PLANNING FOR EFFECTIVE SCHOOL LEADERSHIP: TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE LEADERSHIP SKILLS AND ETHICAL BEHAVIORS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

KATINA WEBSTER
PETER LITCHKA
Loyola University Maryland, U.S.A.

ABSTRACT

Schools need principals who have experienced the most current and compelling theories and practices of school leadership in terms of leading schools to success for each student. There is a considerable amount of research that proposes a definite link between the leadership abilities of a school leader and the impact such leadership has on student success (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007; Heck & Hallinger, 2014; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). School principals, like leaders in other fields, encounter differing levels of success, which can be influenced by the leadership abilities and ethical behaviors of the school principal. This quantitative study, which took place in a large metropolitan area of the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States, examines the relationship between the overall leadership abilities of school principals with their ethical leadership behaviors, as perceived by teachers. This study found a strong (and expected) relationship between the overall leadership abilities of school principals and ethical behaviors, as perceived by teachers. However, statistically significant differences were found among the perceptions in the areas of gender, ethnicity, experience, types of school (elementary, middle, high) and jurisdiction (public, private, religious).

INTRODUCTION

Planning for the preparation for aspiring school principals and support for current school principals is of critical importance to policymakers and institutions of higher learning that have educational leadership programs. In particular, school districts need principals who have experienced the most current and compelling theories and practices of school leadership for both the current and future context of improving student achievement and the teaching/learning environment of schools. In addition, there is a considerable amount of research that proposes a definite link between the leadership abilities of a school leader and the impact such leadership has on student achievement (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, & Orr, 2007; Heck & Hallinger, 2014; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

In most cases, the preparation and support for school principals originates from colleges and universities that offer graduate level programs and degrees in educational leadership, management, and administration. Currently, such accredited institutions are guided by national and state educational leadership standards, such as the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSEL) (NPBEA, 2015). The state of Maryland, where this study occurred, replaced its own educational leadership framework with the PSEL to guide administrator preparation, licensure, and evaluation in Maryland. (Maryland State Department of Education, 2018, p. 4).

Thus, it is quite obvious that planning, problem-solving, and decision-making are some of the most important parts of the contemporary school leader. And with this, school leaders are often faced with ethical and moral dilemmas. Fullan (2011) suggests that school leaders facing such dilemmas are

often asked to apply "once-and-for-all answers that are complex, rife with paradoxes and dilemmas" (p.2). According to Starratt (2005),

> The school leader has access to organizational structures and processes that affect the core work of teaching and learning. These structures and processes are not ethically neutral. They either promote the integrity of the school's work-authentic learning-or they curtail or block its integrity. (p. 128)

We expect our school leaders will have a core set of values that will guide their leadership in helping them to create a learning environment conducive to academic achievement and personal growth for all students in a manner that is consistent with ethics and morals of society. Yet, according to Bowen, Bessette and Chan (2006),

> Our society has come to expect that school leaders will make ethical decisions for the common good and that their actions will be driven by a commitment to moral and academic excellence. It would follow, then, that people preparing for school administration careers receive systematic education about ethics related to leadership. Unfortunately, this has not been the case (para. 1).

During the past several decades, Americans have been witnesses to a frequent number of ethical lapses by numerous elected and appointed members of national, state, and local governments, as well as on Wall Street and in boardrooms across the nation. Just as disturbing, this lack of integrity and morality has found its way into the American system of schools, where numerous school leaders, principals, and teachers have been found to violate both educational law and ethics, particularly when it comes to standardized testing results. According to National Center for Fair and Open Testing (NCFOT), cheating on standardized tests has been documented in 37 states, with high profile cases involving school administrators found in both California and Georgia (NCFOT, 2013).

In this study, we examine whether the school principal's ethical leadership is positively associated with effective school leadership, as perceived by teachers. Standard Two of the PSEL states, "Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student's academic success and well-being", contending that effective leadership cannot occur in schools if ethical norms and standards are not embraced and modeled by the principal (NPBEA, p. 10).

This quantitative study focuses on the relationship between the overall leadership abilities of school principals with their ethical leadership behaviors, as perceived by teachers. The purpose was to determine the relationship between the leadership abilities and ethical leadership behaviors of school principals, the extent of this relationship, and the degree to which teachers perceive this relationship in terms of gender, ethnicity, experience of both teachers and their principals as well as the type, location and jurisdiction of the schools, and finally, the quality of the school in terms of student achievement. School principals, like leaders in other fields, encounter differing levels of success. Such success can occur from within the internal dynamics of the school (i.e., relationships, culture, etc.), from external forces (i.e., parents, community, school district central administration), both of which can be influenced by the leadership abilities and ethical behaviors of the school principal, in terms of the school principal's professional development and related practices.

One group that observes and interacts on a daily basis with the school principal is the teaching staff. Their observations and experiences play a critical role in how the principal's leadership abilities and ethical behaviors are perceived. Thus, the problem is to determine if leadership and

ethics are related to the performance of the principal, as perceived by teachers, and if such are influenced by various teacher demographics. Solving this problem could be of considerable benefit to policymakers and institutions of higher learning involved with the development and support of current and aspiring leaders in determining curricula, professional development, and the theory and practice of contemporary school leadership.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

There were two research questions that guided this study:

1. To what extent did teachers perceive a relationship between their principal's overall leadership abilities with their ethical behaviors?
2. To what extend did the demographics of the teachers have an impact on their perceived relationship between their principal's overall leadership abilities with their ethical behaviors?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership

James Burns (1978) identified two types of leadership in his seminal work, *Leadership.* For decades, organizations across fields have relied on Burns distinction between transactional and transformational leadership to identify the styles of those in power. Transactional leaders favor a rewards and punishment approach, whereas, transformational leaders favor a holistic view of an organization and its future. Transformational leaders establish norms for behavior (Cohen, et al., 2009), build capacity amongst followers and find value in what each individual or group brings to the ultimate fulfillment of organizational goals (Sergiovanni, 2007). In the field of education, emphasis on managerial tasks has decreased. In order to meet the challenges of leading today's schools, principals must combine the best of each style (Varol & Varol, 2012) by becoming more transformational in their thoughts and actions (Bromley & Kirschner-Bromley, 2007).

According to Bernard Bass (1985), there are five elements of transformational leadership: Idealized Attributes, Idealized Behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation and Individualized Consideration. Teachers identify better with principals they perceive having higher levels of idealized attributes such as a sense of power and confidence, setting aside self for the greater good of the school vision, and instilling a sense of pride (Allen, Grigsby, & Peters, 2015). Ronit Bogler (2001) found teachers have higher rates of job satisfaction when their efforts are recognized, provided opportunities for self-development and allowed to participate in the decision-making process.

Most recently discussed as a companion to transformational theory (Copeland, 2014), charismatic leadership is also considered a pathway for increasing effectiveness among leaders (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Charismatic leaders translate intricate thoughts and concepts into relatable messages using stories, metaphors and other communication methods that have emotional appeal (Weber, 1958). Yukl (1999) suggests the two leadership styles may overlap but are distinct in their design. However, not enough empirical evidence exists to support the notion that charismatic leadership improves organizational outcomes. House and Shamir (1993) define charismatic leadership as:

> An interaction between leaders and followers that results in (1) making the followers' self-esteem contingent on the vision and mission articulated by the leader, (2) strong

> internalization of the leader's values and goals by the followers, (3) strong personal or moral (as opposed to calculative) commitment to these values and goals, and (4) a willingness on the part of followers to transcend their self-interests for the sake of the collective (team or organization) (p. 86).

In contrast, Boje (2008) defines a charismatic leader as one who comes to power based on personal appeal and charm as opposed to intellect or specific skills. Shamir and Howell (2018) studied contextual variables related to the emergence of charismatic leadership and the relationship between organizational leadership and setting. Shamir, Howell and others contend some environments promote charismatic leadership more than others and there are conditions under which charismatic leadership is more likely to emerge and be effective (Shamir & Howell, 2018; Lovelace, Neely, Allen, & Hunter, 2019).

Researchers also point out charismatic leaders use of manipulation. Mills (1990) defines manipulation as a way of exerting influence in which the target does not know he or she has been influenced. In the past, the use of manipulation has been considered unethical (Bass, 1998; Brown & Trevino, 2006; Uvinen, Lamsa, Sintonen, & Takala, 2012). Uvinen, Lamsa, Sintonen and Takala (2012) suggest there is a fine line between manipulation and inspiration. When the intent of manipulation is to do good, as in encouraging followers to reach personal goals or constructing a vision of organizational culture, some level of manipulation may be acceptable. Among other findings, Uvinen et al. (2012) discovered, "some leaders considered manipulation as an inescapable part of their work" and part of their everyday routines. Providing misleading information was the most common type of manipulation.

When charismatic leaders are elevated by their followers because of their presence and personality, other leaders would rather place followers in the forefront instead of themselves (Greenleaf, 1977; Lamb, 1999). Servant and spiritual leaders intrinsically uplift others and share power for the good of the organization (Lamb, 1999). Servant and spiritual leaders demonstrate ethical, moral, caring behavior and are motivated by a proclivity to serve rather than lead (McLaughlin, 2009; Washington, Sutton, & Sauser, 2014). Spiritual leaders inspire others using hope and faith to project a shared vision that is empowering and based on service to all stakeholders (Fry, 2003; Smith, Minor, & Brashen, 2018). In turn, followers are driven, dedicated, connected to others and their inner self (Institute for Spiritual Leadership, 2013; Sholikhah, Wang & Li, 2019).

Authentic leaders recognize the importance of unity and collective effort. Authenticity is a cornerstone of values-based leadership frameworks (Duignan, 2014). The Authentic Leadership Theory (ALT) arose from a need to deeply consider leader's inner ethical and moral qualities in relationship to how leaders address difficult situations (George, 2003; May, Chan, Hodges & Avolio, 2003; Avolio & Gardner, 2005). Duncan, Green, Gergen and Ecung (2017) present four dimensions of authentic leadership, including self-awareness, balanced processing, internalized moral perspective and relational transparency. Xiong, Lin, Li, and Wang (2016) identify self-awareness, self-regulation and self-development as essential characteristics of authentic leaders. Introspection alone is not enough to tackle current social, organizational or educational challenges on its own.

Educational Leadership

Educational leaders are charged with guiding teachers and others to improve the learning experience for all students, K-12 and beyond, while also respecting their cultural differences (Wright, Arnold, & Khalifa, 2018). Leaders often face complex situations that call for difficult decisions to be made. Mintrop (2012) suggests three ways to respond to demands: Resistance, alignment and coherence.

Leaders can ignore mandates, risking heavy consequences and job security; Maintain the status quo by aligning school goals with system goals, or establish a culture of shared responsibility and consistency between external and school-based systems.

Currently, issues of equity dominate the discourse around educational leadership (Wright et al., 2018). Critical Race Theory (CRT) serves as an overarching social justice philosophy that seeks to interrupt patterns of exclusion and inequality (Tillman, 2002; Martinez, 2014). According to Martinez (2014), Critical Race Theory, "…[brings] together issues of power, race, and racism…and argues ignoring racial difference maintains and perpetuates the status quo with its deeply institutionalized injustices to racial minorities" (p. 9).The disconnect between the needs of marginalized populations and schools creates tensions not easily remedied (Wright, et al., 2018).

Wright, Arnold and Chalifa (2018) offer Culturally Responsive School Leadership (CRSL), "[as] a pivotal metric for understanding effective and impactful relationships between urban community members and educational leadership" (p. 819). CRSL promotes school-community collaboration and highlights the necessity for professional growth and curriculum development (Khalifa, Gooden, & Davis, 2016). When school systems intentionally or unintentionally reinforce the disconnect by exposing students to poor instruction and unrelatable curriculum, ethical dilemmas arise in tackling the bureaucratic structures hindering equitable access (Larson & Ovando, 2001; Parker & Villalpando, 2007)

Ethics and Ethical Leadership

The terms ethics and morals are often used interchangeably (Thompson, 2004) when describing the principles of right and wrong, values, and codes of conduct (Derr, 2012; Ethic, 2011). Ethics tends to be used to avert the religious connotations associated with the term morality (Thompson, 2004). Doing what is right or having a moral compass is the ability to determine and undertake the best action in a specific situation to serve the common good (Thompson, 2004; Schwartz and Sharpe, 2010). Maxwell (2007) believes ethics can be taught with tailored instruction, while Derr (2012) believes ethics are taught and developed at a young age.

Ethical leaders motivate others by making decisions with integrity, holding others accountable for ethical standards and modeling ethical behavior (Derr, 2012; Martinez, Ruiz, & Ruiz, 2011). In the current climate, the efforts of ethical leaders to act fairly and justly are necessary to interrupt the seemingly common place of moral deficiency and loss of public trust (Brown & Trevino, 2006; Ben-Hur & Johnson, 2012; Copeland, 2014; Ehrich, Harris, Klenowski, Smeed, & Spina, 2015). Thompson (2004) adds there is a moral aspect to the excise of power that is not always acknowledged. He insists, "…there are almost daily examples of moral confusion and paralysis impeding leadership at every level" (p.29). The rise of values-based leadership practices reflects a need for something more (Copeland, 2014). Critics contend the approaches lack empirical evidence and strong theoretical frameworks, which has raised some skepticism (Copeland, 2014; Duignan, 2014).

Copeland (2014) proposes a theoretical framework that places leaders into quadrants based on their behaviors:

Figure 1
Transformational and Ethical Leadership

Q 1 (Ineffective Leaders)	**Q3 (Unrealized Gains; Walkers not Talkers)**
Low authentic/ethical behaviors Low transformational behaviors	High authentic/ethical behaviors Low transformational behaviors
Q2 (Fakers, Talkers not Walkers)	**Q4 (Maximizers)**
Low authentic/ethical behaviors High transformational behaviors	High authentic/ethical behaviors High transformational behaviors

Though becoming a quadrant four leader is optimum, it is a challenge to balance authenticity, one's ethical self, and an organizational culture that may not be aligned with either (Badaracco, 1997; Duignan, 2014).

The Machiavellian approach to ethical leadership frames decision making in terms of doing the least bad thing (Cosans & Reina, 2018). The least bad thing is the preferred outcome when the alternative is equally bad or worse, which describes Machiavelli's ethics of compromise (Cosans & Reina, 2018) Machiavelli accounts for this moral dilemma and supports the notion that individuals in positions of power are often required to do bad things (Machiavelli, 1532). He also recognizes the value in adapting to circumstances based on the demands of a given situation (Machiavelli, 1532; Fiedler, 1954; Cosans & Reina, 2018). The ability to make such ethical choices requires moral intelligence and ethical reasoning (Velasquez, 1998; Lennick & Kier, 2011). The building blocks of moral intelligence are self-awareness and self-management. Ethical reasoning is activated when virtues such as integrity, courage and honesty are at odds with lack of integrity and dishonesty, which fuels the internal struggle (Velasquez, 1998; Lennick & Kier, 2011; Uvinen, et al, 2012).

Ethics and the Leadership of School Principal

The demographics of schools across the United States have changed significantly. The percentages of students of color have increased at a rate far greater than percentages of principals who are Black, Latino or Asian (Parker & Villalpando, 2007). Equity and access for marginalized groups is at the center of school and system-wide improvement, creating fertile ground for ethical dilemmas (Cooper, 2009). Ehrich, Harris, Klenowski, Smeed, and Spina (2015) studied current school leaders who faced conflicting responsibilities and ethical dilemmas using Starratt's (1996) multi-dimensional framework, which includes the Ethic of Care, Ethic of Justice, and Ethic of Critique. The researchers identified practices of school leaders that fit into one or more of the ethic categories and determined how they balanced competing accountability structures. Leaders demonstrating the ethic of care were concerned with supporting the whole child and maximizing potential. Leaders demonstrating the ethic of justice insisted upon equitable access to learning opportunities and academic success (Santamaria, 2013). Leaders demonstrating the ethic of critique questioned educational systems and teacher practices in order to bring about change and new ways of thinking about students (Ehrich, et al, 2015). Starratt (1996) maintains the three ethics are interrelated and one often influences the other. Ehrich, et al. (2015) found leaders are able to articulate their understanding of ethics and acknowledge they are guided by personal values when making decisions, however, no principal, "… reported overtly speaking with their staff about the topic of ethics" (p. 13).

In addition, researchers acknowledge the context in which leaders work, influences their success or failure (Tallerico, 2000; Roegman, 2017). Roegman (2017) presents a framework based on social, organizational, personal, and occupational contexts. Studying school superintendents, he discovered overlap between contexts that challenge what it means to lead for equity. For instance, superintendents often make decisions based on the opinions of their constituency and society at large. Such overlap can present opportunities as well as restrictions when attempting to balance the best interests of schools, school systems and their personal code of ethics (Robey, Shi, & Seward, 2019). A respondent in Larsen and Derrington's (2012) study of students in an educational leadership program advised, "Sticking to your moral compass will lead to consequences, but that does not mean you act in a morally dubious way to keep everyone happy" (p. 10).

Marshall and Ward (2004) claim leaders continue to be trained to maintain the status quo leaving little room to effectively implement equity driven practices. They found administrators who completed their formal training programs further in the past were less likely to perceive issues of equity were emphasized as an important aspect of school leadership (Robey, Shi, & Seward, 2019). Administrators are then left to make ethical decisions without a process or model (Larsen & Derrington, 2012; Gardiner & Tenuto, 2015). Nevertheless, administrators ranging from Pre-kindergarten to grade 12 consider the ethical aspects of leadership more critical today as new and unfamiliar ethical dilemmas emerge (Gardiner and Tenuto, 2015).

Teacher Perceptions of Principal Leadership

Schools thrive when leadership is shared, decisions are made collaboratively, and teachers feel valued for their expertise. Devine and Alger (2011) contend a collective approach to leadership and substantial participation from teachers yields school success. When examining how teachers perceive instructional teacher leaders versus principals, they found instructional teacher leaders were perceived as more transformational, while principals were perceived to exhibit more transactional behaviors. Overall, teachers work harder and are more inspired within a transformational school culture. Principals are encouraged to develop multiple sources and levels of leadership to advance the mission of continuous school improvement (Devine & Alger, 2011).

School improvement occurs when principals are perceived as trustworthy, honest, and admired by their followers (Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Oyer, 2015). According to Mishra (1996) four factors frame a person's decision to trust: competence and ability; openness and integrity; concern for others; reliability and consistency. Perceptions of a principal's abilities outweigh the principal's own perceptions and serve as an indicator of successful school leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 1990; Oyer, 2015).

METHODOLOGY

Participants

The subjects of this study were teachers from a large metropolitan area within the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. In addition, these teachers were enrolled in a graduate program for educational leadership, supervision, and administration at a private, Catholic university located within the largest city of this metropolitan area.

Research Design and Procedures

After receiving approval from the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB), the examiners contacted the subjects via email, requesting their participation in this anonymous survey. The survey was sent via Survey Monkey, an online survey platform and was divided into three sections:

Part 1: *Teacher Demographic Data*, which had 9 items that each participating teacher was asked to respond to according to their own current context. The items for this section included the following:

- Teacher gender (female, male)
- Teacher ethnicity (African-American, Asian-Asian Pacific, Caucasian, Hispanic, other)
- Teacher experience (1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, and 20+ years).
- Type of school (elementary, elementary/middle, middle, middle/high, high school, other)
- Location of school (urban, suburban, rural, combination)
- Jurisdiction of school (public, private, Catholic, charter, other)
- Gender of principal (female, male)
- Ethnicity of principal (African-American, Asian-Asian Pacific, Caucasian, Hispanic, other)
- Quality of school (Exceptional, Effective, Ineffective)

Part 2-*Leadership Practices Inventory* (*LPI)*, based on the *Five Practices of Exemplary Leadership* (Kouzes & Posner, 1993, 2017), is an instrument that involves both leaders (self-assess) and observers/followers to assess the leader through perceptions of the degree in which the leader demonstrates leadership behaviors, using a Likert-scale for each of the 30 statements.

Responses are added up for *each* of the five subscales (*Model the Way, Inspire a Shared Vision, Challenge the Process, Enable Others to Act,* and *Encourage the Heart*). This instrument has been used throughout the world, across cultures, languages, and professions (including educational leadership), and has been validated on a number of occasions (Posner and Kouzes, 1993; Carless, 2010; Zagorsek, Stough, & Jaklic, 2006).

Part 3: *Perceived Leader Integrity Scale* (*PLIS*), developed by Craig and Gustafson (1998), attempts to assess the ethics of a leader by measuring the degree to which followers perceive them behaving in relationship to appropriate and accepted standards of ethical leadership for leaders. Researchers have concluded that this instrument is valid and strongly related to ethical and transformational leadership (Craig & Gustafson, 1998; Parry and Proctor-Thomson, 2002.

Instruments

The instrument itself is made up of 30 items, using a Likert rating scale. The responses are added up for a total score, resulting in three interpretations: High Ethical (leader is highly ethical, trustworthy, and principled), Moderate Ethical (leader is somewhat ethical but may be unethical in certain situations), and Low Ethical (leader is dishonest, unfair, and unprincipled on a regular basis).

RESULTS

A total of 423 surveys were sent, with 258 surveys completed (60.9%). Of the total completed surveys, 194 (75.2%) of the participating teachers identified themselves as female, while 64 (24.8%) identified themselves as male. These results are very much in alignment with the national data regarding gender of teachers (NCES, 2019).

Regarding the ethnicity of teachers, 154 (59.7%) identified themselves as Caucasian, followed by African-American (n=81, 31.4%), with the remaining participants, coded as Other Teachers (n=23,

8.9%) identified as Hispanic, Asian-American, or other.

In terms of teacher experience, those teachers with 6-10 years of experience had the highest frequency (n=87, 33.7%), followed in order by teachers with 11-15 years of experience (n=59, 22.9%), those with 2-5 years of experience (n=52, 20.2%), teachers with 16-20 years (n=40, 15.5%), and finally, those teachers with 20+ years of experience (n=20, 7.8%). No teacher participant indicated that it was their first year of teaching.

In the particular state where this study occurred, a number of school districts have re-aligned the structure of grades found within a school. In addition to the tradition structure of elementary, middle, and high school, two additional types have been added: elementary/middle (grades K-6) and middle/high (grades 6-12). Participating teachers indicated that their schools were structured as follows: elementary (n=97, 37.6%), elementary/middle (n=39, 15.1%), middle (n=38, 14.7%), middle/high (n=10, 3.9%), high school (n=67, 26.0%) and other (n=7, 2.7%).

Regarding the location of the participating teachers' school, teachers indicated that their schools were located in suburban area (n=125, 48.4%), urban area (106, 41.1%), combination of urban and suburban (n=21, 8.1%), and only a very few teachers described the location of their school as rural (n=6, 2.3%).

With respect to the jurisdiction of the schools of the participating teachers, more than three-quarters indicated that they worked in a public school (n=201, 77.9%), followed by Catholic schools (n=28, 10.9%), charter schools (15, 5.8%), private school (n=11, 4.3%), and other schools (n=3, 1.2%).

Regarding the gender of their principal, approximately two-thirds reported that their principal was female (n=173, 67.1%) while the remaining teachers indicated that their principal was male (n=85, 32.9%).

Regarding the ethnicity of their principal, teachers indicated that slightly more than half were Caucasian (n=132, 51.2%), followed by African-American principals (n=115, 44.6%), with the remaining being identified as either Hispanic (n=3, 1.2%) or Other (n=8, 3.1%).

Teachers were asked to indicate the quality of their schools, according to a rating scale of Effective, Satisfactory, or Ineffective. The results were that more than one hundred teachers (n=105, 40.7%) indicated their school was Satisfactory, followed by Effective (n=82, 31.8.7%), and finally, Ineffective (n=71, 27.5%).

Tests

The reliability of the both the *Leadership Practices Inventory (LPI)* and *Perceived Leadership Integrity Scale (PLIS)* was represented by using the Cronbach alpha coefficient, which suggests that values of 0.7 or higher indicate internal consistency. For the *LPI*, which had five subscales, the overall inter-item correlation matrix was .954. For the six items from both instruments, the overall inter-item correlation matrix was .874. None of the 36 correlations has a value of less than .70. Both questionnaires have reached acceptable reliability.

Table 1:
Descriptive Data for Scales and Subscales

Item	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
MTW	258	6.00	30.00	14.13	5.98
ISV	258	6.00	29.00	14.53	5.38
CTP	258	6.00	28.00	14.82	5.14
EOA	258	6.00	29.00	14.25	5.50
ETH	258	6.00	30.00	14.15	5.64
PLIS	258	30.00	105.00	60.32	18.17

To address the first research question, *To what extent is there a relationship between a school principal's leadership abilities with her/his ethical leadership behaviors, as perceived by teachers*, a correlation test was used. It was determined that the correlation between the *LPI* and *PLIS* was strongly positive and statistically significant, $r(257)=+.88$, $p<.001$.

To address the second research question, *If such a relationship occurs and it is strong and statistically significant, to what extent does the context of the teachers have an impact on this relationship*, a series of *t*-tests were used to examine the impact various independent variables had on the dependent variables found within the subscales of both the *LPI* and *PLIS.*

An independent sample *t*-test was used to measure the impact the gender of the teacher participants would have on each of the six sub-scales of both instruments, combined. Female teachers rated their principals higher for each subscale, but the differences were *not* statistically significant.

To examine the degree in which the ethnicity of the teacher participants may impact the subscales for both instruments, *One-way ANOVA* was used. Statistically significant differences were found among the various ethnic groups in the following subscales: *Model the Way* ($F= 2, 255)=3.10$, $p=.047$, *Inspire a Shared Vision* ($F=3.47$, $p=.032$), *Challenge the Process* ($F=4.13$, $p=.017$), *Enable Others to Act*, ($F=4.08$, $p=.018$), *Encourage the Heart*($F=5.63$, $p=.004$), and *PLIS Total*($F=5.28$, $p=.006$. Post-hoc tests revealed the following statistically significant findings:

- Other Teachers rated their principals significantly higher than African-American teachers in *Model the Way*, *Challenge the Process*, *Encourage the Heart*, and *PLIS Total*.
- Other Teachers rated their principals significantly higher than Caucasian teachers in *Inspire a Shared Vision*, *Challenge the Process*, *Enable Others to Act*, *Encourage the Heart*, and *PLIS Total*.

One-way ANOVA was used to examine differences among teacher participants according to their years of experience in teaching with the six subscales. Statistically significant differences were found among the following subscales: *Model the Way (*$F=3.32$, $p_{-}.011$) and *Enable Others to Act (*$F=2.28$, $p_{-}.047$. Post-hoc analysis determined that in both cases, teachers with 6-10 years of experience rated their principals significantly higher than teachers with 11-15 years of experience.

One-way ANOVA was also used to examine differences among teacher participants according to the type of school in which they were presently teaching with the six subscales. Statistically significant

differences were found among the following subscales: *Model the Way(F*=3.14, *p*=.009), *Challenge the Process (F*=3.35; *p*=.006), *Enabling Others to Act (F*=2.65, *p*=.024), and *Encourage the Heart (F*=2.31, *p*=.044).

Post-hoc analysis determined that in four of the cases where significant differences occurred, elementary school teachers rated their principals significantly higher than those in elementary/middle schools (*Model the Way, Enable Others to Act, Encourage the Heart*, and *PLIS Total*). For the fifth case, middle school teachers rated their principals significantly higher than middle/high school principals in the case of *Challenge the Process.*

One-way ANOVA was used to examine differences among teacher participants according to the location of school in which they were presently teaching with the six subscales. However, differences in mean scores among teachers from urban, suburban, rural, and/or combined for the six subscales were not found to be statistically significant.

One-way ANOVA was used to examine differences among teacher participants according to the jurisdiction of the school in which they presently teaching with the six subscales. Statistically significant differences in the means were found within the following: *Model the Way (F*=3.92, *p*=.004), *Inspire a Shared Vision (F*=4.61, *p*=.001), *Enable Others to Act (F*=2.49, *p*=.044), *Encourage the Heart (F*=2.73, *p*=.030) and *PLIS Total (F*=3.95, *p*=.004).

In the *post-hoc analysis,* for each of the subscales that had statistically significant differences in the means, it was found that teachers in public schools had ratings of the principals that were significantly higher than those teachers in Catholic schools for each of the scales. In addition, teachers from private schools rated their principals significantly higher than Catholic school teachers in *Inspire a Shared Vision.*

One-way ANOVA was used to examine differences among teacher participants according to the ethnicity of the principal of the school in which they presently teaching with subscales. Statistically significant differences in mean scores from teachers were found within the following: *Enable Others to Act* (*F*=3.29, *p*=.039), *Encourage the Heart* (*F*=3.26, *p*=.040), and PLIS Total (*F*=3.24, *p*=.041). *Post-hoc analysis* determined that African-American principals were rated significantly higher than Caucasian principals in each of the three scales identified.

An independent sample *t*-test was used to measure the impact the gender of the participating teachers' principal may have on each of the sub-scales. Female principals were rated higher than male principals by participating teachers, but such differences were found not to be statistically significant.

One-way ANOVA was used to examine differences among teacher participants according to the quality of the school in which they presently teaching with the subscales. However, results did not find statistically significant differences in mean scores from teachers within the three groups.

Regression analysis was conducted to test if the teacher demographics significantly predict participants' ratings of their principals, according to the six scales.

For *Model the Way*, the results of the regression indicated predictors explained 8.3% of the variance *F*=2.50, p=.009. It was found that only school jurisdiction (β=-1.17, *p*=.001) significantly predicted principals' ability to *Model the Way.*

For *Inspire a Shared Vision,* the results of the regression indicated two predictors explained 8.3%

of the variance *F*=2.50, p=.009. It was found that teacher ethnicity (β=.1.14, *p*=.030.) and school jurisdiction (β=-1.202, *p*=.001) significantly predicted principals' ability to *Inspire a Shared Vision.*

For *Challenge the Process,* the results of the regression did not indicate any predictors for the variance (*F*=1.74, *p*=.08)

For *Enable Others to Act,* the results of the regression indicated two predictors explained 7.4% of the variance *F*=2.21, p=.022. It was found that teacher ethnicity (β=.1.53, *p*=.005) and location of schools (β=.875, *p*<.046.) significantly predicted principals' ability to *Enable Others to Act*.

For *Encourage the Heart,* the results of regression analysis indicated two predictors explained 7.8% of the variance *F*=2.34, =.015. It was found that teacher ethnicity (β=.1.78, *p*=.001) and school jurisdiction (β=-.869, *p*=.024) significantly predicted principals' ability to *Challenge the Process*.

For *PLIS Total,* the results of regression analysis indicated three predictors explained 12.5% of the variance *F*=3.21, p=.001. It was found that teacher ethnicity (β=6.345, *p*=.001), location of the school (β=3.73, *p*=.042), and school jurisdiction (β=-3.50, *p*=.004) significantly predicted principals' ability to lead with integrity.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between effective leadership of school principals and their ethical behaviors, as perceived by teachers. Furthermore, an examination of the demographics of both principals and teachers was completed to see if any of such independent variables had an impact on the teachers' perspectives.

Contributions of the Study

In line with expectations, the results of this study found a very strong and positive correlation between the leadership of school principals and their ethical behavior (the overall inter-item correlation matrix was .874), which has been found consistently throughout the literature.

However, the results also indicated that teacher perceptions had significant impact on the degree they felt their principal effectively led the school and acted in an ethical manner. The ethnicity of teachers, their experience, the type of school, the school's jurisdiction, and the ethnicity of the principal all were found to be statistically significant in terms of the impact such had on the type of leadership principals provided. Of particular note, was that Catholic School principals were perceived by their teachers to be significantly less effective and less ethical than the public school principals in each of the six scales. The only demographic context that did not have a statistically significant difference among teachers was that in the location of the school (urban, suburban, rural).

Implications

These findings suggest that it is important to recognize that not only are their significant differences in how teachers perceive the leadership and ethical behaviors of their principals, but the existence of situational pressures that may have an impact on how a principal leads a school. For example, it has been reported over the past decades the amount of stress principals are under regarding the impact of high stakes testing and other accountability measures, which may in turn, impact their ability to not only lead effectively, but to lead in an ethical manner as well.

Thus, as policymakers and graduate school programs that provide school leadership preparation programs continue to reflect upon the current context of school leadership, ethical leadership should be at the forefront, as has been consistently found, a principal most likely will not be effective

without having a foundation of appropriate ethical behavior.

We suggest further research in the following areas:

- Investigate the self-reporting of school principal's perceptions of their own leadership and ethical behavior as compared to teachers' perceptions.
- Examine school principals' experiences that have shaped their leadership and ethical behaviors.
- Study cultural factors that influence various demographic groups of teachers' (gender, ethnicity, experience, type of school, etc.) perceptions.
- Explore the contemporary culture of Catholic schools, in terms of principal leadership and ethics, and how such are perceived by Catholic school teachers.

IMPLICATIONS

School systems approach ethics, servant leadership and leading with a moral compass differently. Some more overtly than others. Implications exist for the type of support school leaders receive, in not just tactical or strategic approaches, but ethical decision making as well. Due to the high levels of accountability discussed and other factors, there is less emphasis and validation of soft skills and little recognition of a need for an ethical framework as context for how to lead. Highly effective leadership requires balance. This research suggests there is an imbalance at the school system and graduate program level that favors building leadership capacity void of direct instruction in ethics and ethical decision making. Training not only school-based administrators, but new teachers, teacher leaders, and central office staff to ensure ethical leadership becomes part of a school system's culture may influence the perception of individuals inside and outside of the organization. It may also be beneficial for school-based and central office administrators to operationalize what ethical leadership is and looks like in practice with intentionality and context for why ethical leadership is critical to overall school success.

In summary, effective school leadership includes many abilities and behaviors that have evolved over the past century, including leading and managing the school in a manner that is inspiring and empowering. We believe though, that development of appropriate ethical behaviors of school principals does not just happen. Aspiring school leaders and current principals must learn, understand, and apply the principles of not only effective school leadership, but the philosophy of ethics and ethical decision-making as related to the success of teachers and students in a manner that it obvious and unquestionable.

REFERENCES

Allen, N., Grisby, B., & Peters, M. L. (2015). Does leadership matter? Examining the relationship among transformational leadership, school climate, and student achievement. *NCPEA International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation, 10*(2), 1-22.

Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16*, 315-338.

Badaracco, J. (1997). *Defining moments: When managers must choose between right and right.* Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.

Bass, B. M. (1998). The ethics of transformational leadership. In J. B. Ciulla (Ed.), *Ethics: The heart of leadership* (pp. 169–192). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ben-Hur, S., & Johnson, K. (2012). Ethical leadership lessons from Moses. *Journal of Management Development*, *31*(9), 962-973. doi:10.1108/02621711211259901

Berkovich, I. (2016). School leaders and transformational leadership theory: Time to part ways? *Journal of Educational Administration*, *54*(5), 609-622. doi:10.1108/JEA-11-2015-0100

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

Boje, D. (1991). The storytelling organization: A study of story performance in an office-supply firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *36*(1), 106–126.

Boje, D. (2008). *Storytelling organizations*. Retrieved: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781446214305 Bowen, C., Bessette, H. & Chan, T. (2006). Including ethics in the study of educational leadership.

Journal of College and Character, 7(7). 1-7.

Bromley, H. R., & Kirschner-Bromley, V. A. (2007). Are you a transformational leader? *The Physician Executive*, *33*, 54-57.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*(3), 595-616.

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

Caldwell, C., Hayes, L. A., Karri, R., & Bernal, P. (2008). Ethical stewardship-Implications for leadership and trust. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *78*, 153-164. doi:10.1007/s10551-006-9320-1

Carless, S. (2010). Assessing the discriminant validity of the *Leadership Practices Inventory*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,74*(2), 233-239.

Ciulla, J. B., & Forsyth, D. R. (2011). Leadership ethics. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The sage handbook of leadership* (pp. 229–241). London: Sage.

Cohen, J., McCabe, E., Michelli, N., & Pickeral, T. (2009). School climate: Research, policy, practice, and teacher education. *Teachers College Record*, *111*(1), 180-123.

Cooper, C. W. (2009). Performing cultural work in demographically changing schools: Implications for expanding transformative leadership frameworks. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *45*, 694–724. doi:10.1177/0013161x09341639

Copeland, M. K. (2014). The emerging significance of values-based leadership: A literature review. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *8*(2), 105-135.

Cosans, C. E., & Reina, C. S. (2018). The leadership ethics of Machiavelli's prince. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *28*(3), 275-300. doi:10.1017/beq.2017.13

Craig, S., & Gustafson, S. (1998). Perceived Leader Integrity Scale: An instrument for assessing employee perceptions of leader integrity. *Leadership Quarterly, 9*(2), 127-145.

Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., Meyerson, D., & Orr, M. T. (2007). *Preparing school leaders for a changing world: Lessons from exemplary leadership development programs.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/school-leadership/key-research/Documents/Preparing-School-Leaders.pdf

Derr, C. L. (2012). Ethics and leadership. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability, and Ethics*, *9*(6), 66-71.

Devine, J., & Alger, G. (2011). Teachers' perceptions of the leadership styles of middle school principals and instructional leaders. *Academic Leadership Journal*, *9*(4), 1-22.

Duignan, P. A. (2014). Authenticity in educational leadership: History, ideal, reality. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *52*(2), 152-172.

Duncan, P., Green, M., Gergen, E., & Ecung, W. (2017). Authentic leadership-is it more than emotional intelligence? *Administrative Issues Journal*, *7*(2), 11-22. doi:10.5929/2017.7.2.2

Ehrich, L. C., Harris, J., Klenowski, V., Smeed, J., & Spina, N. (2015). The centrality of ethical leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *53*(2), 197-214.

Fiedler, F. E. (1954). Assumed similarity measures as predictors of team effectiveness. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *49*, 381-388.

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *14*(6), 693-727.

Fullan, M. (2011). *The moral imperative realized.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Gardiner, M. E., & Tenuto, P. L. (2015). Reflections of practicing school principals on ethical leadership and decision making: Confronting social injustice. *Principal's Research Review*, *10*(6), 1-9.

George, W. (2003). *Authentic leadership: rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Heck, R., & Hallinger, P. (2014). Modeling the longitudinal effects of school leadership on teaching and learning. Journal of Educational Administration, 52(5), 653-681. doi: 10.1108/JEA-08-2013-0097

House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 81-108). San Diego: Academic Press.

International Institute for Spiritual Leadership. (2013). What is spiritual leadership? Retrieved from http://iispiritualleadership.com/spiritual-leadership/

Khalifa, M. A., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2016). Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 1272-1311. doi:10.3102/0034654316630383

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1990). The credibility factor: What followers expect from their leaders. *Management Review*, *79*(1), 29-33.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. (2017). *The Leadership Challenge* (6th.ed). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Larsen, D. E., Derrington, M. L. (2012). Calibrating one's moral compass: How principal preparation shapes school leaders. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, *7*(2), 1-12.

Larson, C. L., & Ovando, C. J. (2001). *The color of bureaucracy: The politics of equity in multicultural school communities*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth

Lovelace, J. B., Neely, B. H., Allen, J. B., & Hunter, S. T. (2019). Charismatic, ideological, & pragmatic (CIP) model of leadership: A critical review and agenda for future research. *The Leadership Quarterly, 30*, 96-110.

Machiavelli, N. (1513/1996). *Machiavelli and his friends: Their personal correspondence.* Translated by J. B. Atkinson & D. S. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press.

Marshall, C., & Ward, M. (2004). "Yes, but . . .": Education leaders discuss social justice. *Journal of School Leadership, 14*(1), 530-563.

Martinez, A. Y. (2014). Critical race theory: Its origins, history, and importance to the discourses and rhetoric of race. *Journal of Literary Studies*, *27*(2), 9-27.

Martinez, R., Ruiz, C., and Ruiz, P. (2011). Improving the 'leader-follower' relationship: Top manager or supervisor? The ethical leadership trickle-down effect on follower job response. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *99*(4), 587-608. doi:10.1007/s10551-010-0670-3

Maryland State Department of Education (2018). *Principal Evaluation Guidebook (Draft).* Retrieved from: http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/about/Documents/OTPE/PSEL/PrincipalEvaluationGuidebook10312018.pdf

Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works. From research to results.* Aurora, Colorado: McREL.

Maxwell, J. C. (2007). *The 21 irrefutable laws of leadership.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

May, D. R., Chan, A. Y. L., Hodges, T. D., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Developing the moral component of authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*, *32*(3), 247-260.

Mills, C. W. (1990[1959]). *The sociological imagination*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Mintrop, H. (2012). Bridging accountability obligations, professional values and (perceived) student needs with integrity. *Journal of Educational Administration, 50*(5), 695 – 726. doi:10.1108/09578231211249871

Mishra, A. K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In Kramer, R. M., & Tyler, T. R. (Eds.). *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research.* (pp.261-287). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Oplatka, I., & Tako, E. (2009). School teachers' constructions of desirable educational leadership: A career stage perspective. *School leadership and Management*, *29*, 425-444.

Oyer, B. (2015). Teacher perceptions of principals' confidence, humility, and effectiveness: implications for educational leadership. *Journal of School Leadership, 25*, 684-719. doi:10.1177/105268461502500405

Parker, L., & Villapando, O. (2007). A racialized perspective on education leadership: Critical race theory in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *23*(5), 519-524.

Parry, K., & Proctor-Thomson, S. (2002). Perceived integrity of transformational leaders in organizational settings. *Journal of Business Ethics, 35*, 75-96.

Posner, B., & Kouzes, J., (1993). Psychometric properties of the *Leadership Practices Inventory*-updated. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *53*(1), 191-199.

Robey, P. V., Shi, Q., & Savard, S. J. J. (2019). Ethics, equity, and community engagement: urban school administrators rate their preparation programs. *Journal of School Leadership, 29*(2), 167-184. doi:10.1177/1052684619832152

Roegman, R. (2017). How contexts matter: A framework for understanding the role of contexts in equity-focused educational leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, *27*, 6-30. doi:10.1177/105268461702700101.

Santamaria, L. (2013). Critical change for the greater good: Multicultural perceptions in educational leadership toward social justice and equity. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 20*(10), 1-45. doi:10.1177/0013161X13505287

Sergiovanni, T. (2007). *Rethinking leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 257-283. Retrieved from http://doi.org/bv3vgd

Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (2018). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. In *Leadership Now: Reflections on the Legacy of Boas Shamir* (pp. 255-281). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Sholikhah, Z., Wang, X., & Li, W. (2019). The role of spiritual leadership in fostering discretionary behaviors: The mediating effect of organization-based self-esteem and workplace spirituality. *International Journal of Law and Management, 61*(1), 232-249. doi:10.1108/IJLMA-04-2018-0081

Smith, G., Minor, M., & Brashen, H. (2018). Spiritual leadership: A guide to a leadership style that embraces multiple perspectives. *Journal of Instructional Research, 7*, 80-88.

Starratt, R. J. (1996). *Transforming educational administration: Meaning, community, and excellence*. New York, McGraw-Hill.

Starratt, R. J. (2005). Responsible leadership. *The Educational Forum,69*(2), pp. 124-133.

Tallerico, M. (2000). *Accessing the superintendency: The unwritten rules.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Thompson, L. J. (2004). Moral leadership in a postmodern world. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *11*(1), 27-37.

Uvinen, T. P., Lamsa, A-M., Sintonen, T. & Takala, T. (2012). Leadership manipulation and ethics in storytelling. *Journal of Business Ethics, 116,* 415-431. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1454-8

Velasquez, M. G. (1998). *Business ethics: Concepts and cases* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Washington, R. R., Sutton, C. D., & Sauser Jr., W. I. (2014). How distinct is servant leadership theory? Empirical comparisons with competing theories. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability, and Ethics*, *11*(1), 11-16.

Weber, M. (1947). *Theory of social and economic organization*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Weber, M. (1958). The three types of legitimate rule. *Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions, 4*(1), 1-11. Translated by Hans Gerth.

Wright, J. S., Arnold, N. W., Khalifa, M. (2018). Diverging approaches to educational leadership: The impact of tradition in a changing education landscape. *Journal of School Leadership, 28,* 815-833.

Xiong, K., Lin, W., Li, J. C., & Wang, L. (2016). *Psychological Reports*, *118*(3), 829-848. doi:10.1177/0033294116644370

Yukl, G. A. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 285–305.

Zagorsek, H., Stough, S., & Jaklic, R. (2006). Analysis of the reliability of the Leadership Practices Inventory in the item response theory framework. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment* 14(2), 180-192.