler, 2001; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Price, 2012; Ryan, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Walker & Slear, 2011). Banduras' (1977) theory of self-efficacy suggests that efficacy may be most malleable early in learning, thus the first years of teaching could be critical to the long-term development of teacher efficacy. This information leads us to wonder, what impact principal behaviors have on a teacher's efficacy? Research has examined the relationships between teacher efficacy and which characteristics principals possessed that were seen as motivating factors (Bogler, 2001; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Price, 2012; Ryan, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001; Walker & Slear, 2011). Further research demonstrated specific characteristics that principals could portray as a motivating factor for teachers (Bogler 2001; Price, 2012; Woods, Bennett, Harvey, & Wise, 2004). Previous research is lacking in determining the specific factors related to principal-teacher and teacher-teacher relationships occurring within middle schools (Ryan, 2007). The current study focuses specifically on the relationships found within middle schools. Do specific principal leadership characteristics affect middle school teacher efficacy? Is the level of faculty trust in middle

schools related to principal trust and teacher efficacy? Prior research will be addressed along with the implications for further research that the current study hopes to answer. Participants will be teachers and a principal from a middle school in a rural community. This study will use surveys to gather data on the factors of principal leadership characteristics (Walker & Slear, 2011), teacher efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), principal trust (Gareis & Tschannen-Moran, 2004) and faculty trust (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Statistical Package Social Sciences (SPSS 20.0) will be used to calculate Pearson Product-Moment Correlations to determine the relationships between variables for this study. The following sections will reflect on prior research including: principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher efficacy.

Theoretical Framework

The types of principal leadership qualities and their effects on teacher efficacy have been measured through a variety of means. Each researcher either utilizes another's instrument of measurement or they develop their own in an attempt to clarify the effects. This section will look at previous methods of measurement and the methods of measurement that will be used in the current study. The primary factors of interest include: principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher efficacy.

Background Information of Principal Leadership Characteristics

What specific leadership characteristics do principals possess that effectively impact teacher efficacy? Walker and Slear (2011) studied the effects of principal behaviors on teacher efficacy levels. Their results showed statistically significant relationships between teacher efficacy and three out of the 11 principal behaviors. The three behaviors included modeling instructional expectations, communication, and providing contingent rewards. The findings

demonstrated that principal influences on teacher efficacy vary with teacher experience.

Implications of the research suggested administrators respond to the unique needs of each

teacher in order to increase levels of efficacy and positively impact student achievement. The

authors recommended further research. The current study is using the Rating of Principal

Characteristics survey created by Walker and Slear (2011) to assess which characteristics affect

teacher efficacy the highest along with gender differences. Walker and Slear (2011)

operationalized each characteristic based on trends they found in previous research.

The 11 characteristics and their definitions include:

- Communication—The principal establishes strong lines of communication with and
  among students and teachers (Blase & Kirby, 2000; Whitaker, 2003).

- Consideration—The principal expresses genuine concern for the welfare of teachers and
  makes efforts to get to know each individual (Blase & Kirby, 2000; Hipp & Bredeson,
  1995).

- Discipline—The principal protects teachers from intrusion into their instructional time.
  This includes limiting announcements and preventing disruptions to class time (Hipp,
  1996; O'Donnell & White, 2005).

- Empowering Staff—The principal provides opportunities for teachers to make decisions
  about their work and to be involved in school-wide decisions (Edwards, Green, & Lyons,
  2002; Ross, 1995).

- Flexibility—The principal uses varied leadership behaviors as necessary based on
  specific situations and circumstances in the school (Blase & Kirby, 2000; Marzano,
  Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

- Influence with supervisors—The principal effectively garners support from supervisors and district-level administrative offices to assist in meeting the needs of the school (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993).

- Inspiring group purpose—The principal creates an environment where all teachers are part of a team and work together toward shared goals that result in student and teacher success (Ashton & Webb, 1986; Hipp, 1996).

- Modeling instructional expectations—The principal models his/her belief in the instructional process and emphasizes the importance of the instruction that takes place in each classroom (Ebmeier, 2003; Hipp & Bredeson, 1995).

- Monitoring and evaluating instruction—The principal "keeps an eye" on what is happening in the school and provides feedback to teachers regarding the instructional impact of classroom strategies (Ebmeier, 2003; Hipp & Bredeson, 1995).

- Providing contingent rewards—The principal formally and informally recognizes outstanding work inside and outside of the classroom and shares this recognition in tangible and visible ways (Hipp, 1996; Marzano et al., 2005).

- Situational awareness—The principal is aware of the details and concerns regarding the functioning of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems (Hipp, 1996; Marzano et al., 2005).

The next section reviews the importance of teacher efficacy and its relationship to principal leadership characteristics.

Teacher Self-Efficacy and Principal Leadership Characteristics

Teachers' self-efficacy has been related to "such significant variables as student achievement, student motivation, teacher adoption of innovations . . . and teachers' classroom

management strategies" (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993, p. 355). Walker and Slear (2011) attempted to determine the characteristics that impacted middle school teacher efficacy by creating the Rating of Principal Characteristics (RPC) survey and comparing it to the teacher's self-efficacy as measured by the TSES-long form created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy in 2001. The 11 characteristics measured on the RPC were compiled from recurring themes the researchers encountered in their review of the literature. The current study is using both the RPC and the TSES-short form to measure the effects of principal leadership characteristics on middle school teacher efficacy. Ryan (2007) used the TSES-long form to measure teacher efficacy and the leadership qualities survey used was Jantzi and Leithwood's principal leadership questionnaire (PLQ) to assess the characteristics that impact teacher efficacy (Ryan, 2007). The researcher found no significant relationship between teacher efficacy and leadership characteristics with regard to middle school level teachers. They determined that the results may have been related to gathering a sample that was not representative of the population. Bogler (2001) studied the affects of three factors that impact teacher satisfaction, including: principals' leadership style, principals' decision-making strategy, and teachers' perceptions of their occupation. Bogler (2011) used the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) to measure specific leadership characteristics. By conducting a factor analysis, he identified five principal characteristics that influenced teacher satisfaction: charisma, personal consideration, intellectual stimulation, contingent rewards and management by exception. Other research noted that high levels of satisfaction were found in schools where risk taking was encouraged and accepted by administration and faculty (Tschannen-Moran, 2009; Price, 2012).

In addition to using surveys, Ryan (2007) used an open-ended questionnaire to determine if statistically high efficacy teachers (as measured on the TSES) among all levels (elementary,

middle and high school) would find importance in similar leadership behaviors as each other.

Results indicated that teachers desired leaders who saw them as part of a team and also

maintained high expectations for instructional standards.   High efficacy teachers also maintained

a healthy personal life outside of school and desired a principal who held the same value of

family relationships. Teachers also desired principals who were supportive in the professional

environment. The author suggests that a leader who does not provide support and guidance to

their staff will create an environment of distrust and mediocrity.

The following sections will examine each of the four significant principal leadership

characteristics, as identified by Walker and Slear (2011), and how they are related to principal

trust and faculty trust, according to the literature.

Principal Leadership Characteristics/ Principal Trust/ Faculty Trust

Throughout the review of the literature, the research showed the principal leadership

characteristics, as discussed by Walker and Slear (2011), as being similar to factors associated

with trust. The following sections will review four of the 11 principal leadership characteristics

found to be significant, according to Walker and Slear, as well as the literature associated with

trust factors (principal and faculty).

Communication. Kelley, Thornton and Daugherty (2005) found that statistically

significant positive relationships were established between teachers' perceptions of their

principals' effectiveness when strong communication was established. This open level of

communication, by sharing information, may contribute to teachers feeling enabled to make

responsible decisions (Moye, Henkin & Egley, 2004). When an environment emphasizes

communication and collaboration, there is a higher likelihood of trust to develop (Butler, 1991;

Moye, Henkin & Egley, 2004; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Van

Maele and Van Houtte (2009) used Tschannen-Moran and Hoy's (1999) faculty trust scale to determine the organizational characteristics that impacted teacher efficacy; however, the data could not explain the relationships between faculty trust and the principal characteristics. It was suggested that individual characteristics possessed by the principal determine trust, rather than organizational factors (Van Maele & Van Houtte 2009). The gaps in the study are recognized as the absence of collecting data related to specific principal leadership characteristics. The current study will attempt to address these gaps by collecting data on principal self-efficacy.

Consideration. Principals have the ability to promote trust in their staff through demonstrating benevolent behavior and avoiding exploiting individuals for personal gain (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). The current study will see if this relationship extends to teacher efficacy as well.

Empowering staff. Research has demonstrated that when principals build relationships by engaging in distributed leadership among staff, the levels of faculty trust increase (Van Maele & Van Houtte, 2009; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2004). In order for a school to maintain an effective distributive leadership format, there must be a strong measure of trust among staff members and between staff members and principals (Woods, Bennett, Harvey, & Wise, 2004). Moye, Henkin and Egley's (2004) study concluded that teachers had higher levels of interpersonal trust with principals when teachers found their work to be important and meaningful on a personal level, felt they had significant autonomy, and had perceived influence of their work environment. When teachers were involved in making school-wide decisions that affected them, they were more likely to put the school's interest above their own (Hoy and Tarter, 2004; Thoonen, Sleegers, Oort, Peetsma & Geijsel, 2011).

Wahlstrom & Louis (2008) found that when schools maintained a high level of collaboration among the staff and relied less on the principal for instructional knowledge, the ultimate impact of leadership trust was diminished. It is this decrease in power differential between teachers and principals that has a positive impact on instruction (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008). Principals in complex systems (schools) with interdependent parts are recognizing, increasingly, that empowered employees and trustworthy behaviors may function to alleviate some of the sources of mistrust in the school; that may affect a teacher's belief in the honesty, integrity, and reliability of supervisors and other employees (Moye et al., 2004, p.273).

Inspiring group purpose. When individual teachers are given the opportunity to collaborate together, they are more likely to set more challenging goals and remain committed to those goals (Brinson & Steiner, 2007). Principals can improve faculty trust by building instructional knowledge and skills, creating opportunities for teachers to collaboratively share skills and experience, interpret results, and provide actionable feedback on teachers' performance and involve teachers in group decision-making (Ross & Gray, 2006). The following section will discuss how the current study will address the factors of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher efficacy.

Connections to Literature

Are specific principal leadership characteristics related to how teachers feel about their ability to teach (teacher efficacy)? Is a principal's ability to trust his or her faculty and vice versa related to one another? Does a faculty's ability to trust one another contribute to individual teacher efficacy? By analyzing these factors separately or together, do the relationships change? The previous research examines these relationships in pairs or isolation. Demographic information, such as gender, also played a factor in some relationships. Walker and Slear's

(2011) research specifically looked at the relationships between specific principal leadership characteristics and how they were related to teacher efficacy. By developing the rating of principal characteristics (RPC) survey and using the TSES-long form survey created by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy in 2001, they were only able to identify three out of 11 principal characteristics that were related to middle school teacher's efficacy. Ryan (2007) researched the relationship between principal leadership qualities (PLQ) using a survey by Jantzi and Leithwood and teacher efficacy using the TSES-long form. In his study, there was a lack of significant relationships between middle school teacher efficacy and principal leadership qualities. Kelley, Thornton, & Daugherty (2005) compared teacher perceptions of their principals and principal's self-perception on the measures flexibility and effectiveness. The correlations were measured at near zero, indicating that teacher and principal ratings are not related. The authors noted the small number of principals participating in the study might have affected the results. Van Maele and Van Houtte's (2009) research examined the relationship between faculty trust and organizational characteristics. The authors were unable to determine which specific principal characteristics impacted faculty trust because the data on those characteristics were not gathered. Each of the studies noted in this chapter overlap in the analysis of certain variables (i.e. principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher efficacy), but each one notes a specific limitation that opens the door for further research. The current study hopes to clarify the relationships occurring in schools. By using surveys that have been utilized in previous research to gather information from both teachers and principals in middle schools, the current study is hoping to add to the literature.

Conclusion

The current study is analyzing the relationships between the following factors: principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher efficacy, in middle schools. Previous research has examined these factors individually or in pairs (i.e. principal leadership characteristics and teacher efficacy; principal trust and teacher efficacy). However, there is no study that considers the impact of all of these factors together. With all the variables to consider in the school environment, it's important to look at as many contributing factors as possible. With the inconsistent results among middle school teachers in previous research, this study will attempt to clarify the affecting variables and analyze the relationships between principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher efficacy. By performing a correlational analysis and Pearson Product-Moment Correlations within a group (individual middle school), the researcher will attempt to identify the relationships between variables and how they impact one another.

Chapter Three: Methodology

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the participants, variables, instrument, procedures, and data analysis utilized in this study. The purpose of this study was to determine if there was a relationship between principal leadership characteristics, teacher self-efficacy, faculty trust, and principal trust within a selected California public middle school. In this study, data evaluation included, *principal leadership characteristics* as rated by teachers, *teacher efficacy* was correlated with *principal leadership characteristics*, *faculty trust in teachers* and *faculty trust in the principal. Principal trust in teachers* was also measured. The following research questions guided the study:

1. Which principal leadership characteristics positively or negatively affect teacher self-efficacy?

2. Are the factors of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust in teachers, faculty trust and teacher self-efficacy related?

Design

The study was quantitative in nature using the Pearson Product-Moment correlational research design. Correlational analysis allows the researcher to look for non-causal relationships between different variables. The researcher used correlational analysis to analyze the results of the four variables to attempt to answer the research questions. Each respondent's survey was scored to produce an overall score and categorical scores for each variable being studied. The correlation coefficients were then calculated for the relationships of the four variables as well as for the relationships of each of the categories. Instrumentation will be discussed in detail later in this chapter. Statistical Package Social Sciences (SPSS 20.0) was used to calculate Pearson

product-moment correlations to determine the significance of the relationships between variables for this study.

This section will address the two research questions and the surveys used to answer those questions. Question one was addressed through the use of the teacher sense of efficacy scale short form (TSES) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) and the rating of principal characteristics (RPC) survey (Walker & Slear, 2011). Teacher participants, who were selected through convenience sampling, completed both surveys. The participants were sent links to both surveys via email, to be completed electronically. The survey data was sent and returned through a password secured Google form. Analysis of the quantified data was achieved through SPSS 20.0.

Question two was accomplished through correlational analysis of variables quantified as principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher efficacy. The principal was sent an electronic link to the principal trust survey. Teachers were sent an electronic link to the RPC, TSES and faculty trust surveys.

Participants

The study took place in a middle school located in a rural district in Southern California. This school served approximately 850 students for the 2012-2013 school year and employed 39 teachers. The school district contains 8 schools: 3 elementary, 1 K-8, 1 middle, 1 high school, 1 continuation high school and 1 online K-12 prep school. All participants are English speakers who are over 18 years of age. The study population contained 39 middle school teachers and one principal in the selected school. The population for the proposed study consisted of all respondents from these 39 teachers and one principal. Respondents consisted of 16 female and eight male teachers. The principal was male. The total return rate for all teacher surveys was 61.5%, or 24 teachers. The return rate for the principal survey was 100%.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study were the Rating of Principal Characteristics (RPC) (Walker & Slear, 2011), Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) by (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), Principal Trust Scale (Gareis & Tschannen-Moran, 2004) and Faculty Trust Scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003).

Rating of Principal Characteristics

The RPC survey (Walker & Slear, 2011) consists of 11 characteristics that were found by the researchers to be important factors in impacting teacher efficacy and are operationalized according to descriptions found in the author's research. The 11 characteristics are labeled: communication, consideration, discipline, empowering staff, flexibility, influence with supervisors, inspiring group purpose, modeling instructional expectations, monitoring and evaluating instruction, providing contingent rewards and situational awareness. Each participant was asked to rate each behavior using a 9-point Likert-type scale that identified each participant's perception of the importance of each behavior in influencing teacher efficacy. The principal behavior rating survey, RPC was developed and field-tested with middle school teachers in a mid-Atlantic school system. Permission to use this survey was requested and obtained in writing from the authors (see Appendices A and B). See Appendix C for a full copy of the "Rating of Principal Characteristics".

Table 1

Reliability Scale for Rating of Principal Characteristics

	Mean	SD	alpha
Rating of Principal Characteristics	7.3	1.86	0.89

Note. Scale – 9 point Likert from *Very low importance* to *Very high importance.* From "The

impact of principal leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and experienced middle school

teachers," by J. Walker, 2011, *NASSP Bulletin, 95*(1), *volume,* p. 46-64. Reprinted with

permission.

Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale

The TSES was examined and tested in three separate studies resulting in a long form of

the instrument with 24 items and a short form with 12 items (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk

Hoy, 2001). The three subscales examined were: efficacy in student engagement, efficacy in

instructional strategies and efficacy in classroom management. A factor analysis was used to test

the instrument by computing an efficacy subscale score for each factor and calculating the mean

of the responses to the individual items. The final analysis of the three subscales suggested that

both the long form and the short form would reliably measure the construct of teacher efficacy.

A total score, as well as three subscale scores can be calculated with the total score being the

most likely means of gauging efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). TSES

subscale factors are listed in Table 2. TSES reliabilities are listed in Table 3. Permission to use

this survey was requested and obtained in writing from the author Dr. Tschannen-Moran,

associate professor, at the School of Education of The College of William and Mary in

Williamsburg, Virginia. (Appendices D and E). See Appendix F for a full copy of the TSES.

The current study will use the TSES short form.

Table 2

Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale: Short-form Subscale Factor Items

Factor	Item #
Efficacy in Classroom Management	1, 3, 6, 8

Efficacy in Student Engagement	2, 4, 7, 11
Efficacy in Instructional Strategies	5, 9, 10, 12

Note. Scale – 9 point Likert from *None at all* to *A great deal.* Reprinted from "Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct," by M. Tschannen-Moran and A. Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, p. 783-805. Adapted with permission.

Table 3

Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale: Short-form Subscale Reliabilities

Subscales	Mean	SD	alpha
TSES	7.1	.98	.90
Classroom Management	7.2	1.2	.86
Student Engagement	6.7	1.2	.86
Instructional Strategies	6.7	1.2	.86

Note. Scale – 9 point Likert from *None at all* to *A great deal.* Reprinted from "Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct," by M. Tschannen-Moran and A. Woolfolk Hoy, 2001, *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, p. 783-805. Adapted with permission.

Principal Trust Scale

The principal trust scale measures the level of principal trust in three subscales: principal trust in teachers (PTT), principal trust of students, and principal trust in parents. The norms are based on a sample of 642 principals in Virginia and Ohio. The reliability for Principal Trust in Teachers was .87 in the norming sample, .87 for Principal Trust in Students, and .86 for Principal Trust in Parents. Factor analysis studies of the Principal Trust Scale support the construct validity of this measure (Gareis & Tschannen-Moran, 2004). The PTT subscale can be converted to a standardized score with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100 to make

comparison with other schools possible. The current study only used the subscale of Principal

Trust in Teachers. For all subscale factor items see Table 4. Permission to use this survey was

requested and obtained in writing from the author Dr. Tschannen-Moran (Appendices G and H).

See Appendix I for a full copy of the Principal Trust Scale.

Table 4

Principal Trust Survey Subscale Factor Items

Factor	Item #
Principal Trust in Teachers	1, 4, 6, 8*, 9*, 12, 13, 17, 18
Principal Trust in Students[1]	3, 5, 7, 10, 11, 19
Principal Trust in Clients[1]	2, 14, 15, 16, 20

Note. Scale – 6 point Likert. *Items are reversed scored. [1]Not measured in current study.*

Reprinted from "Principals' Sense of Efficacy and Trust," by C. R. Gareis and M. Tschannen-

Moran, April, 2004, *Paper accepted to be presented at the annual meeting of the American*

Educational Research Association, San Diego.

Faculty Trust Scale

The faculty trust scale measures the level of faculty trust in a school and consists of three

subscales: faculty trust in the principal (FTP), faculty trust in colleagues (FTT), and faculty trust

in clients (students and parents). The norms for the faculty trust scales are based on a sample of

97 high schools in Ohio, 66 middle schools in Virginia, and 146 elementary schools in Ohio. The

reliabilities of the three subscales range from .90 to .98. Factor analysis studies of the faculty

trust scale support the construct validity of the measure (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Each

of the subscales, FTP and FTT, can be converted to a standardized score with a mean of 500 and

a standard deviation of 100 to make comparison with other schools possible.   The range of the

standardized scores is presented below:

    If the score is 200, it is lower than 99% of the schools.

    If the score is 300, it is lower than 97% of the schools.

    If the score is 400, it is lower than 84% of the schools.

    If the score is 500, it is average.

    If the score is 600, it is higher than 84% of the schools.

    If the score is 700, it is higher than 97% of the schools.

    If the score is 800, it is higher than 99% of the schools.

    Permission to use this survey was requested and obtained in writing from the author Dr.

Tschannen-Moran (Appendices G and H). See Appendix J for a full copy of the Faculty Trust

Scale. The current study only used the subscales of faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust

in colleagues (see Table 5).

Table 5

Faculty Trust Survey Subscale Factor Items

Factor	Item #
Faculty Trust in the Principal	3, 5, 6, 10, 14*, 15*, 23*, 25
Faculty Trust in Colleagues	2, 4, 7, 11, 18*, 20, 21
Faculty Trust in Clients[1]	1, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 19*, 22, 24, 26

Note. Scale – 6 point Likert. *Items are reversed scored. [1]Not measured in current study.*

Adapted from *Studies in Leading and Organizing Schools* (pp. 181-208), by W.K. Hoy and C.G.

Miskel, 2003, Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing. Adapted with permission.

Summary of Surveys

In the study by Walker and Slear in 2011, researchers found four of the characteristics measured on the rating of principal characteristics survey to be related to specific subscales in the TSES. There was limited data related to middle school teachers. The current study hopes by using the "Rating of Principal Characteristics" scale (Walker & Slear, 2011), TSES short form (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001), faculty trust scale (Gareis & Tschannen-Moran, 2004), and principal trust scale (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003) to collect data, that a more complete picture of how relationships between the variables of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust, faculty trust, and teacher self-efficacy impact one another.

Procedures

The current research study is quantitative in nature and uses validated surveys to analyze the correlations between the variables of principal leadership characteristics, teacher efficacy, faculty trust in teachers, faculty trust in the principal and principal trust in teachers. The researcher did not find a study that analyzed all four variables in one population. The current study will gather and analyze data for each of the variables. This section will outline the procedure steps including participant recruitment, principal consent and safeguard process, teacher consent and safeguard process, survey distribution, and timeframe.

Participant Recruitment

All participants were recruited from the middle school in the district being studied. The researcher contacted the Director of Human Resources at the district, who communicated the request for research with the participating principal. Upon the confirmation of approval from the Director of HR and IRB committee, the researcher contacted the principal via e-mail and presented him with a research proposal defining the data to be collected and the benefits it would

have for his staff. A follow-up e-mail was sent to answer any remaining questions. At a staff

meeting, the researcher presented teachers with an information sheet outlining the purpose and

benefits of participating in the research study.

Survey Distribution

The initial e-mail to the principal stated the purpose of the study, requested the

principal's involvement, stated that all participation is voluntary and anonymous, and included

the direct link to the survey instrument should the principal choose to participate. The principal

was sent the survey measuring principal trust in teachers (Gareis & Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Due to the small sample population of teachers available, all were solicited to participate

in the survey. The researcher presented the teachers with an information sheet outlining the

purpose and benefits of participating in the research study. Electronic addresses were acquired

from the school principal. The initial e-mail stated the purpose of the study, requested the

teacher's involvement, stated that all participation is voluntary, and included the direct link to the

survey instrument should the teacher choose to participate. A comprehensive survey consisting

of portions of the three surveys (rating of principal characteristics, TSES short form and faculty

trust) were used to gather data from the teachers.

Timeframe

The duration of the survey was two weeks. The researcher presented the teachers with a

survey information sheet at a special staff meeting and followed up with an email containing a

link to the online survey, one hour after the meeting. A second email was sent one week later

thanking those who had participated and encouraged the remaining participants to respond. A

final email was sent one week later thanking all participants and notifying all teachers that the

survey was closed. Data was collected and analyzed using SPSS 20.0 and Microsoft Excel. The

researcher provided a brief summary of results upon email request 90 days following the

collection of data. All Google forms and survey responses were deleted upon the completion of

the research project.

Analysis

The current study is following correlational research design. A sample of cross-sectional

data will be gathered through surveys and the data will be collected in Google forms and

uploaded to SPSS 20.0 for analysis. Data analysis will be conducted using Pearson product-

moment correlation coefficient. The correlation coefficient, or Pearson r, is a number (between -

1.0 and +1.0) that indicates the degree of relationship between the two variables, whether that

relationship is positive or negative, and helps determine how well that line represents the data set

coefficient. SPSS computed the Pearson *r* to establish bivariate correlation coefficient values for

each of the variables, determining both the magnitude and the direction of the relationship.

Descriptive statistics (gender) were used for comparison and interpretation. The teacher survey

response rate was 61.5%.

Summary

This chapter explains the methodology that was used in this correlational study of the

effects of principal leadership behaviors on teacher efficacy and the relationship between the

variables of principal trust, faculty trust, principal leadership characteristics and teacher efficacy.

Three research questions were addressed through quantitative methods involving two

comprehensive surveys. The study participants were middle school teachers and a principal

selected from a school district in California, utilizing a staff list acquired from the site principal.

The quantitative data was calculated and analyzed with the SPSS 20.0 data analysis program

using the Pearson *r* to establish a correlation coefficient. The next chapter presents the results of

the statistical data and analysis of each of the variables.

Chapter Four: Data Analysis

This chapter will present the results and data analysis for each research question. Descriptive statistics, including means (M) and standard deviation (SD) are presented for each variable. Mean and standard deviations of participant responses are organized by study variable and survey instrument to establish support for the study's correlational data. The total data is then distinguished as each separate subgroup. Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine if there was a relationship between each of the variables. The current study used bivariate correlational analysis and two-tailed significance. The variables examined include: teacher efficacy, teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership behaviors, principal trust in faculty and faculty trust in the principal and teachers. If variables were found to be related, the correlation indicated the strength of significance and whether or not it was positive or negative. The level of statistical significance considered acceptable for the study was $p < .05$ and $p < .01$, which is generally the acceptable measure for educational research (Ryan, 2007). Each variable was analyzed using a total score and separated by gender. All analyses were conducted using SPSS 20.0 and Microsoft Excel.

Teachers' sense of efficacy was measured with the teacher's sense of efficacy scale (TSES) consisting of three subscales: student engagement (SE), classroom management (CM) and instructional strategies (IS) (Tschannen-Moran & Woolfolk Hoy, 2001). Teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership behaviors were determined by the rating of principal characteristics (RPC) scale consisting of 11 measurable characteristics labeled: communication, consideration, discipline, empowering staff, flexibility, influence with supervisors, inspiring group purpose, modeling instructional expectations, monitoring and evaluating instruction, providing contingent rewards and situational awareness (Walker & Slear, 2011). Faculty trust

scales measured two subscales: faculty trust in colleagues (FTT) and faculty trust in the principal (FTP) (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003). Principal trust scale measured the principal trust in teachers (PTT) (Gareis & Tschannen-Moran, 2004). The faculty trust scales and principal trust scales were individually calculated using analysis instructions provided by the authors (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2003; Gareis & Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Data Presentation and Analysis

This section will describe the research findings according to the research questions and how they related to the field of education. Tables will be presented to discuss the relationships between principal leadership characteristics, teacher sense of efficacy and trust levels within the school. Each variable will be further analyzed by subgroup and gender.

Principal Leadership Characteristics and Teacher Sense of Efficacy

The first research question asked which principal leadership characteristics positively or negatively, affect teacher self-efficacy. Pearson r correlations were used to compare teacher efficacy as measured by the TSES and the 11 principal characteristics as rated by teachers using the RPC. The TSES total score measured teacher efficacy and belief in their ability to be successful at certain tasks (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). The TSES data was compared to the RPC using total TSES score and the TSES subgroups: classroom management (CM), student engagement (SE) and instructional strategies (IS). The data was also disaggregated by gender. See Table 6 for TSES descriptive statistics. Participants consisted of 16 female and eight male. Only significant correlations are presented.

Table 6

Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale: Descriptive Characteristics

Total Participants	Female	Male

	n	M	SD	n	M	SD	n	M	SD
TSES Total	24	7.21	.588	16	7.25	.577	8	7.13	.641
CM	24	7.75	.442	16	7.81	.403	8	7.38	.744
SE	24	6.63	1.013	16	6.56	1.153	8	6.75	.707
IS	24	7.54	1.062	16	7.63	1.147	8	7.38	.916

Note. CM (classroom management); SE (student engagement); IS (instructional strategies)

TSES-total. The TSES total score for all participants has a M = 7.21, SD = 0.588, N=24. Correlational analysis (see Table 7) found a strong positive relationship between TSES-total and two principal leadership characteristics: empowering staff (r = 0.554, p<.01) and flexibility (r = 0.45, p<.05). The TSES-total female had a M = 7.25, SD = 0.577, N = 16. TSES-total female had one very strong positive relationship: empowering staff (r = 0.718, p<.01); and four strong positive relationships: flexibility (r = 0.511, p<.05), influence with supervisors (r = 0.559, p<.05), inspiring group purpose (r = 0.522, p<.05), and situational awareness (r = 0.570, p<.05). The TSES-total male had a M = 7.13, SD = 0.641, N = 8. Total TSES-total male score found no significant correlations with principal leadership characteristics.

Table 7

Correlations: Teacher Sense of Efficacy and Principal Leadership Characteristics

TSES Subscales	*r*	sig.
TSES-Total (n = 24)		
Empowering Staff	.55**	.006
Flexibility	.45*	.027
TSES-Female (n = 16)		
Empowering Staff	.718**	.002
Flexibility	.511*	.043
Influence with Supervisors	.559*	.024

Inspiring Group Purpose	.522*	.038
Situational Awareness	.570*	.021

TSES-Male (n = 8)

None

Note. *p<.05, two-tailed. **p<.01, two-tailed.

TSES - classroom management. The subgroup TSES-CM total had a M = 7.75, SD = 0.442, N = 24. TSES-CM total had one very strong positive relationship: situational awareness (r = 0.739, p<.01); and four strong positive relationships: communication (r = 0.547, p<.01), empowering staff (r = 0.414, p<.05), flexibility (r = 0.558, p<.01), and influence with supervisors (r = 0.503, p<.05). The TSES-CM female had a M = 7.81, SD = 0.403, N = 16. TSES-CM female had one strong positive relationship: situational awareness (r = 0.593, p<.05). The TSES-CM male had a M = 7.38, SD = 0.744, N = 8. Total TSES-CM male score found no significant correlations with principal leadership characteristics (see Table 8).

Table 8

Correlations: Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale - Classroom Management and Principal Leadership Characteristics

Variable	n	*r*	sig.
TSES-CM Total			
Situational Awareness	24	.739**	.000
Communication	23	.547**	.007
Empowering Staff	23	.414*	.049
Flexibility	24	.558**	.005
Influence with Supervisors	24	.503*	.012
TSES-CM Female			
Situational Awareness	16	.593*	.015
TSES-CM Male			
None	-	-	-

*p<.05, two-tailed. **p<.01, two-tailed.

TSES - student engagement. The subgroup TSES-SE total has a M = 6.63, SD = 1.01,

N = 24. TSES-SE total had one strong positive relationship: empowering staff (r = .477, p<.05).

The TSES- SE female had a M = 6.56, SD = 1.153, N = 16. TSES-SE female had three strong

positive relationships: empowering staff (r = .564, p<.05), flexibility (r = .535, p<.05) and

influence with supervisors (r = .512, p<.05). The TSES-SE male had a M = 6.75, SD = .707, N =

8. The TSES-SE male had one very strong negative relationship: inspiring group purpose (r = -

.847, p<.05). See Table 9 for correlational analysis.

Table 9

Correlations: Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale-Student Engagement and Principal Leadership

Characteristics

Variable	n	*r*	sig.
TSES-SE Total			
Empowering Staff	23	.477*	.021
TSES-SE Female			
Empowering Staff	16	.564*	.023
Flexibility	16	.535*	.033
Influence with Supervisors	16	.512*	.043
TSES-SE Male			
Inspiring Group Purpose	6	-.847*	.033

Note: *p<.05, two-tailed. **p<.01, two-tailed.

TSES – instructional strategies. The subgroup TSES- IS total has a M = 7.54, SD =

1.062, N = 24. TSES-IS total had seven strong positive relationships: communication (r = .445,

p<.05), empowering staff (r = .608, p<.01), flexibility (r = .435, p<.05), influence with

supervisors (r = .405, p<.05), inspiring group purpose (r = .467, p<.05), modeling instructional

expectations (r = .461, p<.05) and situational awareness (r = .470, p<.05). The TSES-IS female

had a M = 7.63, SD = 1.147, N = 16. TSES-IS female had two strong positive relationships:

empowering staff (r = .673, p<.01) and situational awareness (r = .526, p<.05). The TSES-IS

male had a M = 7.38, SD = .916, N = 8. The TSES-IS male had four very strong positive

relationships: communication (r = .722, p<.05), consideration (r = .770, p<.05), flexibility (r =

.876, p<.01), and modeling instructional expectations (r = .877, p<.01). See Table 10 for

correlational analysis.

Table 10

Correlations: Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale - Instructional Strategies and Principal

Leadership Characteristics

Variable	n	*r*	sig.
TSES-IS Total			
Communication	23	.445*	.034
Empowering Staff	23	.608**	.002
Flexibility	24	.435*	.034
Influence with Supervisors	24	.405*	.050
Inspiring Group Purpose	22	.467*	.028
Modeling Instructional Expectations	24	.461*	.023
Situational Awareness	24	.470*	.020
TSES-IS Female			
Empowering Staff	16	.673**	.004
Situational Awareness	16	.526*	.036
TSES-IS Male			
Communication	8	.722*	.043
Consideration	8	.770*	.025
Flexibility	8	.876**	.004
Modeling Instructional Expectations	8	.877**	.004

Note: *p<.05, two-tailed. **p<.01, two-tailed.

Principal Leadership Characteristics and Faculty Trust Scales

The second research question asked: are the factors of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust in teachers, faculty trust and teacher self-efficacy related? Data will be reported on faculty trust total score with subscales of faculty trust in colleagues (FTT) and faculty trust in principal (FTP); principal leadership characteristics and FTP; principal leadership characteristics and FTT; FTP and TSES; FTT and TSES; and principal trust scale and faculty trust scale.

FTT/FTP. The FTT total (M=4.42, SD=.974, N=24) and FTP total (M=4.92, SD=1.1, N=24). The FTT female (M=4.44, SD=.892, N=16) and FTP female (M=4.94, SD=1.063, N=16). FTT male (M=4.38, SD=1.188, N=8) and FTP male (M=4.88, SD=1.246, N=8). The analysis of this data resulted in two significant positive correlations. FTT total and FTP total had a strong positive correlation (r = .561, p<.01). FTT total female and FTP total had a strong positive correlation (r= .523, p<.05). See Appendix K for a complete data table.

Principal leadership characteristics and FTP. This section presents the data analysis of FTP and how it is related to individual principal leadership characteristics.

Consideration. FTP total had a strong positive correlation to consideration (r = .501, p<.05). FTP male had a very strong positive correlation to consideration (r = .784, p<.05). FTP female was not significantly related.

Discipline. FTP total had a strong positive correlation to discipline (r = .486, p<.05). FTP female had a strong positive correlation to discipline (r = .499, p<.05). FTP male was not significantly related.

Empowering staff. FTP total had a strong positive correlation to empowering staff (r = .663, p<.01). FTP female had a very strong positive correlation to empowering staff (r = .771, p<.01). FTP male was not significantly related.

Flexibility. FTP total had a very strong positive correlation to flexibility (r = .725, p<.01). FTP female had a strong positive correlation to flexibility (r = .686, p<.01). FTP male had a very strong correlation to flexibility (r = .848, p<.01).

Influence with supervisors. FTP female had a strong positive correlation to influence with supervisors (r = .500, p<.05). FTP total and FTP male were not significantly related.

Inspiring group purpose. Very strong positive correlations to inspiring group purpose were found for FTP total (r = .832, p<.01), FTP female (r = .772, p<.01) and FTP male (r = .968, p<.01).

Modeling instructional expectations. Strong positive correlations to modeling instructional expectations were found for FTP total (r = .670, p<.01) and FTP female (r = .634, p<.01). FTP male had a very strong positive correlation (r = .771, p<.05).

Monitoring and evaluating instruction. FTP total had a strong positive correlation to monitoring and evaluating instruction (r = .447, p<.05). FTP female and FTP male were not significantly related.

Situational awareness. Strong positive correlations were found for FTP total (r = .435, p<.05) and FTP female (r = .528, p<.05). FTP male was not significantly related.

Principal leadership characteristics and FTT. This section presents the data analysis of FTT and how it is related to individual principal leadership characteristics.

Inspiring group purpose. FTT total had a strong positive correlation to inspiring group purpose (r = .423, p<.05). FTT female and FTT male were not significantly related.

Modeling instructional expectations. Strong positive correlations were found for FTT total (r = .548, p<.01) and FTT female (r = .686, p<.01). FTT male was not significantly related.

Monitoring and evaluating instruction. FTT male had a very strong positive correlation (r = .712, p<.05). FTT total and FTT female were not significantly related.

Providing contingent rewards. FTT male had a very strong positive correlation (r = .738, p<.05). FTT total and FTT female were not significantly related.

Situational awareness. FTT total had a strong positive correlation (r = .579, p<.01). FTT male had a very strong positive correlation (r = .839, p<.01). FTT female was not significantly related.

Faculty Trust Scales and TSES

This section addresses the second research question and the relationship between faculty trust scales and teacher efficacy.

FTP and TSES. This section presents the data analysis of FTP and how it is related to teacher efficacy subscales.

TSES-total. TSES-total female was the only strong positive correlation to FTP (r= .570, p< .05). TSES-total and TSES-total male were not significantly related.

TSES-SE. TSES-SE female was the only strong positive correlation to FTP (r= .575, p< .05). TSES-SE total and TSES-SE male were not significantly related.

TSES-IS. TSES-IS total was the only strong positive correlation to FTP (r= .412, p<.05). TSES-IS female and TSES-IS male were not significantly related.

FTT and TSES. This section presents the data analysis of FTT and how it is related to teacher efficacy subscales.

TSES-CM. TSES-CM total was the only strong positive correlation to FTT (r= .454, p< .05). TSES-CM female and TSES-CM male were not significantly related.

Principal Trust in Teachers and Faculty Trust Scales

Due to having one principal participating, a correlation could not be calculated. The

standardized scores were calculated for the PTT = 486; FTT = 563; FTP = 613. These scores can

be compared to other schools for ranking purposes (see Table 11).

Table 11

Trust Scales: Range of Standardized Scores

Standardized Score	Ranking
200	< 99%*
300	< 97%*
400	< 84%*
500	It is average*
600	> 84%*
700	> 97%*
800	> 99%*

Note: *as compared to other schools.

This section presented the data collected as it related to principal leadership

characteristics and faculty trust scales; teacher sense of efficacy and faculty trust scales; and

principal trust in teachers and faculty trust scales. The next section will interpret the data and

address the possible educational implications.

Interpretation

This section will discuss the data presented in the data presentation and analysis section,

as it relates to educational practices. It will address the relationships between principal

leadership characteristics and faculty trust scales; teacher efficacy and faculty trust scales; and

principal trust in teachers and faculty trust scales. Each relationship will be analyzed by subgroups and gender.

Principal Leadership Characteristics and Teacher Sense of Efficacy

TSES-total. The TSES total score represents the overall teacher efficacy score. Teacher participants measured at an overall high level of efficacy as a whole group and when broken down by gender. When the TSES –total for all participants was correlated with the 11 principal leadership characteristics, it was found to be strongly and positively related to empowering staff and flexibility. The relationship between TSES and empowering staff suggests that teacher efficacy is positively impacted when the principal provides teachers with the opportunity to make decisions about their own work and well as participate in school-wide decisions (Walker & Slear 2011). The relationship between TSES and flexibility suggests that teachers view the principal's ability to use various leadership behaviors, as needed on a situational basis, as a positive characteristic.

TSES- total female. The TSES-total female score represents the overall teacher efficacy score for female participants. TSES total female mean score was positively correlated to five principal leadership behaviors. The two leadership behaviors that were the same as the TSES-total were empowering staff and flexibility. Three more behaviors emerged as significant to TSES-total female: influence with supervisors, inspiring group purpose, and situational awareness. Influence with supervisors refers to the principal's ability to obtain support from his superiors in order to meet the needs of his school (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993). Inspiring group purpose refers to the principal's ability to create an environment that promotes teamwork and shared goals for the success of teachers and parents (Hipp & Bredeson, 1995). Situational

awareness is when the principal is aware of the details and concerns going on in his school and his ability to use that information to address current and potential problems (Hipp, 1996).

TSES-total male. TSES-total male score found no significant correlations with principal leadership characteristics. This suggests that the principal's behaviors are not linked to the overall efficacy of male teachers. The next sections will look at the data analysis of TSES subgroups of classroom management, student engagement, and instructional strategies and how they are related to principal leadership characteristics.

TSES-classroom management. The TSES - CM subgroup data was correlated with five of the 11 principal characteristics. It was found to be very strongly positively correlated to situational awareness and strongly positively correlated to communication, empowering staff, flexibility, and influence with supervisors. These findings suggest that overall teacher efficacy in their ability to manage the classroom is related to principal behaviors. The emergence of the principal leadership characteristic of communication is defined as the principal creating strong lines of communication with and among both teachers and students (Blasé & Blasé, 1999). By having the principal connected with both students and teachers, this may lead to the development of stronger communication between teachers and students. The link could relate to the teachers feeling more confident in their classroom management.

TSES-classroom management female. Findings showed one significant correlation between TSES-CM and the principal leadership characteristic of situational awareness. While this characteristic was also related to the overall TSES-CM, it was also specifically related to female teachers and their feelings about their ability to manage the classroom. It could be said that female teacher efficacy in classroom management is impacted by the principal's awareness

of the functioning of his school and his ability to use that knowledge to address current and potential problems (Hipp, 1996).

TSES-classroom management male. Total TSES-male score found no significant correlations with principal leadership characteristics. However the findings show that the mean of male teacher efficacy in classroom management (CM) is (M = 7.38, SD = .744, N = 8), which is the same as instructional strategies (IS) (M = 7.38, SD = .916, N = 8) and higher than student engagement (M = 6.75, SD = .707, N = 8). It is important to note the differences in standard deviation between CM and IS.

TSES-student engagement total. The subgroup TSES – SE total has a lower mean and larger standard deviation (M = 6.63, SD = 1.01, N = 24) as compared to the other subgroups, CM and IS. TSES – SE had only on significant correlation to the principal leadership characteristic, empowering staff. This would suggest that teacher's who are included in the decision-making process in their classroom and within the school, are going to feel confident in their ability to engage their students through individualized instruction.

TSES-student engagement female. The subgroup TSES – SE female had a lower mean and large standard deviation (M = 6.56, SD = 1.153, N = 16), suggesting that female teachers in this school vary in their efficacy as related to SE. Data revealed strong positive relationships to the three principal leadership characteristics: empowering staff, flexibility, and influence with supervisors. This would suggest that female teachers feel more confident in their ability to engage students in the classroom when the principal uses varied leadership behaviors as necessary based on specific situations and circumstances in the school (Blasé & Blasé, 1999); and when the principal effectively garners support from supervisors and district-level administrative offices to assist in meeting the needs of the school (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993).

TSES-student engagement male. The subgroup TSES – SE male had a lower mean and large standard deviation (M = 6.75, SD = .707, N = 8) as compare to the other subgroups, CM and IS. Data revealed a very strong negative correlation to the principal leadership characteristic, inspiring group purpose. This would suggest that when the principal creates an environment where all teachers are part of a team and work together toward shared goals that result in student and teacher success (Hipp, 1996); male teachers may feel a loss of independence and freedom to teach in a way that enables them to engage students. No significant positive correlations to principal leadership characteristics were found.

TSES-instructional strategies total. The subgroup TSES – IS total (M = 7.54, SD = 1.062, N = 24) had strongly correlated positive relationships to seven principal leadership characteristics: communication, empowering staff, flexibility, influence with supervisors, inspiring group purpose, modeling instructional expectations and situational awareness. This would suggest that a principal's behavior has the most impact on teacher efficacy as it relates to the classroom.

TSES-instructional strategies female. The TSES – IS for female participants (M = 7.63, SD = 1.147, N = 16) had two strong positive relationships: empowering staff and situational awareness. This suggests that when a principal gives teachers the power to make their own decisions (empowering staff) about their work, they feel more confident about their instructional strategies in the classroom. Also, when a principal is aware of concerns within his school and uses that information to improve his school, the teachers may feel more confident and supported in their classroom.

TSES-instructional strategies male. The TSES - IS for male participants (M = 7.38, SD = .916, N = 8) had very strong positive relationships to four principal characteristics:

communication, consideration, flexibility, and modeling instructional expectations. The data suggests a principal's individual behavior may impact a male teacher's efficacy in instructional strategies more than classroom management and student engagement, as measured by the TSES. When a principal expresses genuine concern for the welfare of teachers and makes efforts to get to know each individual, it increases efficacy (Hipp & Bredeson, 1995). The next section will address the influence of trust.

Principal Leadership Characteristics and Faculty Trust Scales

The follow sections will discuss the data presented in the previous section, as it relates to research question two: are the factors of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust in teachers, faculty trust and teacher self-efficacy related? Relationships between the subscales of faculty trust in colleagues (FTT) and faculty trust in principal (FTP); principal leadership characteristics and FTP; principal leadership characteristics and FTT; FTP and TSES; FTT and TSES; and principal trust scale and faculty trust scale.

FTT and FTP. Two positive relationships were found within the faculty trust scales. One relationship between FTT and FTP suggested that the level of trust among teachers was related to the level of trust between teachers and their principal. If teachers trust one another they are more likely to trust the principal. When the data was broken down by gender, the faculty trust level in female teachers was positively related to their trust in the principal. There was no significant relationship between male teacher trust levels and their trust in the principal. The data may be affected by the unequal number of female (N=16) and male (N=8) participants.

Principal leadership characteristics and FTP. This section looks at which principal leadership characteristics may be related to the faculty trust in the principal.

Consideration. The total level of faculty trust in the principal was positively related to the principal leadership characteristic consideration. This suggests that teachers are more likely to trust a principal who is genuinely concerned about their teachers and makes and effort to get to know each individual. The male teachers level of trust in the principal was very strongly related to consideration. Female teachers did not show a significant relationship to this leadership characteristic.

Discipline. Faculty trust levels as a whole group and female teachers were strongly related to the leadership characteristic of discipline. Teachers were more likely to trust in a principal that protected teacher instructional time by limiting announcements and other disruptions. This was not a factor for male teachers.

Empowering staff. All teachers surveyed and the female subgroup of teachers was very strongly and positively related to a principal who empowers their staff. When teachers are given the opportunity to make decisions about their own work and contribute to school-wide decisions, it helps to build trust levels. However, male teacher trust levels were not related. This may be due to the small number of male participants.

Flexibility. All subgroups of trust in the principal were related to the leadership characteristic of flexibility. Teachers trust a principal that uses different leadership behaviors that are appropriate for different situations.

Influence with supervisors. Only female teachers were related to the leadership characteristic, where the principal seeks out support from supervisors and other district personnel in order to meet the needs of the school. The trust levels as a whole group and male participants were not related. This difference may be related to the greater number of female participants or related to years of experience, which was not measured in the current study.

Inspiring group purpose. All subgroups of trust in the principal were very strongly and positively related to the leadership characteristic of inspiring group purpose. Teachers trust a principal who creates an environment where all teachers are part of a team and work together toward shared goals that result in student and teacher success.

Modeling instructional expectations. All subgroups surveyed were strongly and positively related to a principal who models his/her belief in the instructional process and emphasizes the importance of the instruction that takes place in each classroom. The male subgroup was very strongly related.

Monitoring and evaluating instruction. The trust of all teachers surveyed had a strong relationship to a principal who monitors the instructional impact of classroom strategies and provides feedback to the teachers. However the subgroups, male and female, did not have a significant relationship.

Situational awareness. All teachers surveyed and the female subgroup of teachers was very strongly and positively related to a principal who is aware of the details and concerns regarding the functioning of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems. The male teachers trust in the principal was not related to this characteristic.

Principal leadership characteristics and FTT. This section will discuss the relationships between specific principal leadership characteristics and how they are related to the trust level among teachers who participated in this study. Since only 61.5 percent of the teachers responded to the survey, the results may not reflect the attitudes of the entire school staff. The female (N=16) and male (N=8) subgroups may not reflect the attitudes of each gender due to the small number of participants in each subgroup.

Inspiring group purpose. A strong relationship was found within the trust level among

teachers surveyed and the characteristic of inspiring group purpose. Teachers are likely to have a

higher trust level with each other when the principal creates an environment where teacher's

work together toward shared goals that result in student and teacher success. When

differentiated by gender, no significant relationship was found.

      Modeling instructional expectations. The trust level among the total teachers surveyed

and the female subgroup was strongly related when a principal models his/her belief in the

instructional process and emphasizes the importance of the instruction that takes place in each

classroom. Male teacher trust levels were not related.

      Monitoring and evaluating instruction. Trust levels among male staff members was

strongly related to a principal who monitors classroom instruction and provides feedback to

teachers regarding the instructional impact of classroom strategies. The trust level of the total

group of teacher and the female subgroup was not related to this characteristic.

      Providing contingent rewards. The trust level among male teachers was very strongly

positively related when the principal formally and informally recognizes outstanding work inside

and outside of the classroom and shares this recognition in tangible and visible ways. The trust

level of the total group of teacher and the female subgroup was not related to extrinsic

recognition.

      Situational awareness. The trust level among the total teachers surveyed and the male

subgroup was strongly related when they believe the principal is aware of the details and

concerns regarding the functioning of the school and uses this information to address current and

potential problems. Female teacher trust levels were not related.

TSES and Faculty Trust Scales

This section will discuss teacher efficacy, as measured by the TSES and differentiated by subgroups, total efficacy, classroom management (CM), student engagement (SE) and instructional strategies (IS), and its relationship to the subscales of faculty trust in colleagues (FTT) and faculty trust in principal (FTP). Data will also report on gender differences. The female and male subgroups may not reflect the attitudes of each gender due to the small number of participants in each subgroup.

TSES and FTP. This section discusses the relationship between teacher efficacy and trust in the principal.

TSES-total. Overall teacher efficacy among female teachers was strongly related to their trust in the principal. Teacher efficacy of the total teachers survey and male subgroup was not related.

TSES-SE. Teacher efficacy in the subgroup student engagement was strongly related to trust in the principal among female teachers only.

TSES-IS. Teacher efficacy in the subgroup instructional strategies was strongly related to trust in the principal among all the teachers surveyed. The efficacy of female and male subgroups was not related.

TSES and FTT. This section discusses the relationship between teacher efficacy and faculty trust in teachers.

TSES-CM. Teacher efficacy in the subgroup classroom management was strongly related to trust in the principal among all the teachers surveyed. The efficacy of female and male subgroups was not related.

Principal Trust in Teachers and Faculty Trust Scales

The principal trust in teachers (PTT), as rated by the principal, ranked just below average as compared to other schools. The principal had an average trust of his teachers as a whole. The faculty trust scales were scored by subgroup. Faculty trust in teachers (FTT) ranked just lower that 84 percent of schools. The teachers in this school trust each other. Faculty trust in the principal (FTP) ranked just higher than 84 percent of schools. The teachers in this school trust the principal. The faculty trust scores respondents only represent 61.5 percent of the staff. This may have affected the standardized score and ranking level.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the data and analyses addressing the research questions: which principal leadership characteristics positively or negatively, affect teacher self-efficacy and are the factors of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust in teachers, faculty trust and teacher self-efficacy related? Each variable was analyzed by subgroup and gender. Analysis for each characteristic included the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 12.

Teacher Sense of Efficacy and Principal Leadership Characteristics

Table 12

Relationships Between Teacher Sense of Efficacy and Principal Leadership Characteristics

Teacher Sense of Efficacy Subgroups	Total Participants	Female (n = 16)	Male (n = 8)
Total (overall score)	Empowering Staff Flexibility	Empowering Staff Flexibility Influence with Supervisors Inspiring Group Purpose Situational Awareness	**

Classroom Management	Communication Empowering staff Flexibility Influence with Supervisors Situational Awareness	**	**

Student Engagement	Empowering Staff	Empowering Staff
		Flexibility
		Influence with
		   Supervisors
			Inspiring Group
			   Purpose*

Instructional Strategies	Communication
	
	Empowering Staff
	Flexibility
	Influence with
	   Supervisors
	Inspiring Group
	   Purpose
	Modeling
	   Instructional
	   Expectations
	Situational Awareness
		Empowering Staff
		
		Situational Awareness
			Communication
			Consideration
			
			Flexibility
			Influence with
			   Supervisors

Note: *negative relationship. **no significant relationships found.

When a teacher's sense of efficacy in classroom management, student engagement and instructional strategies was compared to the 11 principal leadership characteristics, results indicated that overall teacher efficacy was positively related to seven of the characteristics. The majority of the characteristics were related to instructional strategies. When the data was examined with regards to gender, female teacher efficacy was positively related five characteristics. Only the subgroups of student engagement and instructional strategies were related to the principal's behavior. Male teachers were only positively affected by the principal's behavior in regards to instructional strategies. Male teacher efficacy in student engagement was significantly negatively related to the characteristics of inspiring group purpose. The low

significance of relationships for male participants impacted the significance level for total participants.

Principal Leadership Characteristics and Faculty Trust Scales

When principal leadership characteristics were compared to the subgroups: faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in teachers, some differences emerged between the different genders. A teacher's trust in their principal, when looking at the participant group as a whole, was uniquely related to two characteristics, consideration and discipline. Female teacher trust in the principal was also related to two unique characteristics: influence with supervisors and situational awareness.

A principal's leadership characteristics may also affect the trust among the teachers. The study revealed that the participants trust level in one another, as a group, was affected by three specific principal behaviors: inspiring group purpose, modeling instructional expectations and situational awareness. Trust levels between teachers are higher when a principal promotes an environment where teachers are encouraged to work together to enable student and teacher success, the principal himself models his belief in the importance of classroom instruction and is aware of the needs at his school and makes an effort address them. Male teacher trust seems to be affected by extrinsic motivational factors, such as receiving specific feedback on instructional strategies and being recognized with tangible rewards. See Table 13 for the list of principal leadership characteristics as related to faculty trust scales.

Table 13

Relationships Between Principal Leadership Characteristics and Faculty Trust Scales

	Principal Leadership Characteristic		
Faculty Trust Scales	Total Participants	Female	Male
Faculty Trust in	Consideration		Consideration

Principal	Discipline	Discipline	
	Empowering Staff	Empowering Staff	
	Flexibility	Flexibility	Flexibility
	Inspiring Group Purpose	Inspiring Group Purpose	Inspiring Group Purpose
		Influence with Supervisors	
		Modeling Instructional Expectations	Modeling Instructional Expectations
		Situational Awareness	
Faculty Trust in Teachers	Inspiring Group Purpose		
	Modeling Instructional Expectations	Modeling Instructional Expectations	
	Situational Awareness		Situational Awareness
			Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction
			Providing Contingent Rewards

TSES and Faculty Trust Scales

When faculty trust in the principal was compared to teacher efficacy, the subgroup of instructional strategies was related for all participants. Overall female self-efficacy and student engagement was related to their trust in the principal. Faculty trust among teachers, for all participants, was only related to self-efficacy in classroom management. Relationships between TSES and faculty trust scales are presented in Table 14.

Table 14

Relationships Between Teacher Sense of Efficacy and Faculty Trust Scales

| | Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale | | |

Faculty Trust Scales	Total Participants	Female	Male
Faculty Trust in Principal	Instructional Strategies	Total Self-Efficacy (overall score) Student Engagement	None
Faculty Trust in Teachers*	Classroom Management	**	**

Note. *Faculty Trust Scales measured total participants only. **No significant data was measured between Faculty Trust in Teachers (total participants) and the TSES male and female.

Principal Trust in Teachers and Faculty Trust Scales

Data analysis revealed that the principal has an average trust of his staff as a whole. The teachers in this school trust the principal and each other. All data was calculated using a standardized score and compared to other schools for ranking purposes.

The next chapter will summarize and discuss the findings. The discussion will present the significance of the relationship between teacher efficacy and principal leadership characteristics and the relationships between principal leadership characteristics, principal trust in teachers, faculty trust and teacher self-efficacy. Findings will be interpreted and put in the context as they relate to research discussed in chapter two. It will address implications and recommendations for educational practices as well as limitations of the current study. In conclusion, the final chapter will present recommendations for further research to expand upon the study's outcomes.

Chapter Five: Thesis Recommendations

Each person maintains many different kinds of relationships in home and work. Relationships are built and thrive on various factors such as communication and consideration. These factors are also related to trusting each other (Butler, 1991; Moye, Henkin & Egley, 2004; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Your work environment can be a complex web of interconnecting relationships that needs a strong foundation to sustain. If it's built like a house of cards, it could come down at any moment. This study was designed to address the many variables that may affect relationships between a principal and his or her teachers and among the teachers themselves. The first research questioned asked, Which principal leadership characteristics positively or negatively affect a teacher's sense of efficacy? The next questioned addressed the other variables that may related to each other, Are the factors of principal leadership characteristics, principal trust in teachers, faculty trust and teacher self-efficacy related? This study surveyed teachers and their principal at a middle school in a rural district. Correlational analysis was used to measure the relationships between the variables. All analyses were conducted using SPSS 20.0 and Microsoft Excel. This chapter will discuss the summary of findings, interpretations, educational implications, limitations, and future research directions.

Finding Summary

The first research question asked, Which principal leadership characteristics positively or negatively affected a teachers' sense of efficacy, at one middle school in a rural district? Seven out of 11 leadership characteristics were positively related to the overall self-efficacy of the teacher participants. Gender grouping revealed that female teachers were positively affected by five leadership characteristics in the subgroups of student engagement and instructional

strategies. Male teachers were positively affected by four characteristics in the subgroup instructional strategies and negatively related to the characteristic *inspiring group purpose* in the subgroup student engagement.

The second research question looked at the relationships between principal leadership characteristics, principal trust in teachers, faculty trust and teacher self-efficacy. A teacher's trust in their principal, when looking at the participant group as a whole, was uniquely related to two principal leadership characteristics, *consideration* and *discipline*. Female teacher trust in the principal was also related to two unique characteristics: *influence with supervisors* and *situational awareness*. Male teachers' trust in the principal was related to similar leadership characteristics as female teachers: *flexibility, inspiring group purpose* and *modeling instructional expectations*, but was uniquely related to *consideration*.

The trust level among teachers was related to specific principal leadership characteristics. The trust level among all participants was positively related to *inspiring group purpose, modeling instructional expectations* and *situational awareness*. Female teacher trust was positively related to *modeling instructional expectations* and male teacher trust was positively related to *monitoring and evaluating instruction, providing contingent rewards* and *situational awareness*.

When teacher efficacy was compared to faculty trust in the principal among all participants, trust level in the principal was positively related to teacher efficacy in instructional strategies. Female teacher total self-efficacy and efficacy in student engagement was positively related to principal trust levels, however among male teachers no significant relationship was found. When faculty trust in teachers was compared to teacher efficacy, the only significant relationship was to classroom management for all participants.

Standardized scores were calculated for the factors of principal trust in teachers, faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in teachers. When these scores were compared to other schools, data analysis showed that the principal has average trust in his teachers and the teachers were above average in their trust for the principal and for each other. The next section will discuss finding interpretations.

Finding Interpretations

The first research question hypothesized a correlation between a teacher's sense of efficacy and principal leadership characteristics. The data collected in this study demonstrates a statistically positive relationship between seven out of the 11 characteristics measured. The affect of the principal characteristics on teacher self-efficacy varies based on gender. Female teachers felt better about their ability to perform well in their job when the principal creates an environment allowing teachers to work together and create success-based goals for teachers and students as well as participate in decision-making at the school site level. Male teacher efficacy in their ability to engage students is negatively related to a group work environment. This data may be the result of the small number of male respondents or the idea that male teachers prefer to use their individual teaching style. The principal's awareness and interest in identifying and solving issues within the school, while also using district level assistance, is important to all teachers. Male teachers are influenced by the principal's ability to establish and maintain strong lines of communication as well as the ability to express genuine concern on an individual basis.

The second research question introduces the variable of trust within a school environment and how it is related to teacher efficacy and principal behaviors. There were two significant leadership characteristics that affect both levels of trust in the school: the first is the principal's ability to provide teachers the opportunity to work together in creating successful goals and the

second is when the principal models his belief in the instructional practice within the classroom.

Teacher trust in the principal was most closely related to self-efficacy in instructional strategies

while trust among teachers was related to self-efficacy in classroom management. Each teacher

has their own teaching style and feels more comfortable with a principal that encourages their

individuality. When it comes to classroom management, teachers look to each other to manage

and solve problems. These results relate specifically to the group of teachers that responded to

the survey in this one school, however the connections between the variables are significant.

The next section will discuss how these connections are supported by previous research.

Findings in Context

This section will make connections between the variables researched in the current study

and the results of previous studies. The following relationships will be discussed: teacher sense

of efficacy and principal leadership characteristics; principal leadership characteristics and

faculty trust scales; teacher sense of efficacy and faculty trust scales; and principal trust in

teachers and faculty trust scales.

Teacher Sense of Efficacy and Principal Leadership Characteristics

Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) developed a tool (TSES) to measure teacher

efficacy, which they deemed "an elusive construct" (p.783). They categorized teacher efficacy

into three main components: classroom management, student engagement, and instructional

strategies. Even with the ability to measure teacher efficacy by subgroups, it was still found to

be context-specific, which made it difficult to determine which outside factors are affecting it.

Ryan (2001) attempted to measure the relationship between principal leadership characteristics

and teacher efficacy, but did not find any significant results when studying middle school

teachers. Ryan determined the outcome might have been due to an unrepresented selection of

teachers. Walker and Slear (2011) developed the Rating Principal Characteristics scale in order

to contextualize principal leadership characteristics and compare them to teacher's total self-

efficacy as measured by the TSES. Their results showed significant relationships between

teacher total efficacy and three out of 11 leadership characteristics. The two positively related

characteristics were communication and modeling instructional expectations and one negatively

related characteristic was providing contingent rewards. The current study utilized the same

tools and found significant relationships between seven of the 11 principal leadership

characteristics and teacher efficacy (communication, empowering staff, flexibility, influence

with supervisors, inspiring group purpose, modeling instructional expectations and situational

awareness). Inspiring group purpose was found negatively related to male teacher efficacy in

student engagement and positively related to female teachers' overall efficacy and total

participant efficacy in instructional strategies. Some of these findings have been reflected in

previous research as well. Kelley, Thornton and Daugherty (2005) found that positive

relationships were developed between principals and teachers when strong communication was

established. Open lines of communication through the sharing of information may also

contribute to a teacher feeling enabled to make responsible decisions (empowering staff) (Moye,

Henkin & Egley, 2004). Empowering staff was found significantly positively related to all levels

of the teachers' total efficacy. When teachers feel that they are part of the whole school

decision-making process, they will put more effort into their work and take ownership of their

actions. In the current study, consideration was positively related to male participants in the

efficacy of instructional strategies. Hipp and Bredeson (1995) found that efficacy levels

increased when principals showed genuine concern for the welfare of teachers and made efforts

to get to know each individual. Another leadership characteristic that was positively related to

all participants was flexibility, the principal's ability to use various leadership behaviors

depending on the circumstance. The study by Kelley, Thornton, & Daugherty (2005) found a

near zero correlation between efficacy and the principal characteristic of flexibility. They noted

that this might have been due to the small sample used in the study. However, the current study

also used a small sample, yet found flexibility to be correlated to almost all areas of efficacy.

This could be attributed to the specific characteristics of the middle school staff being studied.

Principal Leadership Characteristics and Faculty Trust Scales

Review of the literature found four principal characteristics, as defined by Walker and

Slear (2011), significantly correlated with faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in

teachers. The characteristics include: communication, consideration, empowering staff, and

inspiring group purpose. In addition to these four characteristics, the current study also found

relationships between leadership characteristics and faculty trust scales that were unique to each

gender. For all study participants, teacher trust in the principal was most closely related to

consideration and discipline. The data helped to confirm Tschannen-Moran (2001) findings that

a principal has the ability to promote trust in his staff when demonstrating benevolent behavior

towards his staff and not exploiting individuals. The current study revealed the specific

leadership characteristics that were positively related to female teacher trust in the principal as

influence with supervisors and situational awareness. Female and male teacher trust in the

principal were both related to flexibility, inspiring group purpose and modeling instructional

expectations, but only male teacher's trust in the principal was related to the leadership

characteristic consideration. The current studies finding on empowering staff lends support to

previous research by Moye, Henkin and Egley's (2004), who found that teachers that felt their

work was meaningful, had significant autonomy and felt they had personal influence on the

school environment, also had higher levels of interpersonal trust with the principal. However these findings are contradictory to Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) who found that when schools maintained a high level of collaboration among the staff and relied less on the principal for instructional knowledge, the ultimate impact of leadership trust was diminished. The current study revealed a positive correlation between and increased level of trust and empowering staff, modeling instructional expectations and inspiring group purpose.

Principal characteristics affect the level of trust among teachers as well. The current study revealed three characteristics related to total faculty trust among teachers, inspiring group purpose, modeling instructional expectations and situational awareness. The data on inspiring group purpose supports the study by Brinson & Steiner (2007) who found when teachers are given the opportunity to collaborate and create more challenging goals, they will have a higher commitment to one another and the school. Ross and Gray (2006) found that principals can improve faculty trust by modeling instructional expectations, inspiring group purpose, interpret results, and provide actionable feedback on teachers' performance (monitoring and evaluating instruction) and involve teachers in group decision-making (empowering staff).

Current study data revealed information not found in the literature. Trust level between teachers for male participants was related to providing contingent rewards. This suggests that when male teachers are extrinsically rewarded they have a higher level of trust in the teachers. Walker and Slear (2011) found this characteristic to be negatively related to teacher efficacy. Several studies found that an environment accentuating communication has a higher likelihood of developing trust (Butler, 1991; Moye, Henkin & Egley, 2004; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). The current study did not measure communication as a significantly related characteristic to trust levels, but it was related to teacher efficacy.

Wahlstrom and Louis (2008) found that when a school possesses a high level of trust, the efficacy of teachers is minimally affected by a principal's behavior and when a school possesses low trust levels, efficacy of teachers is more affected by a principal's behavior. The school in the current study exhibited both high levels of trust between the principal and among teachers and the teacher efficacy was significantly related to seven principal leadership characteristics. These findings may be attributed to the specific characteristics of the study participants.

Teacher Sense of Efficacy and Faculty Trust Scales

Ryan (2001) found that trust was a factor in principal-teacher relations that was positively related to a teacher's sense of efficacy. The current study found a more specific relationship to teacher efficacy in instructional strategies for all participants. Female teachers total efficacy and efficacy in student engagement were also significantly related to principal trust. When looking at faculty trust in teachers, the only significant relationship was to teacher efficacy in classroom management.

This section addressed the findings of the current study and their relationship to the literature discussed in chapter two. The findings were organized by principal leadership characteristics and faculty trust scale; teacher sense of efficacy and faculty trust scales; and principal trust in teachers and faculty trust scales. Each variable was analyzed by subgroup and gender. Many of the variables were interconnected with one another, which helped to bring the literature together. There was an overlapping of variables including levels of trust, efficacy and principal leadership characteristics; and a distinguishing element of gender.

<div align="center">

Lessons Learned and Educational Implications

</div>

I began this journey of discovery with a personal interest in finding out what affects relationships between individuals in a school and how does the principal's behavior relate to

these relationships. In the interest of becoming a school administrator, I wanted to know what interpersonal skills were necessary to succeed. I knew that relationships were complex and interconnected based on different variables, but now I have some research to base it on.

Teacher efficacy is complex in itself. It consists of three subgroups: classroom management, student engagement, and instructional strategies. Each one of these subgroups is affected by different principal leadership characteristics. Teacher efficacy is also related to trust in the principal and trust in the teachers. However, the most interesting findings were in the differences between genders.

Even though all the participants, except the principal, were teachers in the same school, the gender differences were very apparent. Female and male teacher efficacy levels are affected by different principal leadership characteristics. Not all subgroups of teacher efficacy are impacted the same by principal characteristics. Principal behavior affects teacher trust in one another differently based on gender. Female and male teachers trust the principal based on different factors.

All principal preparation programs should include education on the different leadership characteristics that teachers respond to. It should be noted that gender does make a difference and not all teachers (or people) respond the same way to leadership techniques. The next section will discuss the limitations of research.

Limitations of Research

This section will discuss the limitations of the study including survey use, participants and data analysis. Four surveys were used to collect data. The faculty trust scales only use two out of three subscales to minimize the number of questions which may have affected validity and reliability. The principal trust scale only use one out of three subscales, which may have affected

validity and reliability. TSES short form was used to measure teacher efficacy, but the TSES-long form may have provided a more accurate picture of results. Two comprehensive surveys were created, one for teachers and one for the principal. Due to the omission of some survey questions along with compiling the surveys into one, participants may have answered questions according to their responses on other survey questions. The length and amount of surveys may have caused participants to quickly and thoughtlessly answer the questions, in order to complete the surveys. By not having qualitative data, it is difficult to know why participants answered in the manner they did. The researcher was only able to survey one middle school in a rural area and had a return rate of 61.5 percent of the staff, or 24 teachers. The findings of the current study may not be generalizable. Since only one school was in the study, participants may have answered more or less positively, if they thought the principal would have access to the answers. The principal may have answered differently, since he or she was the only principal in the study.

After analyzing the data, I would have wanted to explore other possible variables that may have affected the results. The data may be skewed because of the small size of the district and the close community. I would include questions to assess the number of years teaching, do the teachers live in the community they teach, and do they have children in the school system? The next section will discuss how this study can be used in future research.

Future Research Recommendations

The data analysis in the current study answered some questions posed by previous researchers, by analyzing four variables. I think that it would be beneficial to study more schools in varying geographical locations (urban, suburban, rural) and varying sizes (small, medium, large). Extend the research by investigating the peripheral relationships of students and parents (trust from principals and teachers). Include relationships with the surrounding community to

see what external support is impacting the school. Since schools usually have staffs that are changing with principal/teacher transfers, retirements and new teachers coming into the profession, it would be interesting to do a longitudinal case study on a school to see if there are any extraneous factors impacting the relationship status. One more question to consider, what affect does the gender of the principal have on the relationships?

Principal preparation programs could develop these characteristics to help principals develop and maintain a positive school culture. It would help future principals to understand the differences between female and male teachers and that relationships are individualized and delicate. Many of the variables studied can be transferred to any type of leadership position or co-workers, beyond the confines of the school environment. The next section will give a summary of the research conducted.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationships between teacher self-efficacy, principal leadership characteristics and trust. It compared three aspects of teacher efficacy, 11 specific leadership characteristics, two levels of trust between teachers and the principal, and all variables were examined by gender. The general outcome of the study found positive relationships among the variables as a group and by gender. Subgroup analysis revealed that the self-efficacy of female teachers was related more to principal behaviors and trust than male teachers. Previous research studies support the findings of the current study. Gender differences analyzed here have contributed to and helped to clarify the possible influence of demographic factors.

A school environment is a complex web of relationships that affect and reflect one another. The principal's impact on these relationships is far reaching and should be considered when preparing individuals to take on this leadership role. Principals should be taught and

encouraged to behave in ways that enhance the environment for teachers, allowing them to thrive

within the school and their classroom. This could lead to better teaching and more students

learning. Further research of effective leadership skills and their affect on teacher efficacy and

trust levels within a school should be continued in a variety of school levels and extended to

relationships of other stakeholders as well.

References

Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement. New York, NY: Longman.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavior change. *Psychology Review, 84*, 191-215.

Barnett, K., & McCormick, J. (2004). Leadership and individual principal-teacher relationships in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(3), 406-434.

Blanchard, K., Carlos, J. and Randolph, W. (1999). The Three Keys to Empowerment, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, CA.

Blasé, J., & Blasé, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(3), 349-378.

Blase J., & Kirby, P. C. (2000). *Bringing out the best in teachers: What effective principals do* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Bogler, R. (2001). The influence of leadership style on teacher job satisfaction. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*(5), 662-683.

Brinson, D. & Steiner, L. (2007). Building collective efficacy: How leaders inspire teachers to achieve. *Public Impact*, 1-6.

Butler, J. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a conditions of trust inventory. *Journal of Management, 17*(3), 643-663.

Driscoll, J. (1978). Trust and participation in organizational decision making as predictors of satisfaction. *Academy of Management Journal, 21*(1), 44-56.

Ebmeier, H. (2003). How supervision influences teacher efficacy and commitment: An investigation of a path model. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 18,* 110-141.

Edwards, J. L., Green, K. E., & Lyons, C. A. (2002). Personal empowerment, efficacy, and environmental characteristics. *Journal of Educational Administration, 40*, 67-86.

Gareis, C. R. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2004, April). Principals' sense of efficacy and trust. Paper accepted to be presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego.

Hipp, K. A. (1996, April). *Teacher efficacy: Influence of principal leadership behavior.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Hipp, K. A., & Bredeson, P. V. (1995). Exploring connections between teacher efficacy and principals' leadership behavior. *Journal of School Leadership, 5,* 136–150.

Hoy, W. K. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2003). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools: The omnibus T-Scale. In W.K. Hoy & C.G. Miskel, Studies in Leading and Organizing Schools (pp. 181-208). Information Age Publishing: Greenwich: CT.

Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *Elementary School Journal, 93,* 355-372.

Hoy, W.K. & Tarter, C.J. (2004). Organizational justice in schools: no justice without trust. *International Journal of Educational Management, 18*, 250-259.

Jantzi, D. & Leithwood, K. (2008). Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 496-528.

Kelley, R., Thornton, B. & Daugherty, R. (2005). Relationship between measures of leadership and school climate. *Department of Educational Leadership 126*(1), 17-25.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Moye M., Henkin, A. & Egley, R. (2004). Teacher-principal relationships: Exploring linkages between empowerment and interpersonal trust. *Journal of Educational Administration , 43*(3), 260-277.

Price, H. (2012). Principal–Teacher Interactions: How Affective Relationships Shape Principal and Teacher Attitudes. *Education Administration Quarterly, 48*(1), 39-85.

O'Donnell, R. J., & White, G. P. (2005). Within the accountability era: Principals' instructional leadership behaviors and student achievement. *NASSP Bulletin, 89*, 56-71.

Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment to organizational values: The mediating effects of collective teacher efficacy. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 17*(2), 179–199.

Ryan, H. (2007). *An Examination of the Relationship Between Teacher Efficacy and Teachers' Perceptions of Their Principals' Leadership Behaviors* (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas). Retrieved from http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc3620/ m1/1/high_res_d /dissertation.pdf

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2004). Towards a theory of leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36*, 3-34.

Stockard, J. & Lehman, M. (2004). Influences on the satisfaction and retention of 1st-year teachers: the importance of effective school management. *Educational Administration Quarterly 40*(5), 742-771.

Thoonen, E., Sleegers, P., Oort, F., Peetsma, T., & Geijsel, F. (2011). How to improve teaching practices: The role of teacher motivation, organizational factors, and leadership practices. *Educational Administration Quarterly 47*(3), 496–536.

Tschannen-Moran, M & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive

construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration, 39*, 308-331.

Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools: The role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*(2), 217-247.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Gareis, C. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration, 42*, 573-585.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Gareis, C. (2005, November). *Cultivating principals' sense of efficacy: Supports that matter.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 944–956.

Tschannen-Moran, M. and Hoy, W.K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(4), 547-593.

Van Maele, D. & Van Houtte, M. (2009) Faculty trust and organizational school characteristics : An exploration across secondary schools in Flanders. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 45*, 556-589.

Wahlstrom, K. & Louis, K. (2008). How teachers experience principal leadership: The roles of professional community, trust, efficacy, and shared responsibility. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(4), 458-495.

Walker, J. & Slear, S. (2011). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and experienced middle school teachers. *NASSP Bulletin, 95*(1), 46-64. Retrieved

from http://bul.sagepub.com/content/95/1/46.

Woods, P. A., Bennett, N., Harvey, J. A., & Wise, C. (2004). Variabilities and dualities in distributed leadership: Findings from a systematic literature review. *Educational Management Administration Leadership, 32*, 439-457.

Appendix A

Rating of Principal Characteristics Permission Request

From: Tanya Johnson [mailto:tanya.johnson79@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, March 09, 2012 3:50 PM

To: Walker, Jeff

Subject: Request to Use: Rating of Principal Characteristics

Dr. Walker,

I am a master's student at California State University, San Marcos, working on a degree in Educational Administration. I plan to begin a study in the spring of 2012 exploring the relationship between principal leadership behaviors and teacher efficacy as perceived by teachers with strong measurable efficacy. I am searching for a survey to qualify principal leadership behaviors as measured by teacher's strong self-efficacy.

In my search I have found your Rating of Principal Characteristics and I am curious as to its application in this situation. I have also read The Impact of Principal Leadership Behaviors on the Efficacy of New and Experienced Middle School Teachers, and have considered it as a possible instrument. I am asking your permission to use your research tool. How can I acquire copies of the surveys, administering and scoring information, and reliability data?

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Tanya Johnson

Appendix B

Rating of Principal Characteristics Permission Receipt

From: **Walker, Jeff** walkerj@calvertnet.k12.md.us

To: Tanya Johnson <tanya.johnson79@gmail.com>

Date: Tue, Mar 13, 2012 at 4:33 AM

Subject: RE: Request to Use: Rating of Principal Characteristics

Good morning Ms. Johnson. You have my permission to use the instrument "Rating of Principal

Characteristics." I will send the instrument along with scoring and reliability information later

this week.

Sincerely,

Jeff Walker

Jeff Walker, Ph.D. School

Counselor

Calvert Middle School

410-535-7362

Appendix C

Rating of Principal Characteristics Survey

Rating of Principal Characteristics	Use this section to rate each of the characteristics on a scale based upon the importance of each characteristic.								
Directions: Please indicate your opinion about each of the characteristics below by marking any one of the nine responses in the columns on the right side, ranging from (1) "Very Low Importance" to (9) "Very High Importance" as each represents a degree on the continuum.	Very Low Importance		Low Importance		Some Importance		Quite a Bit of Importance		Very High Importance
Communication The principal establishes strong lines of communication with and among students and teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Consideration The principal expresses genuine concern for the welfare of teachers and makes efforts to get to know each individual.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Discipline The principal protects teachers from intrusion into their instructional time. This includes limiting announcements and preventing disruptions to class time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Empowering Staff The principal provides opportunities for teachers to make decisions about their work and to be involved in school-wide decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Flexibility The principal utilizes varied leadership behaviors as necessary based on specific situations and circumstances in the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Influence with Supervisors The principal effectively garners support from supervisors and district level administrative offices to assist in meeting the needs of the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Modeling Instructional Expectations The principal models his/her belief in the instructional process and emphasizes the importance of the instruction that takes place in each classroom.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction The principal "keeps an eye" on what is happening in the school and provides feedback to teachers regarding the instructional impact of classroom strategies.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Providing Contingent Rewards The principal formally and informally recognizes outstanding work inside and outside of the classroom and shares this recognition in tangible and visible ways.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Situational Awareness The principal is aware of the details and concerns regarding the functioning of the school and uses this information to address current and potential problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Appendix D

TSES Permission Request

From: Tanya Johnson [mailto:tanya.johnson79@gmail.com]

Sent: Friday, March 09, 2012 5:16 PM

To: mxtsch@wm.edu

Subject: Request Permission for TSES

Dr. Tschannen-Moran,

I am a master's student at California State University, San Marcos, working on a degree in Educational Administration. I plan to begin a study in the spring of 2012, exploring the relationship between principal leadership behaviors and teacher efficacy as perceived by teachers with strong measurable efficacy. I would like to use the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale developed by you and Dr. Hoy to identify teacher subjects with measurably strong teacher efficacy. I have seen the instrument used in several other studies and see it as a reliable tool. I have a copy of the instrument along with Directions for scoring and reliabilities. I am requesting your permission to use the instrument and would appreciate a written electronic response indicating such for the appendix of my thesis.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Tanya Johnson

Appendix E

TSES Permission Receipt

From: **Megan Tschannen-Moran** mxtsch@wm.edu

To: Tanya Johnson <tanya.johnson79@gmail.com>

Date: Sun, Mar 11, 2012 at 2:37 PM

Subject: RE: Request Permission for TSES

Tanya Johnson,

You have my permission to use the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (formerly called the Ohio State Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale) that I developed with Anita Woolfolk Hoy in your research. You can find a copy of the measure and scoring directions on my web site at http://wmpeople.wm.edu/site/page/mxtsch . The scoring directions are provided there as well. Please use the following as the proper citation (even though the earlier name was used in that article):

Tschannen-Moran, M & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783-805.

I will also attach directions you can follow to access my password protected web site, where you can find the supporting references for this measure as well as other articles I have written on this and related topics.

Your study sounds like an interesting one. I would enjoy receiving a brief summary of your results when you complete your study.

All the best,

Megan Tschannen-Moran

The College of William and Mary

School of Education

PO Box 8795

Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795

Telephone: 757-221-2187

http://wmpeople.wm.edu/site/page/mxtsch

Appendix F

TSES Short-Form Survey

Teacher Beliefs (TSES Short-form Survey)	This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create challenges for teachers. Your answers are confidential.								
Directions: Please indicate your opinion about each of the questions below by marking any one of the nine responses in the columns on the right side, ranging from (1) "None at all" to (9) "A Great Deal" as each represents a degree on the continuum.									
Please respond to each of the questions by considering the combination of your current ability, resources, and opportunity to do each of the following in your present position.	None at all		Very Little		Some Degree		Quite A Bit		A Great Deal
1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
4. How much can you do to help your students value learning?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
6. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
7. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in school work?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
9. To what extent can you use a variety of assessment strategies?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
12. How well can you implement alternative teaching strategies in your classroom?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Appendix G

Principal Trust and Faculty Trust Scales Permission Request

From: Tanya Johnson [mailto:tanya.johnson79@gmail.com]

Sent: Wed, Mar 14, 2012 at 7:48 AM

To: mxtsch@wm.edu

Subject: Request Permission for TSES

Dr. Tschannen-Moran,

 Thank you so much for your assistance. As I was browsing your website, I came across your Faculty Trust and Principal Trust Scales. I believe these could be effective measurements to gain the data I am researching. I would like to ask your permission to utilize these scales in my research as well. When my research is completed, I would be happy to send you a summary of my results.

Thank you,

Tanya Johnson

Appendix H

Faculty Trust and Principal Trust Scales Permission Receipt

From: **Megan Tschannen-Moran** mxtsch@wm.edu

To: Tanya Johnson <tanya.johnson79@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Mar 14, 2012 at 8:20 AM

Subject: RE: Request Permission for TSES

Tanya,

You also have my permission to use the Faculty Trust Scale and Principal Trust Scale that I

developed with Wayne Hoy. I will be interested in learning what you find.

All the best,

Megan Tschannen-Moran

The College of William and Mary School of Education

PO Box 8795

Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795

Telephone: 757-221-2187

http://wmpeople.wm.edu/site/page/mxtsch

Appendix I

Principal Trust Survey

Principal Survey Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the quality of relationships in schools. Your answers are confidential. Please indicate the extent that you agree or disagree with each of the statements about your school, marking in the columns on the right, ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (6) Strongly Agree, filling the bubbles completely.	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree
1. Teachers in this school are candid with me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I can count on parents to support the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Students here really care about the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I have faith in the integrity of my teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I believe in my teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Most students in this school are honest.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I question the competence of some of my teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I am often suspicious of teachers' motives in this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Most students are able to do the required work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I trust the students in this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. When teachers in this school tell you something, you can believe it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Even in difficult situations, I can depend on my teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Parents in this school have integrity.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Most parents openly share information with the school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. My teachers typically look out for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. I trust the teachers in this school.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Students in this school are reliable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Most parents here have good parenting skills.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix J

Faculty Trust Survey

Faculty Survey

Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the quality of relationships in schools. Your answers are confidential.

Please indicate the extent that you agree or disagree with each of the statements about your school, marking in the columns on the right, ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree to (6) Strongly Agree, filling the bubbles completely.

	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree
1. Students in this school care about each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Teachers in this school typically look out for each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Even in difficult situations, teachers in this school can depend on each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. The principal in this school typically acts in the best interests of the teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Teachers in this school trust each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Teachers can count on parental support.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. Teachers think that most of the parents do a good job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Teachers in this school trust the principal.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Teachers in this school are open with each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. The principal doesn't tell teachers what is really going on.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. The principal of this school does not show concern for teachers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Teachers in this school trust the parents.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Teachers in this school are suspicious of each other.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Students here are secretive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. When teachers in this school tell you something you can believe it.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Teachers in this school do their jobs well.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Teachers here believe that students are competent learners	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal's actions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. Teachers in this school believe what parents tell them.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. Teachers in this school trust their students.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix K

Correlations: Faculty Trust in the Teachers, Faculty Trust in the Principal and Principal

Leadership Characteristics

Total		TOTAL FTT-Mean	FEMALE FTT-Mean	MALE FTT-Mean	TOTAL FTP-Mean	FEMALE FTP-Mean	MALE FTP-Mean
Communication	Pearson Correlation	.396	.387	.424	.235	.080	.436
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.062	.154	.295	.280	.777	.280
	N	23	15	8	23	15	8
Consideration	Pearson Correlation	.264	.013	.659	.501*	.343	.784*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.213	.962	.075	.013	.194	.021
	N	24	16	8	24	16	8
Discipline	Pearson Correlation	.291	.320	.263	.486*	.499*	.481
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.167	.226	.530	.016	.049	.227
	N	24	16	8	24	16	8
Empowering Staff	Pearson Correlation	.405	.327	.741	.663**	.771**	.410
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.055	.216	.057	.001	.000	.361
	N	23	16	7	23	16	7
Flexibility	Pearson Correlation	.311	.155	.534	.725**	.686**	.848**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.139	.566	.173	.000	.003	.008
	N	24	16	8	24	16	8
Influence with Supervisors	Pearson Correlation	.285	-.052	.631	.507*	.500*	.601

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.177	.847	.094	.011	.049	.115
	N	24	16	8	24	16	8
Inspiring Group Purpose	Pearson Correlation	.423[*]	.407	.388	.832[**]	.772[**]	.968[**]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.050	.118	.447	.000	.000	.002
	N	22	16	6	22	16	6
Modeling Instructional Expectations	Pearson Correlation	.548[**]	.686[**]	.321	.670[**]	.634[**]	.771[*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.003	.437	.000	.008	.025
	N	24	16	8	24	16	8
Monitoring and Evaluating Instruction	Pearson Correlation	.404	.279	.712[*]	.447[*]	.414	.560
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.051	.295	.048	.029	.111	.149
	N	24	16	8	24	16	8
Providing Contingent Rewards	Pearson Correlation	.393	.244	.738[*]	.358	.258	.641
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.058	.362	.036	.086	.335	.087
	N	24	16	8	24	16	8
Situational Awareness	Pearson Correlation	.579[**]	.453	.839[**]	.435[*]	.528[*]	.458
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	.078	.009	.034	.036	.254
	N	24	16	8	24	16	8

FTT- Total Mean	Pearson Correlation	1	1	1	.561[**]	.523[*]	.615
	Sig. (2-tailed)				.004	.038	.105
	N	24	16	8	24	16	8
FTP- Total Mean	Pearson Correlation	.561[**]	.523[*]	.615	1	1	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.038	.105			
	N	24	16	8	24	16	8

Note: FTT: Faculty Trust in Colleagues; FTP: Faculty Trust in Principal

*p<.05, two-tailed. **p<.01, two-tailed.