Georgia Educational Researcher

Volume 17 | Issue 1 Article 4

1-2020

Making Sense of Georgia School Leader Evaluation: Climate, Engagement and the District Office

Bipul Singh
Clarke County School District, bipulusa@gmail.com

Matt Townsley
University of Northern Iowa, matt.townsley@uni.edu

Making Sense of Georgia School Leader Evaluation: Climate, Engagement and the District Office

Abstract

Assessment of principal effectiveness is a complex process due to the multidimensional nature of their job. Historically, a disproportionate significance has been placed on standardized assessment scores when evaluating school leaders, therefore states are beginning to emphasize other factors such as school climate in order to increase employee retention. This study investigated any correlation between leadership effectiveness, the staff perception of school climate, and employee engagement in a suburban Georgia school district's 139 schools. An improved understanding of these constructs may assist principals and assistant principals modify their leadership practices to better meet the needs of their teachers. Results suggest a significant correlation between leadership effectiveness, staff perception of school climate and employee engagement across the district with varied levels of agreement at the elementary, middle school and high school levels. Implications for leadership preparation programs and redundancy in school leader evaluation systems are noted. Future research is recommended to improve the reliability and validity of the leader evaluation tool, along with studying similar data trends from other school districts in the country.

Keywords

educational leadership, leader effectiveness, employee engagement, leader keys effectiveness system, school climate

Introduction

Researchers have demonstrated an indirect yet significant relationship between principal effectiveness, school culture and student achievement (Brockmeier, Starr, Green, Pate, & Leech, 2013; Dhuey & Smith, 2014; Fullan, 2014; Hallinger & Murphy, 2013; Heck & Hallinger, 2014; Ross & Gray, 2006). In an attempt to quantify school leader influence over math and reading achievement scores, Dhuey and Smith (2014) found that one standard deviation increase in principal effectiveness resulted in an increase in student achievement between .28 - .40 standard deviations. Furthermore, Shaw and Newton (2014) reported a significant positive correlation between teachers' perception of their supervisor and their intended retention in the same school.

School leaders have a direct influence over organizational structures that significantly affect school climate and in turn, retaining teachers (Boyce & Bowers, 2018; Cohen, McCabe, Michelli, & Pickeral, 2009). As such, evaluating school leadership's impact on school climate and student achievement has become crucial (Stronge, Xu, Leeper, & Tonneson, 2013). Although school administrators have an indirect yet significant impact on student achievement (Stronge et al., 2013), historically a disproportionate significance has been placed on standardized assessment scores compared to any other leadership functions and characteristics (Teh, Chiang, Lipscomb & Gill, 2014).

A great deal of research has been conducted with organizational commitment as an independent variable (Allen, 2015; Gokce, 2014; Leithwood et al., 2012; Pogan, 2015; Serrano & Reichard, 2011); however, limited research exists which examines employee perception and engagement in relation to leader effectiveness (Allen, 2015; Aytac, 2015; Pogan, 2015). Several studies have documented a significant relationship between employees' perception of their leader and the employees' effectiveness (Gokce, 2014; Pogan, 2015). As such, there is a need to understand the correlation between leaders' effectiveness as measured by a supervisor and the leader effectiveness measured in terms of employees' perception of school climate, and their engagement in various organizational processes (Allen, 2015). Hence, the aim of this study was to determine any correlation between school leader effectiveness as measured by district office staff and school leader effectiveness as perceived by teachers. Furthermore, this study sought to determine any correlation between school leader effectiveness as measured by district office staff and employee engagement.

This study is significant because school leaders' behavior influences staffs' perception of leadership as well as their perception of the workplace

(Baptiste, 2019; Thompson, 2016). In some states, teachers' and supervisors' perceptions are used in school leader performance evaluation (Radinger, 2014; Saw & Newton, 2014; Stearns, 2012; Wagner & Harter, 2006). In order to improve leader effectiveness, it is important to understand how the supervisor's perception of a school leader equates to that of the teachers' perception. A significant relationship has been noted between leadership style and employees' organizational commitment and engagement (Aytec, 2015). A clear understanding of these correlations in school settings can help principals and assistant principals modify their leadership practices to better meet the needs of their teachers.

Literature Review

Measuring the effectiveness of educational leaders has gained a tremendous amount of attention from researchers and practitioners (Halverson et al., 2014; Hornung & Yoder, 2014). Until a decade ago, a limited number of measures were able to conduct an equitable evaluation of a leader's effectiveness (Radinger, 2014). Measuring leaders' ability to impact school climate, staff perception, motivation and eventually student achievement is essential for continuous quality improvement (Stronge, 2013; Stronge et al., 2008). This is especially true given ever changing leadership responsibilities such as the introduction of new academic standards, more rigorous accountability measures, and complex social and cultural issues affecting the student population (Clifford, 2015; Hesselbein & Goldsmith, 2006).

School Leader Evaluation

In 1977, only two states required formal leader evaluation while today every state requires some form of principal evaluation (Bethman, 2015). Because of federal accountability requirements such as *NCLB*, *RT3*, and *ESSA*, evaluation of school leaders' effectiveness has gained tremendous attention from educational researchers and policy makers (Bethman, 2015; Condon, 2010; Dechert, Kappler, & Nordin, 2015). However, assessing school leader effectiveness is a complex process due to the multidimensional nature of the job responsibilities (Clifford, 2015; Radinger, 2014; Stronge et al., 2008). A wide variety of leader effectiveness assessment methods are currently used, including self-evaluation, rating checklists, client-centered feedback, and peer supervision (Anderson, 1991, Condon, 2010; Lashway, 2003).

Transformational Leadership

A notable relationship has been established between leadership style and employees' organizational engagement (Aytec, 2015). One leadership style, transformational leadership, is the theoretical framework of this study. Leithwood et al. (1995) is credited with developing the transformational leadership model for school leaders which includes four key characteristics: individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence. A transformational leader's number one priority is to lead others into changing behavior, culture, and beliefs (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002; Khine & Saleh, 2014; Kouzes & Posner, 2013). Transformational school leaders aspire to change the building's culture to create a shared value and develop teachers' capacity by promoting continuous improvement, achievement, and self-esteem (Avolio & Bass, 1999; Kwasi, 2015).

A number of researchers have investigated the effect a leader has on the culture and climate of the school (e.g. Hallinger, 2003; Stronge et al., 2008; Warner, 2014). For example, Hallinger and Heck (1996) found a small but significant direct effect of principals' efforts on improved learning climate, as well as a moderate effect of principals' instructional efforts on student learning outcomes. In addition, Kullar (2011) found a statistically significant correlation between the administration and school climate. Further, Alzoraiki, Ab. Ranhman, and Mutalib (2018) utilized structural equation modeling analysis to conclude transformational leadership has a statistically significant effect on teachers' performance.

Perceptions of School Leader Effectiveness

According to one estimate, one-third of all teachers leave the profession due to a perceived lack of administrative support as well as the lack of job satisfaction (Carroll, 2015). In light of such startling findings, principal leadership style is important to recruiting and retaining teachers. A multitude of studies solidify the belief that leaders' behavior and staff perception have statistically significant correlation positively impacting job satisfaction and long term retention (Allen, 2015; Anderson, 2015; Aytaç, 2015; Bonaros, 2006; Boyce & Bowers, 2018; Gupta, 2015; McKinney, 2009; Owens, 2013; Yeldell, 2012; Zhang, 2010). Leadership is as much about leaders' behaviors as it is about followers' perception of the leader (Arogundade & Arogundade, 2015).

Key indicators of leaders' effectiveness are staff's professional experience, job satisfaction, motivation, and retention (Baker, 2011; Ertas, 2015;

Galagan, 2015). With this understanding, studying leaders' influence on employee motivation and engagement has become more valuable than ever before. Because principal actions often influence building morale, leadership behavior emerges as a large contributor to teacher satisfaction and motivation (Moore, 2012; Welch, 2014).

Many researchers found a common thread connecting employee perception with job satisfaction and productivity (Baptiste, 2019; Shaw & Newton, 2014; Stearns, 2012; Temple, 2009; Wagner & Harter, 2006). The excessive exodus of teachers from teaching profession has also been attributed to the perceived lack of support from school leaders (Carroll, 2015). Therefore, a great deal of emphasis is placed on staff perception to incorporate an evidence-based qualitative assessment measure in the leader effectiveness evaluation.

According to Anderson (1991), the most significant contributor of principal evaluation is their supervisors' perception. Other stakeholders' (i.e. teachers, staff, and parents) input is considered equally valuable and recommended to be a part of the principal evaluation. Some schools use a principal's own perception of effectiveness and compare it with teacher perception of the principals' effectiveness (Hall, 1998).

Evaluating leaders' effectiveness has proven significant in school improvement initiatives. The use of multiple tools to measure various aspects of actionable attributes offers better insight about leaders' effectiveness. A *360-degree Evaluation* provides leaders with feedback from multiple stakeholders' points of view and in turn offers a growth opportunity for the leader (Hornung & Yoder, 2014). Thus, the purpose of this correlational study was to examine any relationship between leader effectiveness, teacher perception of school climate, and employee engagement in a suburban Georgia school.

Methods

Procedures and Participants

Existing data was collected from a suburban Georgia public school district's office of research and evaluation. Based on the number of students receiving free and reduced-price lunch, several of the district's 139 schools have Title I status. Although each school has one principal and between one and twelve assistant principals, the sample included only schools with at least two assistant principals in order to protect the confidentiality of the leaders' evaluations. As such, a total of 130 school principals and 601 assistant principals' leader effectiveness scores were analyzed. The study also used climate perception data

from 19,027 staff participants within these schools. Additionally, Gallup Q12 employee engagement survey results from all participating schools were examined. The district's office of research and evaluation anonymized all data by replacing personally identifiable information with a faux identification code for analysis. One employee engagement score was generated per attendance center, which was used for the principals and assistant principals in a given school.

Research Questions

1. Is there a correlation between leaders' effectiveness and staff perceptions of school climate as measured by Leader Assessment On Performance Standards (LAPS) and Staff Perception Survey (SPS) respectively?
2. Is there a correlation between leaders' effectiveness and employee engagement as measured by *Leader Assessment On Performance Standards* (LAPS) and *Gallup's Q12* survey respectively in a suburban Georgia public school?
3. Is there a correlation between staff perceptions of school climate and employee engagement as measured by *Staff Perception Survey* (SPS) and *Gallup's Q12* survey respectively in a suburban Georgia public school?

Instruments

The Suburban Georgia Leader Effectiveness System [anonymized identification] *(SGLES)* is adapted from LKES, a tool developed and utilized by the Georgia Department of Education to measure school leaders' effectiveness in executing leadership responsibilities as described by eight performance standards. SGLES comprises of concurrent use of three different performance measures, which are *Leader Assessment of Performance Standards (LAPS), Staff Perception Survey (SPS),* and *Result Based Evaluation System* using student performance data. This study focused on understanding the correlation between *LAPS* and *SPS*, in addition to *Q12*. Student performance was not included in this study.

LAPS. Two evaluations were conducted by the supervisor (principals evaluate assistant principals; district office personnel evaluate principals) using the eight leader performance standards (Appendix A). Based on those two evaluations conducted by the supervisors, a summative score was assigned to each standard. By adding scores from each of the eight standards, a cumulative score was generated for each principal or assistant principal. The cumulative score ranges between 0 and 24. Based on their scores principals and assistant principals are classified by the district office into four performance-based effectiveness categories; which are described in Table 1.

A validity and reliability assessment of *LKES* was conducted by The Georgia Center for Assessment at College of Education, University of Georgia (2014) and found a high degree of internal consistency in the LAPS. In this study, leader effectiveness is measured using *LAPS*.

Table 1
Rating Scale for Each Leader Assessment of Performance Standard (LAPS)

Rating Scale	**Rating Level**	**LAPS Score on each standard**
Ineffective	Level 1	0
Need Development	Level 2	1
Proficient	Level 3	2
Exemplary	Level 4	3

***Staff Perception Survey*.** In response to the Georgia Department of Education's school climate perception survey requirement, a tool called *Staff Perception Survey (SPS)* was developed by this school district to evaluate school employees' perception of their principals and assistant principals. This instrument uses 17 leadership effectiveness indicators or items related to the eight leadership performance adopted from a 33 item climate survey provided by the GaDOE (See sample in Appendix B). The number of items related to each standard varies from one to four. A minimum of fifteen teachers and non-instructional staff assess principals and assistant principals on each of the seventeen items using a five-point Likert scale. The responses for each item are calculated in percent for every rating scale and later assigned a score using 5 point scale. A mean score for each leader is calculated which falls between 0 and 4. In this study, teacher perception of leader effectiveness was measured using *SPS*.

Gallup's Q12 Employee Engagement Survey. *Gallup's Employee Engagement Survey* (Q12) is comprised of 12 statements that measure employees' perceptions of the quality of people-related management practices and predict attitudinal outcomes like satisfaction, loyalty, and pride (Harter et al., 2006). Every employee in the school district evaluates his or her workplace engagement and overall satisfaction by responding to the 12 engagement questions. Because each employee rates the 12 core elements using a five-point scale, the final score can range from 12 to 60 with 12-35 indicating disengagement, 36-47 suggesting an employee is neither engaged nor disengaged, and 48 or higher suggesting an

employee is highly engaged. The *Gallup Employee Engagement Survey (Q12)* was developed and piloted with 1135 businesses across the world with a Cronbach's alpha reliability of 0.91 (Harter et al., 2006). In this study, employee engagement is measured using *Q12*.

Data Analysis

Using SPSS, a Pearson's product-moment correlation was used to analyze the data. A mean score was calculated combining cumulative *LAPS* scores and *SPS* scores of every leader at each school. Those scores were combined and a mean was calculated for elementary, middle and high school levels. The Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was conducted for each level (elementary, middle and high school). In addition, the relationship between leader effectiveness and employee engagement data for the school by level was calculated using Pearson product-moment correlation. Finally, the correlation between staff perceptions of school climate and employee engagement and similar parameters were analyzed using SPSS.

Research Design Limitations

Perceived leader effectiveness may differ with assigned roles and responsibilities. For instance, principals are typically responsible for developing the vision and setting the expectation; whereas, assistant principals are usually tasked with finding ways to enact the vision. Using a single instrument to measure both roles' effectiveness may not always provide an accurate assessment.

A second limitation comes from using *Q12* data. Gallup assigned a single score to each school. While studying the relationship between leader effectiveness, school climate, and employee engagement; an assumption should be made that all site leaders contributed equally to school climate and in fostering employee engagement at that school.

Results

The first research question asked, "Is there a correlation between leaders' effectiveness and staff perceptions of school climate as measured by LAPS and SPS respectively?". Across the school district, leader effectiveness and staff perceptions of school climate were positively correlated and statistically significant. In addition, there was a significant correlation between leader effectiveness and staff perception of school climate at the elementary school level. At the middle and high school levels, $p > .01$, suggesting leader effectiveness and

teacher perception of school climate do not have a statistically significant correlation. Table 2 summarizes the results for this research question.

Table 2
Correlation of Leader Assessment on Performance Standards (LAPS) and Staff Perception Survey (SPS) Based on Mean Score.

Level	N	r	p
All	130	.306	.000*
Elementary	78	.338	.002*
Middle	27	.310	.115
High	25	.115	.455

***** $p < .01$

The second research question asked, "Is there a correlation between leaders' effectiveness and employee engagement as measured by LAPS and *Gallup's Q12* survey respectively, in a suburban Georgia public school?". At the district level, leader effectiveness and employee engagement had a significantly positive correlation. Analysis of *LAPS* and *Q12* data at school level also revealed a significant correlation at elementary level. However, at the middle school and high school levels, there was not a statistically significant correlation. Table 3 provides a summary of the results for this research question.

Table 3
Correlation of Leader Assessment on Performance Standards (LAPS) and Gallup's Q12 Survey based on mean scores.

Level	N	r	p
All	130	.286	.001*
Elementary	78	.288	.011*
Middle	27	.425	.027
High	25	.118	.575

* $p < .01$

To answer the third research question, "Is there a correlation between staff perceptions of school climate and employee engagement?" *SPS* and *Q12* data were utilized from all 130 schools in a Suburban Georgia Public School district.

At the district level, these two variables demonstrated a positive and significant correlation. The same relationship was true at each of the school levels: elementary, middle school and high school. Table 4 provides a summary of the results for this research question.

Table 4
Correlation of Gallup's Q12 and Staff Perception Survey (SPS) Based on Mean Scores.

Level	N	r	p
All	130	.658	.000*
Elementary	78	.672	.000*
Middle	27	.562	.002*
High	25	.783	.000*

***** $p < .01$.

Overall, a statistically significant correlation was found among the three leader effectiveness assessment tools across the district. In response to the first research question, the district findings revealed a change in leader effectiveness has an influence over staff perception of school climate. Further data analysis discovered that at the elementary school level a similar effect was observed; however, at the middle and high school level a change in leader effectiveness did not have an influence over staff perception of school climate. In response to the second research question, any change in the leaders' effectiveness significantly impacted employee engagement district wide as well as at the elementary and middle school level. At the high school level, a change in leader effectiveness did not have an influence on employee engagement. While answering the third research question, it was discovered that any change in staff perception did significantly impact employee engagement at district as well as elementary, middle and high school level.

Discussion

School leaders are trusted with school improvement responsibility by creating the culture and climate conducive to teaching and learning (Capshew, 2015). Analysis of leader effectiveness data in this study from a suburban Georgia public school system concluded that effectiveness of school leaders directly impacts the staffs' perception of the school climate. This is consistent with existing literature suggesting school leaders play a small, but significant role in managing the learning environment (Clifford, 2015; Radinger, 2014; Stronge et al., 2008), and in generating a higher staff satisfaction, motivation and productivity level (Waldron & McLeskey, 2010). Our findings were also

consistent with Kilinc's (2014) study, which argued that supportiveness and intimacy of a leader are positively related to school improvement and professional development. Consistent with this finding, leaders in this district may foster collaboration between teachers and leaders, and share decision-making responsibilities to inculcating a climate conducive for a high degree of trust and cooperation (Chong & Kong, 2012).

Data from the middle school and high schools exhibited a lack of statistically significant correlation between leader effectiveness and teacher perception of school climate. This finding is inconsistent with a Nelson (2012) study, which suggested the existence of a significant correlation between leadership style and teacher perception. A possible explanation for the discrepancy between this study and Nelson's study is the large size of the participant schools. In such large schools, school leaders and staff may not engage in daily collaboration and communication, resulting in a sense of alienation among staff (Humlum & Smith, 2015). Departmentalization by content area may contribute in teachers working in silos, particularly at middle and high schools, affecting staff perception of school climate. The challenge of meeting curricular and socio-emotional needs of middle school students, compounded by the stringent promotion requirement, may also significantly affect the school climate perception of the teachers.

The overall perception of teachers towards school leaders is consistent with the framework of transformational leadership, where leaders aspire to personally and professionally develop their teachers and staff (Kouzes & Posner, 2013; Kwasi, 2015). On the contrary, the high school data exhibited a lack of statistically significant relationship between leader effectiveness and teacher perception of school climate. This finding is in agreement with the Sarikaya and Erdogan (2016) study which concluded that teachers perceive high school leaders to be adequate in setting and sharing goals; and least adequate in supporting and developing teachers. According to Humlum and Smith (2015), the alienation effect caused by a large school size can be another contributor to this phenomenon. Student enrollment data available at the school system website shows that elementary schools in this district are often smaller in size when compared to their middle and high school buildings. This provides leaders and staff opportunities to frequently interact and understand each other's perspective. According to Humlum and Smith (2015), large school size can prevent leaders from frequently connecting with individual staff, and understand their needs and aspirations. This may have contributed to the differences in staff perceptions of school leaders at the larger middle and high school buildings.

Another plausible reason for the lack of significant correlation between leader effectiveness and teacher perception of school climate is that elementary teachers teach under a self-contained model, and collaborate with leaders and teachers to be effective in teaching all content areas. On the other hand, middle and high school levels departmentalize by content areas, resulting in compartmentalization instead of a climate of cohesive collaboration giving rise to a lower staff perception of school climate. Enforcement of rigid graduation requirements can potentially cause high school teachers to feel more pressure to meet academic goals and thus result in their negative perception of leadership (Sarikaya & Erdogan, 2016).

In response to the second research question, leader effectiveness and employee engagement demonstrate a statistically significant positive correlation. This finding is consistent with various studies which suggest that leader effectiveness is a predictor of employees' organizational commitment (Biggs, Brough, & Barbour, 2014; Sarikaya & Erdogan, 2016; Wollard & Shuck, 2011). Further data analysis revealed that a statistically significant correlation also exists between leader effectiveness and employee engagement at elementary and middle school level.

Regarding the correlation between teacher perception of school climate and employee engagement, overall findings at the district level were consistent with high school, middle school and elementary. This strong correlation does not necessarily indicate a high degree of positive staff perception and engagement, but does indicate a high degree of correlation between *SPS* and *Q12*. Because both tools are perception-based measures and were completed by the same set of staff, they may be highly correlated. For example, if a teacher holds a strong opinion for or against a leader, this may be reflected in his or her response to the questions in both the surveys. The close connection between staff perception and engagement can also be explained by Othman and Nasurdin (2013) who argue that a supportive work culture can enhance employee engagement.

The theoretical framework for this study was rooted in the concept of transformational leadership. Transformational leaders carry a variety of responsibilities, which include pedagogical leadership, managing teachers, and improving school climate (Radinger, 2014). As such, this study has implications for leader preparation programs and leader evaluation systems.

Leader preparation programs. The role of a school leader (principals or assistant principals) has changed from a school manager to an instructional leader (Marzano et al., 2005). In order to be effective in his/her role, instructional leaders

must develop their ability to promote adult learning for staff and to improve teaching and learning for students. This study signified the correlation between leader effectiveness, staff perception of school climate, and leaders' ability to increase employee engagement. Based on the study findings, it can be concluded that individuals in a leadership role must develop a high level of communication and collaboration skills to connect with teachers to inspire a change in the organizational culture. This craft can be improved with leaders' experience practicing transformational leadership.

Leader evaluation systems. Due to consistent results among all school levels using the perception surveys SPS and Q12, these two instruments, while designed to capture different constructs, may be redundant in practice. As such, the results from this study suggest staff may not need to complete both instruments. A concerted effort must be made to select appropriate evaluation measures, without adding unnecessary assessment or survey activities for teachers. School districts should consider minimizing the number of surveys by either selecting one of the two tools to use or combining them to form one tool to evaluate staff perception of school culture, climate, and engagement. The efforts to minimize the number of surveys staff complete will also increase the probability of participation in any such assessment.

This study described the value of measuring leader effectiveness in developing positive school climate and increasing employee engagement. Currently, all principals and assistant principals in the state of Georgia are evaluated twice every year by their supervisors and the staff. One mid-year and one end of the year evaluations are used to make employment decisions such as retention, promotion, pay increase or removal from the job (Clifford, 2015). Leaders' continuous development can be ensured by initial as well as periodic evaluation of their leadership competencies. Because the leader evaluation is a cumulative process; an equal emphasis should be placed on a formative as well as a summative evaluation (Radinger, 2014). In order to make leader evaluation purposeful and effective in developing leadership competencies, non-evaluative periodic formative assessments should be conducted by a coach or mentor. A summative appraisal should be conducted at a later stage or through a separate process when concerns arise.

The study utilized the leader evaluation data collected from a suburban Georgia school district. Despite a difference in the roles and responsibilities of principals and assistant principals, a similar performance measure was used and similar data were generated for both leader subgroups. Due to the varied nature of their everyday responsibilities, a different approach for evaluation should be used

for these two leader groups. A unique set of tools, mostly targeting different leadership characteristics should be used to measure each one of their effectiveness.

Recommendation for Future Research

The Georgia Department of Education recommends three components of leader evaluation tools to be used for leader appraisal. A validity and reliability study was conducted; however, more studies need to be conducted to accurately understand each component of the leader evaluation, including student achievement component.

A further analysis of middle and high school leader evaluation data (LAPS and SPS) is recommended to evaluate any existing correlation between leader effectiveness and the socio-economic status of the community they serve. It will be interesting to learn how leader's effectiveness measure correlates to changing socioeconomic parameters. Additionally, studying the change in correlation with changing demographics, teacher tenure, school size and longevity of the school leader will yield a valuable result, thus it should be considered.

This study data was collected from a suburban Georgia school system. Conducting similar studies in urban and rural school districts in the state and around the country will provide insights regarding leader effectiveness in relation to geographical location.

References

Allen, N. J. (2015). *Transformational leadership and its relationship to school climate and student achievement*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3662981)

Anderson, L. E. (2015). *Relationship between leadership, organizational commitment, and intent to stay among junior executives.* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 3708010).

Anderson, M. E. (1991). *Principals, How To Train, Recruit, Select, Induct, And Evaluate Leaders For America's Schools.* Eugene, Or. : ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. Accession Number 337843.

Arogundade, O. T., & Arogundade, A. B. (2015). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Implications for employees' career satisfaction. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *17*(1), 27-36. Retrieved from http://najp.8m.com/

Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal Of Occupational & Organizational Psychology*, *72*(4), 441-462.

Aytaç, T. (2015). The relationship between teachers' perception about school managers' talent management leadership and the level of organizational commitment. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *59*, 165-180. doi:10.14689/ejer.2015.59.10

Baker, L. M. (2011). *The Relationships Between Leadership Practice And Teacher Motivation, Capacity, And Work Setting as Related to Change in Literacy Instruction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 913093486)

Baptiste, M. (2019). No teacher left behind: The impact of principal leadership styles on teacher job satisfaction and student success. *Journal of International Education and Leadership*, *9*(1), 1-11. Retrieved from http://www.jielusa.org

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bethman, J. L. (2015). *The principal evaluation process: Principals' learning as a result of the evaluation process* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3715162)

Biggs, A., Brough, P., & Barbour, J. P. (2014). Relationships of individual and organizational support with engagement: Examining various types of causality in a three-wave study. *Work & Stress, 28*(3), 236–254. doi:10.1080/02678373.2014.934316

Bonaros, D. J. (2006). *A study of transformational leadership and student achievement in inner-city elementary schools* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3498714)

Boyce, J., & Bowers, A. J. (2018). Toward an evolving conceptualization of instructional leadership as leadership for learning. *Journal of Educational Administration, 56*(2), 161-182. doi:10.1108/JEA-06-2016-0064

Brockmeier, L. L., Starr, G., Green, R., Pate, J. L., & Leech, D. W. (2013). Principal and school-level effects on elementary school student achievement. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 8*(1), 49-61. Retrieved from http://www.ncpeapublications.org/

Brogan, N. (2002). *Transformational Leadership, Teacher Motivation, And Team Effectiveness.* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 3135471).

Capshew, S. (2015). *The impact of principal leadership style, experience, and tenure on school climate in times of instructional reform.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3706185).

Carroll, J. E. (2015). *Effective recruitment practices for newly prepared teachers in Virginia.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 3721085).

Chong, W. H., & Kong, C. A. (2012). Teacher Collaborative Learning and Teacher Self-Efficacy: The Case of Lesson Study. The Journal of Experimental Education, 80 (3), 263-283. doi:10.1080/00220973.2011.596854

Clifford, M. (2015). *Building leadership talent through performance evaluation*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/about-us

Cohen, J., McCabe, E., Michelli, N., & Pickeral, T. (2009). *School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. 111*(1), 180-213. Retrieved from http://www.tcrecord.org/

Condon, E. I. (2010). *Principal evaluation and student achievement: A study of public elementary schools in DuPage, Will, and Lake Counties, Illinois*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3387407)

Dechert, K., Nordin, A., & Kappler, L. (2015). Developing and implementing principal- and teacher-evaluation systems in Mississippi. *Journal of Educational Leadership in Action, 3*(1). Available at http://www.lindenwood.edu/ela/issue05/dechert.html

Dhuey, E., & Smith, J. (2014). How important are school principals in the production of student achievement?. *Canadian Journal Of Economics, 47*(2), 634-663. doi:10.1111/caje.12086

Ertas, N. (2015). Turnover intentions and work motivations of millennial employees in federal service. *Public Personnel Management, 44*(3), 401-423. doi:10.1177/0091026015588193

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

Galagan, P. (2015) Employee engagement: An epic failure? *TD: Talent Development, 69(*3), 24-27. Retrieved from https://www.td.org/Publications.

Georgia Department of Education. (2014). *Leader assessment on performance standards* (LAPS) and rubrics. Retrieved from http://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/ Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Documents/FY15%20TKES%20and% 20LKES%20Documents/ C_LAPS%20Standard%20Rubrics%20C2.pdf

Georgia Department of Education. (2016). *Leader keys effectiveness system (LKES)*. Retrieved from https://www.gadoe.org/School-Improvement/ Teacher-and-Leader-Effectiveness/Pages/Leader-Keys-Effectiveness-System.aspx

Gokce, B. A. (2014). Do doctors' perception of hospital leadership style and organizational culture influence their organizational commitment? *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, *42*(9), 1549-1561. doi:10.2224/sbp.2014.42.9.1549

Gupta, N. (2015). *Workforce prediction.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 10017947).

Hall, J. K. (1998). *An examination of the perceptions of teacher appraisal of principal performance between elementary teachers and principals in Wayne County* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 9827207)

Hallinger, P. (2003) Leading educational change: Reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. 329–351.doi: doi:10.1080/ 0305764032000122005

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996) Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly 32*, 5–44. doi:10.1177/0013161X96032001002

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (2013). Running on empty? Finding the time and capacity to lead learning. *NASSP Bulletin, 97*(1), 5-21. doi:10.1177/0192636512469288

Halverson, R., Kelley, C., & Shaw, J. (2014). A call for improved school leadership. *Phi Delta Kappan, 95*(6), 57-60. doi:10.1177/003172171409500612

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., Killham, E. A., & Asplund, J. W. (2006). Q12 meta-analysis. Retrieved from https://strengths.gallup.com/

Heck, R. H., & Hallinger, P. (2014). Modeling the longitudinal effects of school leadership on teaching and learning. *Journal of Educational Administration, 52*(5), 653. doi:10.1108/JEA-08-2013-0097

Heifetz, R. A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading*. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press

Hesselbein, F., & Goldsmith, M. (2006). *The Leaders of the future 2. Vision, strategies, and practices for the new era.* New York, NY: Jossey Bass

Hornung, K., & Yoder, N. (2014). *What do effective district leaders do? Strategies for evaluating district leadership. Policy snapshot*. Retrieved from http://www.air.org/

Humlum, M. K., & Smith, N. (2015) Long-term effects of school size on students' outcomes. *Economics of Education Review*, *4528(*43), 1-27. doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2015.01.003

Khine, M. S., & Saleh, I. M. (2014). *Reframing transformational leadership: New school culture and effectiveness*. Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.

Kilinc, A. C. (2014). Examining the relationship between teacher leadership and school climate. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 14*(5), 1729-1742. doi: 10.12738/estp.2014.5.2159

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2013). *The five practices of exemplary leadership: Asia.* San Francisco, CA: Wiley.

Kullar, P. (2011). *A multi-site case study: The effect of principal leadership on school climate and student achievement in charter schools in Los Angeles, California* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3449691)

Kwasi, D. B. (2015). Resilient leadership: A transformational-transactional leadership mix. *Journal of Global Responsibility, (6)*1, 99-112. doi:10.1108/JGR-07-2014-0026

Lashway, L. (2003) *Improving Principal Evaluation.* ERIC Digest. Accession Number ED482347.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1995). An organizational learning perspective on school responses to central policy initiatives. *School Organization*, *15*(3), 229-252. doi:10.1080/02601369550038147

Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S. E., Wahlstrom, K., Mascall, B., Gordon, M. F., & Jantzi, D. (2012). *Linking leadership to student learning*. San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McKinney, B. D. (2009). *An examination of the effectiveness of a principal leadership screening program on teacher perception and teacher retention.* Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 3409040).

Nelson, A. L. (2012). *The relationship between middle school teachers' perceptions of principals' transformational leadership practices, teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 3530736).

Othman, N., & Nasurdin, A. M. (2013). Social support and work engagement: a study of Malaysian nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, *21*(8), 1083-1090. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2834.2012.01448.x

Owens, S. A. (2013). *The relationship between elementary school teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership effectiveness and teacher burnout.* (Doctoral

dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3557679)

Pogan, L. (2015). Engagement focused leadership. *Revista Academiei Fortelor Terestre*, *20*(1), 87-93. Retrieved from http://www.armyacademy.ro/english/index.html#.html

Radinger, T. (2014). School leader appraisal - A tool to strengthen school leaders' pedagogical leadership and skills for teacher management? *European Journal of Education*, *49*(3), 378-394. doi:10.1111/ejed.12085

Ross, J. A., & Gray, P. (2006). School leadership and student achievement: The mediating effects of teacher beliefs. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *29*(3), 798-822. doi:10.2307/20054196

Sarikaya**,** N., & Erdogan**,** Ç. (2016) Relationship between the Instructional Leadership Behaviorsof High School Principals and Teachers' Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Education and Practice, 7*(3), 72-82. Accession Number**:** EJ1089789

Serrano, S. A., & Reichard, R. J. (2011). Leadership strategies for an engaged workforce. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *63*(3), 176-189. doi:10.1037/a0025621

Shaw, J., & Newton, J. (2014). Teacher retention and satisfaction with a servant leader as principal. *Education, 135*(1), 101-106.

Stearns, M. (2012). *The relationship of leadership behaviors to staff RN job satisfaction and retention* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3523913)

Stronge, J. H. (2013). Principal evaluation from the ground up. *Educational Leadership*, *70*(7), 60-65.

Stronge, J. H., Richard, H. B., & Catano, N. (2008). *Qualities of effective principals*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stronge, J. H., Xu, X., Leeper, L. M., & Tonneson, V. C. (2013). *Principal evaluation: standards, rubrics, and tools for effective performance.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Teh, B., Chiang, H., Lipscomb, S., & Gill, B. (2014). *Measuring school leaders' effectiveness: An interim report from a multiyear pilot of Pennsylvania's Framework for Leadership* (REL 2015–058). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Mid-Atlantic. Retrieved from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs.

Temple, R. S. (2009). *An empirical analysis of nurse manager leadership practices and staff nurse job satisfaction* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3356436)

Thompson, T. (2016). *Principal behavior and teacher perceptions: Cultivating a positive school climate* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 10107642)

University of Georgia (2014). *Assessing the validity and reliability of the Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES) and the Leader Keys Effectiveness System (LKES) of the Georgia Department of Education*. Retrieved from https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/1354986/tkes-lkes-reliability-validity-report.pdf

Wagner, R., & Harter, J. K. (2006). *12: The elements of great managing*. New York, NY: Gallup Press.

Waldron, N. L., & McLeskey, J. (2010). Establishing a collaborative school culture through comprehensive school reform. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Consultation, 20*(1), 58-74. doi:10.1080/10474410903535364.

Warner, T. L. (2014). *Enhancing student achievement: Examining the extent principal leadership characteristics influence student achievement in northern Virginia elementary schools.* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3645144)

Welch, M. S. (2014). *Teacher perceptions of principal leadership behaviors and morale: A descriptive case study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (UMI No. 3627282)

Wollard, K. K., & Shuck, B. (2011). Missing article title. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 13*(4), 429-446. doi:10.1177/1523422311431220.

Yeldell, P. A. (2012). *The relationship between principals' perception of their leadership style and teachers' perception of their job satisfaction.*(Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 3547204).

Zhang, Y. (2010). *Empirical research of influencing factors on job satisfaction of temporarily transferenced employee in party and government organizations.*(Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 10427154).

APPENDIX A: Georgia Leadership Performance Standards

The eight standards or principal quality (Stronge, Richard, & Catano, 2008) of Leader Keys Effectiveness System (Georgia Department of Education, 2015) are listed below:

Performance Standard 1 (Instructional Leadership): The leader fosters the success of all students by facilitating the development, communication, implementation, and evaluation of a shared vision of teaching and learning that leads to school improvement.

Performance Standard 2 (School Climate): The leader promotes the success of all students by developing, advocating, and sustaining an academically rigorous, positive, and safe school climate for all stakeholders.

Performance Standard 3 (Planning and Assessment): The leader effectively gathers, analyzes, and uses a variety of data to inform planning and decision-making consistent with established guidelines, policies, and procedures.

Performance Standard 4 (Organizational Management): The leader fosters the success of all students by supporting, managing, and overseeing the school's organization, operation, and use of resources.

Performance Standard 5 (Human Resources Management): The leader fosters effective human resources management through the selection, induction, support, and retention of quality instructional and support personnel.

Performance Standard 6 (Teacher and Staff Evaluation): The leader fairly and consistently evaluates school personnel in accordance with state and district guidelines and provides them with timely and constructive feedback focused on improved student learning.

Performance Standard 7 (Professionalism): The leader fosters the success of students by demonstrating professional standards and ethics, engaging in continuous professional development, and contributing to the profession.

Performance Standard 8 (Communication and Community Relations): The leader fosters the success of all students by communicating and collaborating effectively with stakeholders.

APPENDIX B: STAFF PERCEPTION SURVEY

The following 17 items reflect school staff's perceptions of how they view their assistant principal's leadership.
(Rating scale: Strongly Agree (4), Agree (3), Disagree (2), Strongly Disagree (1), Not Applicable (0))

Instructional Leadership - Standard 1

1. My assistant principal communicates a clear vision of how effective teaching and learning should take place in this school.
2. My assistant principal takes an active role in improving curriculum and instruction.

School Climate - Standard 2

3. I feel free to express opinions even if they are different from my assistant principal.
4. My assistant principal gives me the opportunity to provide input into decisions that affect the school or me.
5. When I make discipline decisions consistent with established school policy, the assistant principal supports those decisions.
6. My assistant principal encourages staff to be inclusive of all cultures.

Planning & Assessment-Standard 3

7. My assistant principal includes teachers and staff in the process of developing school improvement plans.
8. My assistant principal promotes the importance of using student assessment data to make instructional decisions.

Organizational Management - Standard 4

9. My assistant principal clearly communicates administrative procedures.
10. My assistant principal responds promptly to teachers/staff members who identify students with behavior problems.
11. My assistant principal makes appropriate decisions.

Human Resources - Standard 5

12. My assistant principal recognizes good work of individual employees.

Teacher/Staff Evaluations - Standard 6

13. My assistant principal is fair when evaluating teachers/staff at this school.
14. My assistant principal is committed to helping me develop and improve my performance.

Professionalism - Standard 7

15. My assistant principal treats me with professionalism.

Communication - Standard 8

16. My assistant principal communicates effectively with teachers/staff members.
17. My assistant principal is a visible presence in our building to parents, staff, and students.

DOI: 10.20429/ger.2020.170104