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ABSTRACT

The Impact of Female School Principals’ Leadership Traits on Teacher Morale in California CBEE Star Schools

by Moira E. Zacharakis

Purpose. The purpose of this study was to determine how teachers with female principals at Campaign for Business and Education Excellence (CBEE) Star Schools in Contra Costa County, California (CA) rate their principals’ leadership skills, how they rate their own job satisfaction, and to determine if a relationship exists between the principals’ leadership skills and employee job satisfaction.

Methodology. The study employed a quantitative correlational research design using data from two instruments.

Findings. The sample size for this study was too small to generalize to a larger population; however, statistically significant relationships were found in the data. Mean scores indicated the teachers working with female principals rated their administrator as engaging in behaviors associated with transformational leadership, with the highest mean for the domain of Personal and Interpersonal Skills. Multiple scales on the leadership survey positively correlated with other scales; for example, Visionary Leadership was positively correlated with Communication, Problem-Solving, and Character/Integrity. In terms of employee engagement, teacher job satisfaction scores were highest for the Work Environment scale, followed closely by the Workplace Engagement and Relationship Management scales. Similarly, many of the scales were positively correlated with each other; for example, Career Development was positively correlated with Compensation, Workplace Engagement was positively correlated with Relationship Management and
Work Environment. In comparing principal leadership skills and employee engagement, the data revealed both positive and negative correlations; for example, Compensation and Benefits were both negatively correlated with Personal/Interpersonal and Team Building, meaning teachers satisfied with their compensation and benefits rated their supervisors lower in terms of their personal/interpersonal skills and team building.

Conclusions. Teachers working with female principals in CBEE Star Schools highly rated the principals’ leadership skills. Teachers working with female principals at CBEE Star Schools highly rated their job satisfaction. Correlations between the employee ratings of female principals’ leadership skills and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction were mixed, with both positive and negative correlations.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

“Are leaders made or born?” The question resonates in many fields across the world from business to politics, education, non-profits, and beyond. The world needs leaders, claimed author and speaker John C. Maxwell, and media outlets: Forbes, The Huffington Post, CNN, and US News and World Report (2014, 2016). Leadership was considered natural for some, but for others the ability to lead was a skill and craft learned and developed over time; some people assumed leaders were born with a natural capacity to lead and others were just not meant to lead (Anderson, 2012). Effective leadership was not tied to gender, although gender was an undeniable and influential factor. For this fact, it was crucial for women, and men, to be self-aware as they led to maximize their impact, effectiveness, and potential (Anderson, 2012).

Woman leaders faced numerous barriers, including the wage gap; the glass ceiling; the glass; discrimination; second-generation biases; sexism; oppression; discrimination; opposition from their female counterparts, subordinates, and superiors; conflicts involving work-home balance; and resistance to their leadership capabilities (Olson, 2012; Fullerton, 1999). Many of these barriers were due to the global stereotyping of women (Sandberg & Mitchell, 2014). More women serve as leaders in the United States than in any other country in the world (Forbes, 2015). Women wielded their power by building empires, strengthening nations, building capacity in themselves and others, increasing productivity at home and afar, and by protecting, empowering, and leading people. The number of women in leadership positions increased, but has not equalized (Hayer, 2015). Significant numbers of women in leadership positions can arguably be traced back to fewer than 75 years ago, with the start of World War II, when
for the first time in American history women entered the workforce by the millions, as marked on the Susan B. Anthony Center for Women Leadership’s US Suffrage Movement Timeline (Atlantic Magazine, 2006).

Women found ways to function within the stereotypes of female leaders. They could be seen as bossy and aggressive, whereas their male counterparts with similar leadership attributes were seen as assertive (Sandberg & Mitchell, 2014). According to Caliper Research and Development (2014), society held general expectations of female behaviors and personality traits, as well as expectations for the behaviors and personality of leaders. Caliper’s (2014) Women Leaders Research Paper claimed the problem for women leaders arose when gender expectations did not align with expectations of leadership behaviors shared by the general public, causing negative judgments of women as leaders. Little changed over the past several decades regarding stereotyping, except people were more open to dialoging about this pervasive and embedded global stereotyping (Olson, 2012; Sandberg & Mitchell, 2014).

When women successfully filled leadership positions, they offered insights into the personality of successful female leaders and the impact of gender-specific personality traits on workplace morale and employee job satisfaction (Caliper, 2014). Multiple indicators showed that women enacted their leadership roles with an aim of producing outcomes that could be described as more compassionate, benevolent, universalistic, and ethical, thus promoting the public good (Eagly, 2013). Rowland (2008) discovered that some people found female administrators to be more supportive, approachable, sensitive, understanding, nurturing, organized, creative, and receptive than male principals, which were attributes that emerged when female leaders did not feel the pressure to act and
behave like a male leader. Courageous female leaders found their voice, experienced moral courage, and allowed themselves to be vulnerable (Ali, 2015). In Psychology Today, R. Williams (2011) reported that,

While more and more women are assuming roles as managers a new study reveals that rather than using what should come more easily to them like empathy and compassion, these women are increasingly turning to the stereotypically more ‘male’ traits, such as aggression, to get results. (p. 1)

The influence of gender roles on leaders’ behavior and leadership traits was considered important in organizational settings because these roles lent their occupants legitimate authority and were usually regulated by relatively clear rules about appropriate behavior (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt & Van Engen, 2003). The impact good leadership had on employee morale and performance was a key indicator of good leadership. The traits inherent in leadership roles impacted morale and a greater awareness of these traits for females, and their connection to employee performance and morale, would allow for identification, and if warranted, change (Eagly et al., 2003).

**Background**

Over one hundred years ago, Ella Flagg Young announced that “Women are destined to rule the schools of every city…she is no longer satisfied to do the greatest part of the work and yet be denied leadership” (as cited in Blount, 1998, p. 1).

During the Civil War, increasing numbers of women entered schools as teachers, changing the teaching profession from a male-dominated occupation to a female-dominated occupation (Fegan, 2012). According to Feistritzer’s (2011) *Profile of Teachers in the United States 2011*, 84% of public school teachers in the United States
were women. Since women occupied the majority of public school teaching positions, it would be logical to conclude women also constituted the majority of public school administrative leadership positions. However, public school administrative posts were comprised of approximately 44% women (Snyder & Dillow, 2011). Additionally, a higher percentage of female principals (50.4%) were at the elementary level whereas only 23.7% of principals at the secondary level were female (Rouleau-Carroll, 2014).

According to Catalyst, a nonprofit company seeking to expand women’s roles in the workplace (as cited by Olson, 2012), women headed just 3.6% of Fortune 500 companies and occupied a mere 16.1% of board seats. From 2000 to 2008, female public school principals increased by just 7% (Lennon, 2012). Much of this imbalance could be attributed to living and leading in a male dominated society; in 1995, the Glass Ceiling Commission (as cited in Johns, 2013) found that women’s compensation was still lower than that of their male counterparts and several barriers continued to block the success of women in reaching the top echelons of management, including societal, governmental, internal business, and business structural barriers. Heather Deason Zynczak (2014), data-driven marketer, technology executive, and blogger said things only changed in that, “My generation has a seat at the table, but it comes with strings attached. I’m hoping that the next generation does not have to have ‘rules’ for working in a man’s world” (Find a Female Mentor section, para. 2).

In 2015, Pew Research Center conducted a woman and leadership survey. The results showed that 43% of respondents believed that one factor holding women back was that women were held to higher standards than men. The findings of the survey also indicated that most people found women indistinguishable from men on key leadership
traits, including intelligence and capacity for innovation; some respondents indicated that women were stronger than men in terms of being compassionate and organized leaders (Pew Research Center, 2015).

In a national survey of 1,026 adults, the data revealed that 48% of participants preferred a male supervisor to a female, 22% preferred a female supervisor, and 28% had no preference (Simmons, 2001). Eagly and Carli (2007) found the reason for a higher male preference rate was female leadership practices were questioned and females were held to a higher competency standard. Thus, it appeared that females must demonstrate consistently superior performance to compete with perceptions of male leadership ability (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

In their meta-analysis of leadership styles, Eagly and Carli (2007) found that small gender-related differences were present in leadership style. Female leaders tended to be more democratic and participative than their male counterparts (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Also, women adopted more culturally feminine leader behaviors when their role was not strongly male-dominated (Eagly, 2013). Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, and van Engen (2003) also found in their meta-analysis that female managers were somewhat more transformational than male managers. Transformational leaders acted as inspirational role models, fostered good human relationships, developed the skills of followers, and motivated others to go beyond the confines of their job descriptions (Eagly et al., 2003).

In 1978, Burns defined transformational leadership as a process where “leaders and their followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation” (p. 20). In 1985, Bass developed the concept of transformational leadership further by defining a
transformational leader as one who set clear goals, maintained high expectations, encouraged others, provided support and recognition, stirred the emotions of people, got people to look beyond their self-interests, and inspired people to reach for the improbable. Women leaders were faced with the dual challenge of trying to get ahead in a male-dominated workforce and having to prove themselves while impacting employee morale upon obtaining a leadership position (Sandberg, 2013).

School culture and leadership were relevant to morale (Crum, 2013). Merriam-Webster (n.d.) defined morale as “the mental and emotional condition (as of enthusiasm, confidence, or loyalty) of an individual or group with regard to the function or tasks at hand” (2a) or as “a sense of common purpose with respect to a group” (2b). Morale was affected by work expectations, salary, environment, relationships, stability, policies, status, and leadership; one of the most important factors affecting employee morale was leadership (Crum, 2013).

Regardless of the gender expectations of society, women leaders in all facets of business and education faced challenges. In education, female principals filled a role that was a complex combination of leadership and administration geared toward enabling and motivating teachers and staff to offer the best possible opportunities for student growth and achievement. To some, the challenges faced by school administrators seemed insurmountable; they must function as effective and efficient leaders while creating a culture of positive support and maximizing achievement (Burkhauser, Gates, Hamilton, & Ikemoto, 2012). Burkhauser et al. (2012) explored new principals’ actions and working conditions, examining how those factors related to school achievement and principal retention. The study revealed that a principal’s ability to foster teacher capacity
and cohesiveness impacted outcomes. The study revealed that principal success could not be traced to a single strategy, and suggested that an administrator’s effectiveness as a manager of human capital was likely to contribute to improved school outcomes (Burkhauser et al., 2012).

The intent of Littleford’s (2007) qualitative study was to explain the connection between principal leadership practices and the phenomenon of teacher morale. She summarized that to raise morale, there had to be effort made on the part of both principals and teachers to build an educational culture and climate that was pleasant, successful, and enjoyable for everyone (Littleford, 2007). Principals’ practices had the potential to change a school culture and both positively and negatively affect teacher and institutional morale (Meyer, Macmillian, & Northfield, 2009). The leadership of the principal was imperative to the success of a school. An individual’s leadership style could inspire followers to achieve greater outcomes, or discourage followers to the point of underachievement (Costellow, 2011). Similarly, Rowland (2008) found a principal’s daily behavior played a vital role in the environment of the school.

Costellow (2011) researched leadership traits and leadership behaviors most preferred by teachers. The teachers felt that principals should be moral, principled, diligent, emotionally intelligent, open-minded, and dedicated; possess common sense and a strong work ethic; understand the imperfections in others; be aware of their own strengths; and ask for help in areas of weakness. A principal’s behaviors and character traits, such as concern, impacted teacher morale; according to Scutti (2015), women in leadership and management roles showed greater concern for subordinates and other employees.
According to Rowland (2008), principals had the power to influence many factors of a school. One of the most important and influential aspects of a principal’s role was the effect he or she had on the teachers of the school. The principal played a vital role in the morale of teachers who needed support, guidance, or reassurance (Rowland, 2008). In his research, Costellow (2011) found that some teachers expressed concerns about women administrators working harder than comparably positioned men. They classified females as being “overachievers” and having to work extremely hard in positions of leadership (Wharton Schools, 2005); female leaders were also described as multi-taskers, emotional, caring, tough, intuitive, observant, compassionate, relationship focused, verbal, and collaborative.

**Research on Female Leadership**

The research intent of the Women Leaders Research Paper (Caliper, 2014) was to explore the personality traits related to successful women leaders and to determine which challenges women leaders experienced most in today’s workplace. Women leaders were found to be more empathetic and flexible, as well as stronger in interpersonal skills than their male counterparts (Caliper, 2014).

Campbell (2011) conducted a qualitative study to assess teacher perceptions of the leadership practices of elementary school female administrators. Campbell (2011) interviewed teacher to understand their perceptions of effective leadership practices, including the leader’s approach to vision, student growth, staff development, organization, communication, caring, and community. She concluded that educators wanted clear expectations, a focused vision centered on productive learning, understanding, listening, respect, acknowledgement, organization, follow-through, and
clear communication and expectations from their principal. It was suggested that further research be conducted in a variety of elementary schools to provide a larger sample of participants, and to interview teachers from elementary schools to compare their perceptions of male and female principals (Campbell, 2011).

A 2003 meta-analysis of studies of leadership styles conducted by Eagly et al. (2003) found that female leaders were more transformational than male leaders. The study found that male leaders engaged in contingent reward behaviors, which was a component of transactional leadership. The implications of the study’s findings were encouraging for female leadership because other research established that all aspects of leadership styles on which women exceeded men related positively to leaders’ effectiveness whereas all aspects on which men exceeded women had negative or null relations to effectiveness (Eagly et al., 2003).

Costellow (2011) claimed that gender biases still existed even though women in management and administration were increasing in both number and perceived competence. He indicated that surveys in recent years found a greater acceptance of female leadership. However, a significant preference for male leadership among both women and men was still prevalent (Costellow, 2011). Research is needed to determine if and how the prevailing preference from male leadership among both sexes impacts morale in the presence of a female leader.

**Research Gap**

A variety of research was conducted on preferred leadership styles related to gender, women in leadership, and school principals (Campbell, 2011; Costellow, 2011; Scutti, 2015). According to Rowland (2008), principals had the power to influence many
factors of a school. One of the most important and influential aspects of a principal’s role was the effect he or she had on the teachers of the school. Principals served in many roles as their duties required, but their ability to interact successfully with a variety of people, particularly their staff, was a key to the principals’ success and the success of their schools (Rouleau-Carroll, 2014; Rowland, 2008).

Several researchers identified the connection between principals’ performance and traits and their impact on employees (Rowland, 2008). However, no specific research on the impact of female principals’ leadership traits on the performance and morale of employees in high-performing, socio-economically disadvantaged schools had been done. This research intended to address that gap.

Statement of the Research Problem

Much research was conducted on leadership over the past decades. More recently, researchers such as Rouleau-Carroll (2014), Rowland (2008), Costellow (2011), and Campbell (2011) looked at the traits of leaders in general and leaders in education specifically to identify and describe the traits of successful leaders. In addition, these researchers discussed the connection between the traits and behaviors of leaders and their employees. However, the connection between leader traits and behaviors and the behavior and morale of employees was yet to be studied specifically and was mentioned as an area where further research was needed.

Rouleau-Carroll’s (2014) research claimed that limited research was conducted on women in educational leadership. This meant the data on female leaders’ impact on morale was limited and it spoke to a need for more research about women in leadership positions, specifically school principals. Rowland (2008) examined the relationship of a
principal’s leadership practices and the morale of the school’s teachers and determined the possibility existed that teachers were impacted more by their principal’s actions than any other factor. Rowland (2008) identified a need for additional research that focused on principal leadership and employee morale that included a measure relating achievement to teacher morale and principal leadership.

Research on women in leadership was mounting, in particular research that compared the leadership styles of women to that of men. The research to date did not address the specific impacts of male and female leadership according to gender. Both Rowland (2008) and Rouleau-Carroll (2014) highlighted an important issue regarding women’s leadership: the impact of female leaders on the morale of their employees. However, no one determined the impact of female principals’ leadership on the morale of their employees, specifically in higher-achieving schools with high levels of poverty.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to determine how teachers working with female principals in Campaign for Business and Education Excellence (CBEE) Star Schools rated the principals’ leadership skills using the Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi). In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine the teachers’ ratings of their job satisfaction using the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM; 2016) Employee Engagement Survey. The final purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between employee ratings of female principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey.
Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. How do teachers working with female principals in CBEE Star Schools rate the principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi?

2. How do teachers working with female principals at CBEE Star Schools rate their job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey?

3. What relationship exists between employee ratings of female principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey?

Significance of the Problem

If women constituted 75% of the school teacher population, it would be reasonable to assume that women constituted a similar percentage of the school principal population; however, only 44% of public school principals were women (Snyder & Dillow, 2011). Historically, women struggled to obtain leadership positions due to sexism, promotional barriers, the “glass ceiling,” and the pressure of managing full-time work while raising children (Johns, 2013).

Despite lasting barriers, women achieved positions of power (Pew Research Center, 2015; Quast, 2011). Now, a need exists to further investigate the attributes of women leaders and their impact on employee morale and job satisfaction. This would provide more information regarding women and their impact, negative or positive, on employee morale and job satisfaction, thus informing female leaders of the potential positives and pitfalls of female leadership traits. For example, differences in confidence and career ambition between men and women were cited as factors in preventing women
from moving into senior and executive positions (Johns, 2013). A leader’s lack of confidence on the job was bound to impact the morale of his or her employees.

More information is needed to determine if there is a relationship between gender, leadership, and workplace morale. If a correlation is found, more relevant information would be available to explain the imbalance in principal leadership at the school level. If the disproportionate percentage of female leaders at the elementary school level can be connected to leadership style and the impact gender has on teacher morale, then female leaders would have access to insights to support their growth as leaders. This study could bring significant insight into the connection between the leadership behaviors and traits of successful female principals and the performance and morale of their employees, adding to the rationale for selecting female leaders equally with male leaders.

**Definitions**

**Academic Performance Index (API).** A measure of the academic performance and growth of schools on a variety of academic measures. This term originated in California’s Public Schools Accountability Act of 1999.

**Campaign for Business and Education Excellence (CBEE).** A leading, unifying voice for California business leaders committed to improving public education, closing the achievement gap, and helping ensure college readiness and success.

**CBEE Star Schools.** Higher-performing schools in the state, particularly higher-poverty schools that were closing achievement gaps and those with a focus on STEM proficiency. The CBEE Honor Roll is the only school recognition program in the state using only student achievement outcomes as the criteria and is a growing resource for all schools to learn about best practices that increase student achievement. CBEE utilizes
data from the non-profit Educational Results Partnership, the largest longitudinally-linked, actionable school data system in the country.

**Educational Results Partnership (ERP).** An online improvement system that uses actionable data and best practices to improve student achievement and decrease achievement gaps.

**Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM) Employee Engagement Survey.** An employee engagement survey that examines 43 aspects of job satisfaction and 37 factors related to employee engagement.

**Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi).** Includes 10 elements of leadership that support transformational leadership and was developed through rational and empirical processes. Based on research and field experience, the authors believed the 10 elements provided a holistic framework for understanding the nature of leadership. The 10 elements are character/integrity, collaboration, communication, creativity and sustained innovation, diversity, personal/interpersonal skills, political intelligence, problem solving/decision making, team building, and visionary leadership.

**Delimitations**

This study was delimited to CBEE Star Schools located in Contra Costa County, CA, and headed by female administrators. It was further delimited to teachers who had been employed at those schools for at least two years.

**Organization of the Study**

This dissertation is organized into four additional chapters. Chapter II is a review of the literature, Chapter III discusses the methodology used in this study, Chapter IV details the research findings as they relate to the three research questions, and Chapter V
summarizes the findings, conclusions, and implications of the study, including recommendations for additional research.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Producing a thorough literature review involved searching out existing knowledge on a topic; analyzing, synthesizing and organizing arguments; considering ideas and perspectives; constructing a case for investigating a topic; and writing the review (Hart, 1998). Boote and Beile (2005) claimed that, “…a researcher cannot perform significant research without first understanding the literature in the field” (p. 3). A thorough literature review identified gaps in current knowledge, adverted researchers from redundancy, set the background and context, increased the researcher’s knowledge, identified seminal works, and provided opposing viewpoints (Greenfield, 2002).

This literature review explored the characteristics of women leaders and how women leaders were perceived. More specifically, Chapter II explores the literature about (a) women in the workplace, (b) the education of women, (c) the history of women in leadership, (d) women leaders today, (e) women leaders in business and education, (f) the leadership styles of women, (g) specific characteristics of women leaders in education, and (h) the impact of leadership on employee morale and job satisfaction.

Overview

This review of literature aimed to provide substantial background information gleaned from prior research and present current information regarding women’s entry into the workforce, barriers women overcame and continue to face to gain entry and maintain continued access to the workforce, and the overall styles and impact of their leadership. It looked at the barriers women faced to achieve positions equal to their male counterparts based on qualifications and skill sets, including educational attainment. It aimed to provide data and information on women leaders in the workforce, their
educational attainment, and their specific skill sets and characteristics. The researcher sought to find relevant information about educational leadership among women, the specific characteristics that support and impede their success, and how their leadership styles could potentially affect job satisfaction and employee morale.

**Women in the Workplace**

A Google query for ‘sexism in the workplace for women’ yielded close to 725,000 search results. In 2015, Barnett and Rivers published *The New Soft War on Women: How the Myth of Female Ascendance is Hurting Women, Men, and Our Economy*. They noted the face of sexism in the workplace changed over the decades. According to their data and research, sexism was still an undeniable factor impacting workplace dynamics (Barnett & Rivers, 2015). Stereotyping fed into the pervasiveness of sexism in the workplace and beyond (Olson, 2012). Olson (2012) indicated stereotypes were hard to change, as they were often deeply embedded in the culture of a system, society, organization, workforce, or department.

Beginning in the 1940s and continuing today, women entered and impacted the U.S. workforce for numerous reasons, such as: (a) World War II labor shortages, (b) the rise of the feminist movement, (c) economic necessity, (d) an increase in service-sector jobs, (e) access to higher education, and (f) the passage of numerous equal rights acts in the 1960s including the Equal Pay Act and the establishment of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (Quast, 2011).

Attitudes toward women in the workforce shifted significantly during World War II (Quast, 2011). Prior to the 1940s, middle class women, for the most part, did not work. During this era, men left home to fight in the war, thus causing a labor shortage on the
home front. The U.S. government started an ad campaign, with Rosie the Riveter as its fictitious frontrunner, to invite and entice woman into the labor force. During World War II, from 1940–1945, the number of females in the workforce increased by 50% (Quast, 2011). According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2014), in 1950, 34% of women were represented in the workforce. The number of women in the U.S. labor force continued to grow with setbacks noted for women after World War II and stagnation after 1990. When men returned home and went back to work after the war, women were told to return home (Fullerton, 1999). Things slowed for women in the 1950s and began to pick up in the 1960s. The percentage of women in the workforce increased to 38% by 1960 (Fullerton, 1999). In 1967, Muriel Siebert became the first female member of the New York Stock Exchange, which was founded in 1817 (T. Williams, 2013). From 1970 to 2010, with the greatest gains happening prior to 1990, a 20% increase occurred in the representation of women in the labor force. In 1970, over 30 million women comprised 38% of the workforce. By 2010, 72.7 million women comprised 47% of the U.S. workforce (Baig, 2013). In 2013, the labor force participation rate for women was 57% as compared to 70% for men and approximately 74% of women worked (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014).

In the past, women had limited rights and limited abilities to change their circumstances. The Feminist Movement, which began in the early 1800s, supported women in their quest for representation and equity (Imbormoni, 2013). The 19th Amendment to the Constitution, which gave women the right to vote, and the Equal Rights Amendment of the 1920s were followed by other movements that supported women’s rights and freedoms. These included the approval of birth control by the Food
and Drug Administration in 1960, The Equal Pay Act of 1963 that made it illegal to pay a woman less than a man for the same job, the founding of the National Organization of Women (NOW), and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which barred discrimination in employment due to one’s race and/or sex (Imbormoni, 2013). For centuries, women were not considered equal, a thought that lingers and remains evident today (Carr, 2013). For example, equal pay is an area of ongoing concern for women in the workforce; the wage gap has not shifted since 2002 and women earn 77 cents to the dollar of what a man earns (Baig, 2013). For African American and Latino women, the wage disparity was even greater, 64 cents and 54 cents to the dollar, respectively (Olson, 2012; Sandberg & Mitchell, 2014).

Promotional barriers were also prevalent for women in the workplace. According to the non-profit organization Catalyst (as cited in Olson, 2012), women led just 3.6% of Fortune 500 companies and occupied a mere 16.1% of board seats. Male bosses with stay-at-home wives tended to view women in the workforce unfavorably, and therefore negatively impacted a woman’s likelihood of being promoted (Fisher, 2012; Olson, 2012). Career Cast (2015) rated the following jobs best for women due to competitive wages and growth opportunities: actuary, advertising and promotions manager, biomedical engineer, dental hygienist, education administrator, event planner, human resources manager, market research analyst, occupational therapist, public relations manager, and statistician.

Research indicated that in theory, women should advance into positions of leadership once they acquired the skills to serve in leadership roles (Ali, 2015). In actuality, when it came to career advancement, women were slowed or stopped in their
advancement by factors such as the glass ceiling, the glass escalator, or second-
generation biases (Ali, 2016). The glass ceiling, a term dating back to a 1986 Wall Street
Journal article of the same name by Hymowitz and Schellhart, is commonly known as the
invisible barriers that kept women from advancing in their professions regardless of their
experiences, capacity, and education (Graham, 2012). The glass escalator is a metaphor
used to define how men in all fields, including female-dominated fields, tended to get
promoted faster than their female counterparts (Olson, 2012). Herminia, Ely, and Kolb
(2013), defined second-generation biases as the subtle and often invisible barriers that
women faced in the 21st century. Second generation biases stemmed from embedded
cultural assumptions and organizational structures, practices, and patterns of interaction
that ultimately placed men at an advantage and women at a disadvantage. Barriers
included a lack of role models for women, gendered career paths, and gendered work for
women, as well as a lack of access to supporters, sponsors, and networks (Herminia et al.,
2013).

The collective and individual voices of women continued to ignite change and
ultimately changed things for the better for women and men. In 1923, the Equal Rights
Amendment granted women equality of rights under the law, which prompted many
states in writing their own anti-discrimination laws (Landel, 2015). In the latter half of
the 20th century, women continued to move out of the household and into the workforce
and engaged in dialogues about the wage gap, rape culture, and marginalization. Women
helped pass Title IX, which ensured equal access to higher education for women and
made gender discrimination illegal in private and public school programs funded by the
federal government. Women continued to fight for equality, birth control and
reproductive rights, workers’ rights, and marriage rights. Women made the workplace a more balanced arena for everyone (Landel, 2015).

An increase in jobs, especially during World War II, allowed women to enter the workforce in droves. From 1940 and beyond, in the absence of men on the home front, women drove taxis, pumped gas, and designed war planes (Harper, 2007). The Feminist Movement during the 1960s and early 1970s focused on the inequalities of the workplace, resulting in prohibitions on gender discrimination being added to the Civil Rights Act and the founding of Coalition of Labor Union Women. The largest gain of women’s participation in the workforce occurred from 1970 to 1980. Prior to 1970, American women were expected to marry early, birth children, and devote their lives to being a homemaker. At the time, most women did not feel as though they had a choice (Harper, 2007).

Women’s lives changed considerably over the past century. Most women, with and without children, work with 74% employed (Kurtz, 2013). Traditionally, women worked as teachers, administrative assistants, nurses, childcare providers, hairdressers, retail workers, and domestic workers; in recent decades, women’s career options widened to include work previously dominated by men, such as medicine, law, engineering, finance, and manufacturing (Baig, 2013). Today, women hold positions that were previously reserved for men, including chief executive officers (CEOs), chief operating officers (COOs), chairwomen, political leaders, superintendents, news anchors, executive editors, college presidents, generals, bishops, and opinion leaders (Hyde & Mertz, 2009).

These changes were in part a result of political movements and government initiatives such as the Women’s Trade Union League, the 19th Amendment, the Civil
Rights Act, the Equal Pay Act, Equal Rights Amendments, and Title IX. Women’s improved access to education improved women’s access to better paying jobs. Prior to the 19th century less than 1% of women in the United States attended college. According to 2012 data, the percentage of U.S. women attending college was higher than the percentage of men attending college, 76% and 62% respectively (Lopez & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2014). In comparison to the 1950s, progress was evident. However, two facts remained: as positions of leadership rose in stature and power, the number of women leaders in such positions declined, and since the 1950s the most common job for women was that of secretary (Baig, 2013).

Women made strides in terms of leadership; however, the struggle remains. In 2001, with regard to gender preference in a boss, male supervisors were preferred over female supervisors at a rate greater than two-to-one (Newport, 2011). As of 2014, both men and women preferred a male boss (Riffkin, 2014). Women preferred a male boss at a significantly higher rate than men. Research revealed that 39% of women preferred a male boss in comparison to 26% of men. Additionally, 58% of men had no preference in supervisor’s gender compared to only 34% of women (Riffkin, 2014). This research revealed another barrier holding women back, women themselves.

The U.S. Department of Labor released data in 2015 revealing that the most common professions for women were secretaries, elementary and middle school teachers, and nurses. In fact, the most common profession for women was the same as it was in 1950, secretary (Lock, 2013). One way to improve the employment opportunities for women is to continue to advance the education of women.
The Education of Women

In the early years of academia in the United States, women were discouraged from attending institutions of higher education as it was thought to unsex women (Wood, 2009). This dated view of women in higher academia subsided significantly over the decades; however, due to pervasive sexism and oppression the education of women was still limited in some cultures (Wood, 2009). For example, two out of three illiterate people were women (SOS Children’s Villages, 2013). The illiterate population among youth was predominantly female; around the world, 61% of illiterate youth were female. In India, only one in three girls finish primary school. Globally, women and girls were often expected to put education aside for marriage, caregiving, household chores, and motherhood. The exclusion of girls from education was deeply embedded in some cultures as centuries old customs in some cultures favored boys (SOS Children’s Villages, 2013).

Higher education was considered a great equalizer. It supported access into the labor force, increased social status, supported confidence, increased life expectancy, raised incomes, developed skills, increased one’s likelihood of voting and volunteering, and supported stronger civic engagement (Reese, 2013). A lack of education impacted health, socio-economic status, and longevity across gender and races. For example, the life expectancy rate for uneducated white woman in the United States recently dropped by five years from 78 years in 1990 down to 73 years in 2008 (Reese, 2013).

Although women were granted the same access to higher education as men, attendance opportunities strongly correlated with socio-economic status (National Women’s History Museum [NWHM], 2007). In 1870 less than 1% of women attended
college in the United States. By the 1920s the percentage of women attending college remained low at less than 8%. The increase in woman attending institutions of higher education steadily increased over time. Women began attending college in equal numbers to men in the 1980s. From 1970 to 2012, the number of women earning a college degree tripled (NWHM, 2007). By March of 2012, 32% of women 25 years of age and older had obtained a bachelor’s degree or higher (Lopez & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2014). The number of women attending college surpassed the number of men attending college; 71% of female high school graduates go off to college, surpassing men by 10% (Lopez & Gonzalez-Barrera, 2014).

In 2011, the U.S. Census Bureau reported that more working women than men held college degrees. The data revealed that women’s progress in the field of academia was not impacting the workforce in the same way. The high number of women earning higher education degrees did not impact the business world with equitable correlation (Brooks, 2014). Brooks (2014) reported that U.S. businesses were not adequately placing women in leadership roles nor were U.S. businesses hiring recent female college graduates at the same ratio as male college graduates; 20% of U.S. businesses said fewer than 10% of their recent graduate hires were women (Brooks, 2014). A small percentage of this could be attributed to the fact that many women chose to have children right out of college and stay at home for a limited time. Forty-four percent of women had their first child by the age of 25 (Klein, 2015).

The higher education of women gained slow momentum in the 19th and rapid momentum in the 20th century. However, the number of women in leadership roles has not shown such rapid momentum.
History of Women in Leadership

The question regarding women and leadership changed from if women were capable of leading to how effective was their leadership (Northouse, 2007). A Google query of the history of women in leadership yielded more than 350,000,000 results, indicating it was a hot topic.

Even though woman held more than half of managerial positions, Grant Thornton (as cited by Brooks, 2014) concluded in the annual Grant Thornton International Business Report that the United States ranked in the bottom 10 out of 45 for the percentage of women holding senior management positions; in the United States, women held 22% of senior management positions. At the executive level, women occupied 15% of the leadership positions and 2.4% of the CEO positions (Perupchick, 2014). These numbers were far from equitable given the percentage of men and women in the work the force. The 2013 labor force participation rate was 57.2% for women and 69.7% for men, meaning that women were in the labor field at a rate of .83 compared to men; therefore, true equity would mean that women would lead in approximately 45% of senior management, executive, and CEO positions (Hayer, 2015). The number of women in leadership positions increased despite of their underrepresentation (Hayer, 2015).

From 1990 to 2013, seventy-four percent of women aged 25-54 participated in America’s workforce (Kurtz, 2013). The decision to stay out of the workforce for some may be in part due to the fact that many U.S. businesses lack family friendly policies. For example, most U.S. companies offer 12 weeks of maternity leave in comparison to one year in countries such as Britain (Kurtz, 2013).
The complexities of women in leadership persisted due to the continued societal pressure for women to prove themselves as leaders and the visible and invisible barriers women had to navigate, even though a recent women and leadership poll from Pew Research Center (2015) states most Americans “find women indistinguishable from men on key leadership traits such as intelligence and capacity for innovation, with many saying they’re stronger than men in terms of being compassionate and organized leaders” (p. 1). Often, women in leadership and management roles showed greater concern for subordinates and other employees (Scutti, 2015). Concern as a leadership trait, as well as other leadership characteristics and employment factors, impacted workplace morale (Scutti, 2015).

The biases embedded in a culture were frequently embedded in the culture of an organization, thus creating a setup for failure (Herminia et al., 2013). Women often did not see themselves as leaders nor did those who surrounded them. It was a nearly invisible double-edged sword. Aspects of the denial and slowing of women’s upward trajectory were embedded in cultures, or implied in religions, not unlike the factors that contributed to racism, anti-Semitism, or homophobia. Cultural assumptions were detrimental to the advancement of women. Evolving into a leader was a multi-tiered process requiring many shifts that went far beyond being placed in a position of leadership and learning new skills. For some, becoming a leader required a fundamental identity shift (Herminia et al., 2013). Herminia et al. (2013) went on to state,

Many CEOs who make gender diversity a priority—by setting aspirational goals for the proportion of women in leadership roles, insisting on diverse slates of candidates for senior positions, and developing mentoring and
training programs—are frustrated. They and their companies spend time, money, and good intentions on efforts to build a more robust pipeline of upwardly mobile women, and then not much happens (p. 60).

If one was not exposed to female leadership or never saw a woman leading, then the chances of being opposed to this type of leadership increased (Miller, 2012). Gender discrimination was legal until 1972, at which time the Equal Employment Act was passed. Strong women, historically, were ignored, silenced, oppressed, and shutout. An extreme example of strong women being silenced was the Salem Witch Trials, which took place in the colony of Salem, Massachusetts during 1692 and 1693.

A number of historians have speculated as to why the witch hunts occurred and why certain people were singled out. These proposed reasons have included personal vendettas, fear of strong women and economic competition. Regardless, the Salem Witch Trials are a memorial and a warning to what hysteria, religious intolerance, and ignorance can cause in the criminal justice system. (Miller, 2012, p. 1597)

It took centuries for women’s voices to be heard, and leaders must have a voice to lead effectively and be taken seriously. Women must acquire the right skills to be effective as leaders. The research of Herminia et al. (2012) found three steps organizations could take to increase the chances that female leaders would successfully embrace their leadership roles and therefore increase their likelihood of being recognized as a leader by others and increasing their chances of leadership success. Such steps could aid today’s female leaders.
Women Leaders Today

Women leaders today continue to face barriers such as the wage gap; the glass ceiling and/or glass elevator; discrimination; second-generation biases; sexism; oppression; discrimination; opposition from their female counterparts, subordinates, and superiors; conflicts involving work-home balance; and resistance to their leadership capabilities men are not likely to face (Sandberg, & Mitchell, 2014). Despite underrepresentation, the number of women in leadership positions continued to increase (Hayer 2015).

Women leaders seeking a chance to be significant viewed the world through a lens of opportunity; women were especially in search of opportunities previously unseen (Llopis, 2014). Women today have different career expectations than those 100, 50, or even 20 years ago. Each new generation of women must find an opportunity to lead, from Generation GI, to the Silent Generation (the pre-feminist generation), the Baby Boomers, Generation X, and the Millennials (the largest group of employees in the workforce today; Fry, 2015).

Today, women seeking to become leaders must continue to seek out opportunities that do not come easily. Sheryl Sandberg (2013), COO of Facebook, with a net worth of $1.26 billion and ranked number 16 on Forbes Magazine’s 2015 America’s Richest Self-Made Women, advised women to get a mentor. Sandberg encouraged women to seek advice from both senior and junior people. Seeking advice from those above and below in the work structure engender productive relationships (Sandberg, 2013). Success may be afforded to women who were aggressive, assertive, and confident, and had the ability
to monitor these traits to fit social circumstances; this type of woman was more likely to get promotions than other women and men (Rigoglioso, 2011).

Pflanz (2011) included the following research question in her dissertation, “What are the barriers that women must navigate in their positions of leadership?” (p. 6). Women must navigate opposition from the same sex and opposite sex, discrimination, oppression, the glass ceiling, the glass elevator, and the wage gap. The barriers women must navigate were both visible and invisible, and were often embedded in the culture of the organization (Pflanz, 2011).

Carr (2013) conducted a mixed-methodology research study that investigated the underlying issues contributing to the success or failure of women in leadership and management roles. Her research variables were gender bias and stereotyping. More than 200 women residing and working in the United States participated in the study. Her study revealed that as gender bias and stereotyping scores increased, so did the number of barriers and obstacles that thwarted an upward career trajectory for women (Carr, 2013).

Mety’s (2015) research delved into the perceptions that gender-specific behaviors of female leaders prevented them from realizing their full leadership potential. Her mixed-method study explored the relationship between self-efficacy and the ability of women to overcome gender-specific behaviors and become more effective leaders. Her study found four main themes: (a) the attributes necessary for effective leadership were not gender-specific, (b) self-efficacy increased with knowledge and experience, (c) strong self-efficacy beliefs helped participants overcome gender-specific behaviors, and (d) overcoming gender-specific behaviors increased the leadership effectiveness of participants. Mety (2015) concluded that a strong relationship existed between self-
efficacy and leadership. Self-efficacy gained ground with social psychologist Albert Bandura (1994). Bandura defined the term as individuals’ beliefs in their capacity to conduct themselves in such a way as to attain targeted performance results. A self-efficacious person generally exuded confidence, and was motivated and in control. A strong sense of self-efficacy enhanced personal well-being (Bandura, 1994).

International, national, state, and local organizations, societies, foundations, charities, councils, and exchanges exist to support and grow women leaders. These include Young Female Entrepreneurs, The International Women’s Leadership Association, Women for Women International, Women’s Leadership Council, Women’s Leadership Foundation, ATHENA International, National Women’s Leadership Association, Women in Leadership Foundation, Women’s Leadership Exchange, Women’s Leadership Society, and Lean In Foundation. Such organizations aim to increase the number of women leaders in business and politics.

**Women Leaders in Business and Politics**

In the worlds of business and politics, gender biases resulting from norms within organizations and American society at large placed women at an undeniable disadvantage (O’Neil, Hopkins, & Bilimoria, 2015). In January 2015, *The New York Times* ran a piece by Gladstone (2015) titled, “Women Run 30 Percent of All Businesses, but Only 5 Percent of the Biggest, Study Shows.” The International Labor Organization proclaimed it would take 100 to 200 years to achieve gender parity in positions of business leadership, unless new and immediate actions were taken to promote equality in management for women in business (Gladstone, 2015).
Much research was conducted to determine the qualities that made women effective leaders in political and business arenas. Founded in 1985 by a group of women, EMILY’s List triumphantly supported hundreds of women to get elected to political office (Przybyla, 2017). EMILY’s List is a political action committee of pro-choice democratic women dedicated to women making gains in the political arena. In 2016, women continued to be underrepresented in political roles, but an undeniable stride forward was made when Hillary Clinton was named the presidential nominee of the Democratic political party in 2016. The Democratic political party’s nomination of Clinton was a national representation of a woman on the political forefront (Hampson, 2016).

Jack Zenger and Joe Folkman (2012) described the skill and diversity women had to offer the realm of executive leaders. They recognized that more women at the top would increase the overall effectiveness of leadership teams. Zenger and Folkman’s research confirmed that women had a clear advantage in the areas of relationships and communication (Zenger & Folkman, 2012).

Giang (2014) asked 10 successful businesswomen, including a lawyer, CEOs, founders, co-founders, and an editor-in-chief, what they thought most people did not know about leadership. The businesswomen offered the following advice:

- Be a deep listener
- Sometimes just go with your gut
- Pay attention to what you are doing wrong
- Be your authentic self
- Ask questions
• A lot of leadership is a private journey
• In good times and bad, be humble
• Listening is the biggest part of the job
• You don’t have to have all the answers
• Real leadership is about service (Giang, 2014)

Extensive research was conducted on women leaders in business and politics, exploring the characteristics of effective leaders and the skills necessary for women to reach the upper echelon of their companies. Less research was available examining women leaders in education.

Women Leaders in Education

In 1874, Iowan, Miss Phebe Sudlow became the first female school superintendent in the United States (Iowa Pathways, 2015). Sudlow was a committed advocate for equal pay for teachers, a cause that she remained committed to throughout her career. Equal salaries for teachers came to fruition in the 1960s (Iowa Pathways, 2015). The number of female school administrators continued to increase since the early 1900s (McFadden, Maahs-Fladung, Beck-Frazier, & Bruckner, 2009). However, the data on female principals revealed a disproportionate number of female teachers compared to the number of female administrators. Statistical data from 2011 found 84% of the K-12 teaching population was female, whereas only 52% of K-12 (public and private) principals were female (Goldring, Gray, & Bitterman, 2013; Feistritzer, 2011). Grogan (2010) claimed there was a need to collect better data at state and local levels to obtain more accurate numbers of women serving as principals and superintendents, as women were still significantly underrepresented in powerful administrative positions.
According to McFadden et al. (2009), there was a lack of significant research regarding the characteristics of successful female principals nor was there adequate research regarding the perceptions of female principals. A gap in the research indicated the need for additional research in this area. Given this gap, the literature review examined the leadership styles of women in more general terms rather than focused on women in education.

**The Leadership Styles of Women**

Female leaders were described as multi-tasking, emotional, empathetic, strong, intuitive, compassionate, relationship building, verbal, consensus building, collaborative, and gossipy (Wharton School, 2005). Hymowitz (2010) acknowledged that women and men shared many of the same leadership styles. She noted that the ways in which women differed from their male counterparts made them an asset to decision-making teams. Hymowitz (2010) also claimed that women were more motivated by the meaning of their work and not by the mere title of their position. Women were more risk-aversive and emotional than men, which added diversity and tone to what may be an otherwise monotonous team of mostly men. Women were social risk takers and skilled at recognizing subtle facial expressions. They reacted to situations with greater emotional intensities (Hymowitz, 2010). Research by Folkman (2012) on more than 7,280 leaders found that women excelled at the following leadership competencies: (a) initiative, (b) self-development, (c) integrity and honesty, (d) results-driven, (e) development of others, (f) inspiration and motivation, (g) relationship building, (h) collaboration and teamwork, (i) development of stretch goals, (j) championing change, (k) problem-solving and analyzing issues, (l) communication, (m) connecting groups to the outside world, and (n)
innovation. Additionally, women were not rated significantly more positively on only one competency: developing strategic perspective (Folkman, 2012).

Much research was conducted on the leadership styles of women resulting in both conclusive and inconclusive information. Some of that research looked more specifically at the characteristics of women leaders in education and business.

**Characteristics of Women Leaders in Education and Business**

Women leaders around the world were often referred to as bossy and aggressive (Sandberg, 2013). Sandberg and Mitchell (2014) recommended moving away from this and instead referring to these same women as possessing executive leadership skills. Historically, well-behaved women were demure and compliant; conversely, women who were outspoken and assertive were seen as aggressive and bossy, or even bitchy (Harrison, 2007). Harrison (2007) noted that Laurel Thatcher Ulrich’s 1976 quote, “Well behaved women seldom make history,” began as a simple phrase she used in an article about Puritan funeral services; however, its popularity spread and in 2007, Ulrich went on to write a book titled by her famous phrase, *Well-Behaved Women Seldom Make History*. Ulrich’s point when she penned her famous phrase was that colonial women lived and labored in silent obscurity; and women who were viewed as the ones who misbehaved were actually insistent in having a voice and receiving the attention and respect due to them. They wanted the recognition of being fully human, the same as a man (Harrison, 2007).

Talent management firm, Caliper (2014), conducted a study that revealed seven key personality traits of high-performing women: (a) assertiveness, (b) aggressiveness, (c) empathy, (d) ego, (e) strength, (f) energy, and (g) stress tolerance. However, Pew
Research Center (2015) indicated that most people found women indistinguishable from men on key leadership traits, including intelligence and capacity for innovation. The study also showed women were perceived as stronger than men in terms of being compassionate and organized leaders (Pew Research Center, 2015). Women in leadership and management roles were noted as showing greater concern for subordinates and other employees (Scutti, 2015). Additionally, Wharton School (2005) identified a trend that descriptions of leaders were becoming more gender-neutral.

Dana Hughens (as cited in Jacobs, 2015), CEO of Clairemont Communications, claimed the tenets of leadership remained the same regardless of an organization’s purpose and/or size. Jacobs (2015) cited Hughens as identifying six essential attributes that leaders must possess to be and remain successful. Those six essential leadership attributes were: (a) integrity, (b) openness and transparency, (c) the ability to communicate, (d) trustfulness, (e) passion, and (f) sense of humor (as cited in Jacobs, 2015).

In the field of education, Rowland (2008) discovered that some people found female administrators to be more supportive, approachable, sensitive, understanding, nurturing, organized, creative, and receptive than male principals; these attributes emerged when a female leader did not feel the pressure to act and behave like a male leader. Courageous female leaders found their voice, experienced moral courage, and allowed themselves to be vulnerable (Ali, 2015). Women leaders who with these characteristics and who could find their voice tended to be more successful, which directly related to employee morale and job satisfaction.
The Impact of Leadership on Employee Morale and Job Satisfaction

Leadership impacted employee morale and job satisfaction. Leadership was considered a critical factor impacting employee morale, with democratic, people-oriented leaders tending to have a positive impact on employee morale (Yahaya, Osman, Mohammed, Gibrilla, & Eliasu, 2014). In 2009, 45% of American employees surveyed reported being satisfied with their jobs (Nikravan, 2010). Leadership effected job satisfaction, productivity, and organizational commitment (Chiok Foong Loke, 2001). According to Scott Hunter (as cited in Nikravan, 2010),

The success of a company is a function of the mood of the company, and most people that run companies don’t understand that. They’re so busy getting the product out, getting the service out, making money, that they forget to take care of their most precious asset—their people. (para. 2)

In addition, exhaustion, job tension, nervousness, depression, and a lack of trust were experienced by workers who felt discord with their bosses, according to a 2007 Florida State study that surveyed more than 700 employees (as cited in Tierney, 2012).

Research prior to the 1990s revealed that experimenters investigated whether people showed biases toward women leaders who held the same characteristics as their male counterparts, thus impacting morale (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). Results indicated that in most circumstances there was only a small inclination for employees to evaluate female leaders less favorably than male leaders. The bias toward male leaders was more pronounced when female-led positions were devalued in relation to their male counterparts, and the devaluation of female leaders was greater when women leaders occupied male-dominated roles and when the evaluators were men (Eagly et al., 1992).
In the teaching profession, new teachers time and time again left the profession after only a year or two on the job; their number one reason for leaving was poor leadership (Tierney, 2012). A study of teachers in Massachusetts schools found that teachers who left the profession described their administrators as arbitrary, abusive, or neglectful (Tierney, 2012). Principals had the power to influence many factors of a school. One of the most important and influential aspects of a principal’s role was the effect the he or she had on the teachers of the school; the principal played a vital role in the morale of teachers who needed support, guidance, or reassurance (Rowland, 2008).

Rowland (2008) found a significant positive correlation between the measures of principal leadership and teacher morale. The influence of gender roles on leaders’ behavior and leadership roles should be of primary importance in organizational settings because these roles lent their occupants legitimate authority and were usually regulated by relatively clear rules about appropriate behavior; the traits inherent in these roles impacted morale and a greater awareness of these traits would allow for identification and change (Eagly et al., 2003).

The literature on principal leadership and teacher morale hypothesized that administrators who proactively practiced transformational leadership behaviors had a positive impact on educator morale and productivity (Randolph-Robinson, 2007). The greatest single factor that influenced teacher morale was principal leadership style (Hindt, 2012). The intent of Littleford’s (2007) qualitative study was to explain the connection between principal leadership practices and the phenomenon of teacher morale. She summarized that to raise morale, there had to be effort on the part of both principals and teachers to build an educational culture and climate that was pleasant, successful, and
enjoyable for everyone (Littleford, 2007). A principal’s practices had the potential to change a school culture and both positively and negatively affected teacher and institutional morale (Meyer et al., 2009). The leadership of the principal was imperative to the success of a school. An individual’s leadership style could inspire followers to achieve greater outcomes or discourage followers to the point of underachievement (Costellow, 2011). Similarly, Rowland (2008) found a principal’s daily behavior played a vital role in the environment of the school and Scutti (2015) found a principal’s behaviors and character traits impacted teacher morale.

Research indicated a link between leadership, employee morale, and job satisfaction. However, more research was warranted to link specific leadership characteristics of female principals to employee morale and job satisfaction.

**Gap in the Literature**

A need exists to further investigate the attributes of women leaders and their impact on employee morale and job satisfaction. Additional research would provide more information regarding women and their impact, negative or positive, on employee morale and job satisfaction, thus informing female leaders of the potential positives and pitfalls of female-specific leadership traits. For example, differences in confidence and career ambition between men and women were cited as factors preventing women from moving into senior and executive positions (Johns, 2013).

Studies focusing on the impact of female leaders on employee morale were limited. A 2008 study that explored the relationship between a principal’s leadership practices and the morale of the school’s teacher revealed a need for additional research focusing on a measure relating achievement to teacher morale and principal leadership
(Rowland, 2008). Additionally, the relationship between transformational leadership skills of female elementary principals and job satisfaction had not been adequately explored. In 2011, Campbell studied teacher perceptions of effective leadership practices of female principals and recommended future research included (1) the study of principals’ perceptions of effective leadership practices and (2) a variety of elementary schools for a larger sample of participants.

More information is needed to determine if there is a relationship between gender, leadership, and workplace morale. An identifiable correlation would add relevant information to support an explanation of the imbalance in principal leadership at the elementary school level. If the disproportionate percentage of female leaders at the K-12 school level could be connected to leadership style and the impact of gender on teacher morale, then female leaders would have access to insights and possible entry points that could support their growth as leaders.

Summary

Chapter II explored the literature about (a) women in the workplace, (b) the education of women, (c) the history of women in leadership, (d) women leaders today, (e) women leaders in business and education, (f) the leadership styles of women, (g) specific characteristics of women leaders in education, and (h) the impact of leadership on employee morale and job satisfaction. Female leadership had a rugged, tempered, and fragmented history. Knowing why women chose to lead could develop a better understanding of women leaders, building an awareness of their personal leadership styles and examining attitudes regarding female leadership (Pflanz, 2011).
Synthesis Matrix

The synthesis matrix created for this dissertation focused on the following main points: women in the workplace; education of women; history of women in leadership; women leaders today; women leaders in business, politics, and education; leadership styles of women; and specific characteristics of women leaders in education (see Appendix A). The purpose of this matrix was to synthesize multiple sources of information the researcher used while conducting the review of literature.
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

This quantitative correlational study focused on the relationship between specific leadership styles of female administrators and teacher morale and employee job satisfaction. A quantitative correlational study includes two or more quantitative variables from the same subject group for which the researcher seeks to determine if a relationship between the variables exists (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). Correlation was defined by the Business Intelligence (2013) analytics glossary as a statistical measure that indicates the extent to which two or more variables fluctuate together. A positive correlation indicated the extent to which those variables increased or decreased in parallel whereas a negative correlation indicated the extent to which one variable increased as the other decreased (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010).

The detailed methodology for this research study is included in this chapter. The chapter begins with a reiteration of the purpose statement, which is followed by the research questions developed with the intent of gleaning specific information. The purpose statement and research questions are followed by a description of the research design, the broad population and specific sample, the research instruments, the data collection process, and the data analysis procedures. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to determine how teachers working with female principals in Campaign for Business and Education Excellence (CBEE) Star Schools rated the principals’ leadership skills. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine the teachers’ ratings of their job satisfaction.
The final purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between employee ratings of female principals’ leadership skills and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction. The tools for this study were the Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM) Employee Engagement Survey and the Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi).

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. How do teachers working with female principals in CBEE Star Schools rate the principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi?

2. How do teachers working with female principals at CBEE Star Schools rate their job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey?

3. What relationship exists between employee ratings of female principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey?

**Research Design**

The methodology employed in this research was a quantitative correlational research design using data from two instruments, the TLSi and the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey, to address the three research questions. A quantitative correlational study is used to determine if a relationship exists between two or more quantitative variables (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). A quantitative correlational design was appropriate for this study because the researcher sought to determine if a relationship was present between the following variables: principals’ leadership styles as
measured by the TLSi and teacher morale and job satisfaction as measured by the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey.

To collect quantifiable data regarding leadership styles, teacher morale, and job satisfaction, a survey was utilized. Surveys were considered a typical means of gleaning representative data on traits, opinions, attitudes, and other psychological constructs of a population (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). The SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey and the TLSi, were combined into a single survey to collect scaled quantitative data for this study.

Research Question 1 (RQ1) was addressed through a descriptive analysis of quantitative data from the TLSi, which examines 10 elements that support transformational leadership. Research Question 2 (RQ2) was addressed through a descriptive analysis of quantitative data from the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey, which examines aspects of job satisfaction and factors related to employee engagement. Research Question 3 (RQ3) was addressed through a correlational analysis of responses to the TLSi and the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software. SPSS is a software program used for data entry and analysis, with the capability to create graphs and tables (Pallant, 2001). To determine the relationship between the specific leadership styles of female administrators and CBEE Star Schools and their teachers’ morale and job satisfaction, the data analysis for this quantitative correlational study was conducted using SPSS.
**Population**

The population in a research study was defined as the group of interest to the researcher, the group to which the researcher would like the results of the study to be generalizable (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010; Roberts, 2010).

In recent years, the leadership of women in the PreK-12 sectors of educational settings was acknowledged as credible and legitimate (Grogan, 2010). During the 2011–12 school year, there were 89,810 public school principals in the United States, of which 46,701 were women (Goldring, Gray, & Bitterman, 2013). The population of this study was teachers who worked for female school principals at CBEE Star Schools in California. Goldring et al. (2013) reported that 51.6% of public school administrators were female. Of the 1,328 CBEE (2014) Star Schools in the state of California, 685 were headed by female principals who led approximately 20,550 teachers.

**Target Population**

A target population is a group with common defining characteristics that the researcher can identify and study. Target populations may be comprised of individuals or groups. A target population is also referred to as a sampling frame, (Creswell, 2012).

The target population of this study was teachers at CBEE Star Schools in Contra Costa County in the 2015–16 school year. Nine school districts were identified as having CBEE Star schools operating within their boundaries during the 2015–16 school year: Antioch Unified, Brentwood Union Elementary, Byron Union Elementary, Liberty Union High School, Martinez Unified, Mount Diablo Unified, Oakley Union Elementary, Pittsburg Unified, and West Contra Costa Unified. Across these districts, 12 schools were identified as having female principals who led 336 teachers working at those 12
schools. Thus, the target population was the 336 teachers working at CBEE Star Schools in Contra Costa County led by female principals.

Sample

A sample was defined as a measurable segment of a statistical population; it is the portion of participants selected from a larger group for the purpose of a study (Patten, 2002). Sampling referred to the process of selecting a representative portion of a population to determine characteristics of a whole population (Fridah, 2002). Sampling helps researchers draw conclusions about whole populations based on their samples. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2010), correlational studies should have a minimum of 30 subjects. However, the invited sample for this study was 2 teachers from each of the 12 CBEE schools led by female school principals, for a total of 24 teachers. The selected teachers needed to be employed at the site for two or more years.

Two of the principals opted out from participating in the study, and not all teachers responded to the survey, so not all the schools were represented. The specific Contra Costa County schools included in the study were: Discovery Bay Elementary, Edna Hill Middle, John Muir Elementary, Martinez High, and Vintage Parkway Elementary. Two teachers from each school completed at least one survey, for a total sample size of 10 teachers.

Sample Selection Process

The sample selection process was enacted as follows:

1. Potential CBEE Star Schools were identified through the website [www.ed.results.org]
2. The researcher contacted each female principal of the CBEE Star Schools by phone to ask their interest in participating in the study; the researcher secured agreement to participate from 10 of the 12 principals.

3. For those principals who agreed to participate, each was asked to identify from her staff 3 to 5 teachers to participate in the study.

4. A list of potential teacher participants was developed by each participating principal and email addresses were provided to the researcher.

5. Two teachers from each participating school were selected at random by the researcher to be included in the study.

6. The researcher contacted the selected teachers via email to provided them with the informed consent materials (Appendix B) and secure their participation.

**Instrumentation**

Two instruments were used for this study, the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey (SHRM) and the TLSi. Specific information regarding both follows.

**SHRM Employee Engagement Survey**

In 2002, SHRM created its first Employee Engagement Survey to measure employee job satisfaction using research founded in academic literature for industrial-organizational psychology and business management. After the initial version, the survey was expanded to include employee job engagement. The final SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey distinguishes each aspect of respondents’ answers. It includes 42 items across 6 components of job satisfaction and engagement (Appendix C).
**SHRM reliability.** Babbie (2011) defined reliability as “whether a particular technique, applied repeatedly to the same object, yields the same result each time” (p.157). A means of verifying reliability was by testing the instrument for consistent and established results that were comparable across multiple assessments (Patten, 2012). To develop the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey approach and items, an extensive review of the academic research literature from the fields of industrial-organizational psychology and business management was conducted. Based on this literature review, SHRM researchers created a pool of items that were then reviewed by two separate panels of experts. The current job satisfaction survey was comprised of these final items, as well as additional items added as advances in theory necessitated.

In 2011, the survey was expanded to include employee job engagement. As with the job satisfaction survey, these engagement items were based on an extensive review of the academic research literature. The final items were developed by a team of SHRM researchers.

**SHRM validity.** Instrument validity referred to how well the purpose of the instrument was achieved (Patten, 2012). Extensive research and review of the literature attributed to content validity and surface validity of the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey.

The SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey was designed with support and input from an analytical consultant. The designer of the SHRM Employee Engagement Survey piloted the instrument in two separate unpublished studies. Based upon feedback from the study groups, the researcher amended and edited the survey by removing open-ended questions to reduce survey completion time. After the removal of open-ended
questions, the researcher disseminated the survey to subject matter experts and organizational behavior analysts to obtain additional feedback regarding potential weak points with content and format.

**Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi)**

The TLSi was designed by Dr. Keith Larick and Dr. Patricia Clark-White, and permission was granted to use the survey (Appendix D). The survey includes 10 domains of leadership that support transformational leadership: (a) Visionary Leadership, (b) Communication, (c) Problem-Solving and Decision-Making, (d) Personal and Interpersonal Skills, (e) Character and Integrity, (f) Collaboration and Sustained Innovation, (g) Managing Change, (h) Diversity, (i) Team Development, and (j) Political Intelligence (Appendix E). The tool was developed through rational and empirical processes.

**TLSi reliability.** Assessing an instrument for consistent and stable results comparable across multiple tests is a means of verifying reliability (Patten, 2012). Reliability issues were often closely associated with subjectivity; once a researcher adopted a subjective approach toward the study, the level of reliability of the work was compromised (Wilson, 2010).

Each domain of the TLSi was analyzed statistically by prior researchers. Researchers Larick and White (2012) developed an assessment instrument of leadership characteristics to be used a 360-degree assessment tool. By administering the TLSi to a pilot group of individuals and administering it again within 90 days to compare for consistency, its consistency was established. This technique was referred to as the test-retest technique (Babbie, 2011).
**TLSi validity.** Validity was considered vital “in the selection or application of an instrument, for validity is the extent to which that instrument measures what it is intended to measure” (Lynn, 1986, p. 382) and “accurately performs the function(s) it is purported to perform” (Patten, 2012, p. 61).

A series of steps were taken to ensure the validity of the TLSi. The tool was psychometrically analyzed to establish validity. Correlation of the individual items within each domain with the overall domain established stability of the instrument. Larick and White (2012) established a dependable instrument that continues to be used as a 360-degree assessment of leadership qualities. Statistical analysis of each of the 10 domain’s items further promoted the dependability of the TLSi. Domain item average comparisons to the overall rating reflected a correlation coefficient of .45 or higher, demonstrating moderate to strong relationships (Zardo, 2015).

**Data Collection**

A request to Brandman University’s Institutional Review Board (BUIRB) was submitted to conduct this research. No data were collected for this study until approval was received from the BUIRB. Upon approval, the researcher began to conduct her study. Communications were sent to school principals promptly after approval to acquire email addresses of eligible teachers. An email was sent to eligible teachers inviting voluntary participation in the survey and informed consent forms outlining the purpose of the study, participant rights, duration of participation, privacy and confidentiality rights, potential benefits of the study, and the right to withdraw without ramification (Appendix B). Participants were identified and participation secured prior to the beginning of the data collection process. All participants were assured prior to data collection that their
responses would remain confidential and in either a password protected file or a locked file cabinet to which the researcher had sole access.

Both the TLSi and the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey were administered to the participants via email. Results were collected electronically and stored in a password-protected file, or via U.S. Mail and stored in a secure location. Follow up emails reminding participants to complete the survey occurred several times prior to the completion of the data collection process.

**Data Analysis**

According to Northern Illinois University (2005), “Data Analysis is the process of systematically applying statistical and/or logical techniques to describe and illustrate, condense and recap, and evaluate data” (Data Analysis section, para. 1). Data integrity refers to the appropriate and accurate analysis of the findings found in the data. When data were not appropriately analyzed or improperly handled, it could be misleading and distort the scientific findings (Shepard, 2002).

**Research Question 1 – TLSi Data**

Descriptive measures were used to analyze the data from RQ1. Mean scores were calculated for each scale and placed in a table to compare and assess the overall average score for each TLSi scale. In addition, the standard deviation for each scale was calculated and placed in the same table so the researcher and other data analysts could determine how consistent the responses for each scale were over the entire group of respondents.
Research Question 2 – SHRM Data

Descriptive measures were used to analyze the data from RQ2. Mean scores were calculated for each scale and placed in a table to compare and assess the overall average score for each SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey scale. In addition, the standard deviation for each scale was calculated and placed in the same table so the researcher and other data analysts could determine how consistent the responses for each scale were over the entire group of respondents.

Research Question 3 – Correlation Calculations

Correlational statistics were used to determine the relationship between the scales of the TLSi and the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey. The process was conducted as follows:

Pearson Product Moment Calculations. The Pearson compares single pieces of data to one another to determine the isolated correlation between the variables (Patten, 2012). Scale mean scores from the TLSi and SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey were statistically compared to determine the level and direction of the relationship between them. Results of these calculations were placed into a table for observation and visual analysis. A narrative report of these findings is provided in Chapter IV.

Limitations

Limitations of this study included the chosen sample. The principals and staff in this study were from CBEE Star Schools in Contra Costa County, CA. CBEE Star Schools have significant levels of poverty, are higher-performing, and closing the achievement gap. As a result, the outcomes of this research may not be generalized to female administrators at schools with different characteristics.
The fact that both the principal and teacher participants were volunteers was also a limitation because it was possible only those with a positive attitude toward the principal might participate. It was also assumed the volunteer participants would be honest in their responses, but that may not have been the case.

**Summary**

Chapter III included an introduction to the chapter, a restatement of the purpose and research questions, the research design, population, target population, sample, instruments, data collection, data analysis, and the limitations of the study. Chapter IV presents the data collection and findings of the study, and Chapter V presents the conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future study.
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH, DATA COLLECTION, AND FINDINGS

Chapter VI presents the analysis of the data and findings derived from the study. This study was formulated to determine how teachers at Campaign for Business and Education Excellence (CBEE) Star Schools in Contra Costa County, California rated their female principals’ leadership skills and their own job satisfaction.

Data were collected using two surveys, the Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi) and the Society of Human Resource Management’s (SHRM, 2016) Employee Engagement Survey. The two instruments were used to measure how teachers rated their female principals’ leadership skills and their own job satisfaction. The data were also used to determine whether a correlation existed between the employee ratings of female principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey. This study was created to determine if statistical similarities existed between how teachers rated their own job satisfaction and how they rated the female principals’ leadership skills.

The TLSi survey includes 10 domains of leadership that support transformational leadership: (a) visionary leadership, (b) communication, (c) problem-solving and decision-making, (d) personal and interpersonal skills, (e) character and integrity, (f) collaboration and sustained innovation, (g) managing change, (h) diversity, (i) team development, and (j) political intelligence. The tool was developed through rational and empirical processes, and includes 8 items for each domain for a total of 80 questions.

The SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey includes 42 items and examines aspects of job satisfaction and factors related to employee engagement and organizational performance. SHRM created the survey to measure employee job
satisfaction using research founded in academic literature from industrial-organizational psychology and business management. The survey includes six domains with 2 to 12 items per domain. The domains are career development (6 items), work engagement (12 items), compensation (2 items), relationship management (7 items), benefits (5 items), and work environment (8 items).

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to determine how teachers working with female principals in CBEE Star Schools rated the principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine the teachers’ ratings of their job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey. The final purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between employee ratings of female principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study:

1. How do teachers working with female principals in CBEE Star Schools rate the principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi?
2. How do teachers working with female principals at CBEE Star Schools rate their job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey?
3. What relationship exists between employee ratings of female principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey?
Population and Sample

The population was classroom teachers who worked at one of the 12 CBEE Star Schools in Contra Costa County that were led by a female principal. Twenty-four teachers were invited to participate in the study, which represented two teachers from each of the 12 qualifying schools. Nine participants completed both the TLSi and SHRM surveys, and one additional participant completed only the TLSi survey. Two additional teachers returned their survey packets weeks after the data collection window closed; therefore, their survey data were not included in the analysis. Participants included in the study were from five schools – three elementary schools and two middle schools.

Data Collection

Upon approval by the IRB, female principals at CBEE schools were asked to identify 3 to 5 teachers who had worked at their site for two or more years. The researcher randomly chose two names from each site and invited those teachers to participate in the study. An email was sent to the 24 selected teachers inviting them to participate in the study.

Both the TLSi and the SHRM surveys were administered to the participants online or sent to the participant via U.S. mail with addressed, stamped envelopes. Responses were collected electronically as participants scanned and emailed completed surveys to the researcher, and via U.S. mail.

Research Question One

Research Question One (RQ1) was: How do teachers working with female principals in CBEE Star Schools rate the principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi?
The TLSi consists of 10 domains with 8 questions for each domain. Participant responses were averaged to create a single scale score for each domain. Scaled scores were used to represent responses of the overall category in the TLSi survey rather than each individual item. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the TLSi data for RQ1. Mean scores and standard deviations were calculated for each domain and examined to assess differences across domains (Table 1).

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics for TLSi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character/Integrity</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity &amp; Sustained Innovation</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores ranged from 4.40 to 4.69, indicating the teachers working with female principals rated their administrator as engaging in these behaviors to a great extent across all the domains. The highest mean was for the domain of Personal and Interpersonal Skills, whereas the lowest mean was for the domain of Diversity. As can be seen from the minimum and standard deviations, there was a high level of consistency across the domains.
Research Question Two

Research Question Two (RQ2) was: How do teachers working with female principals at CBEE Star Schools rate their job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey?

The SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey examines aspects of job satisfaction and factors related to employee engagement and organizational performance. It includes six domains each with between 2 and 12 items. Scaled scores were calculated by taking the average of across all items within the domain rather than each examining individual item. The SHRM Employee Engagement Survey scales were: Career Development, Workplace Engagement, Relationship Management, Compensation, Benefits, and Work Environment.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data for RQ2. These included the mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation, which are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Development Scale</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Engagement Scale</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Management Scale</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation Scale</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits Scale</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment Scale</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, teacher ratings were highest for the Work Environment, followed closely by the Workplace Engagement and Relationship Management scales. In contrast, ratings were lowest for the Benefits and Compensation scales. The range and standard
deviations also showed less consistency in the data, with wide ranges for the Compensation and Benefits scales, indicating some teachers were highly satisfied in these areas and other teachers were not.

**Research Question Three**

Research Question Three (RQ3) was: What correlation exists between the employee ratings of female principal’s leadership skills using the TLSi and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey?

This question was addressed using correlational statistics to determine the relationship between the variables of the TLSi and the SHRM. More specifically, a Pearson correlation was conducted, which compares single piece of data to one another to determine the isolated correlation between the items. Mean scale scores from the TLSi and from the SHRM Employee Engagement Scale were statistically compared to determine the level and direction of the relationship between the scales.

Because of the large number of variables included in the analysis, the data were first separated and presented by instrument to determine correlations across the scales within each instrument. Table 3 presents the correlations from the SHRM Employee Engagement Survey. As can be seen, Career Development was positively correlated with Compensation, Workplace Engagement was positively correlated with Relationship Management and Work Environment, Compensation was positively correlated with Benefits and Work Environment, and Benefits was also positively correlated with Work Environment.
Table 3

Scale Correlations for the SHRM Employee Engagement Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WPE</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>COMP</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>WE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.93**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. * p < .05; ** p < .01

Similarly, the scales of the TLSi were also examined to determine what relationships existed among the scales. As can be seen in Table 4, multiple scales significantly correlated with other scales. For example, Visionary Leadership was positively correlated with Communication, Problem-Solving, and Character/Integrity, and Communication was positively correlated with Problem-Solving, Character/Integrity, and Political Intelligence. Most scales were highly correlated with two to three other scales, except Diversity and Team Building, which were not significantly correlated with any other scale.
Table 4

*Scale Correlations for the TLSi*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>PIS</th>
<th>CI</th>
<th>CO</th>
<th>CSI</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>TB</th>
<th>PI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td>.69*</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.72*</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character/Integrity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.66*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *p* < .05; **p** < .01

The final correlations looked at the relationship between the TLSi scales and the SHRM Employee Engagement Survey scales. The data revealed both positive and negative correlations. Compensation and Benefits were both negatively correlated with Personal/Interpersonal and Team Building, meaning teachers who were satisfied with their compensation and benefits rated their supervisors lower in terms of their personal/interpersonal skills and team building. The other statistically significant relationship was between Character/Integrity and Career Development, which were positively correlated (Table 5).
Table 5

*Correlations between the TLSi and SHRM Employee Engagement Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visionary Leadership</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal/Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.72*</td>
<td>-.67*</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character/Integrity</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity &amp; Sustained Innovation</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Building</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.73*</td>
<td>-.67*</td>
<td>-.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Intelligence</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * p < .05; ** p < .01

**Summary**

Research information cannot be generalized beyond the few participating schools in this study. The sample size was too small to generalize to a larger population. However, statistically significant relationships were found in the data.

Mean scores from teachers rating the principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi indicated the administrators engaged in these behaviors with the highest mean for the domain of Personal and Interpersonal Skills and the lowest mean for the domain of Diversity. A high level of consistency across the domains was seen from the small standard deviations. Multiple TLSi scales significantly correlated with other TLSi scales. For example, Visionary Leadership was positively correlated with Communication, Problem-Solving, and Character/Integrity, and Communication was positively correlated
with Problem-Solving, Character/Integrity, and Political Intelligence. Most scales were highly correlated with two to three other scales, except Diversity and Team Building, which were not significantly correlated with any other scale.

Teacher job satisfaction scores, according to the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey analysis, were highest for the Work Environment, followed closely by the Workplace Engagement and Relationship Management scales. In contract, ratings were lowest for the Benefits and Compensation scales. The range and standard deviations also showed less consistency in the data, with wide ranges for the Compensation and Benefits scales, indicating some teachers were highly satisfied in these areas and other teachers were not. Correlations from the SHRM Employee Engagement Survey indicated that Career Development was positively correlated with Compensation, Workplace Engagement was positively correlated with Relationship Management and Work Environment, Compensation was positively correlated with Benefits and Work Environment, and Benefits was also positively correlated with Work Environment.

The final correlations looked at the relationship between the TLSi scales and the SHRM Employee Engagement Survey scales. The data revealed both positive and negative correlations. Compensation and Benefits were both negatively correlated with Personal/Interpersonal and Team Building, meaning teachers who were satisfied with their compensation and benefits rated their supervisors lower in terms of their personal/interpersonal skills and team building. The other statistically significant relationship was between Character/Integrity and Career Development, which were positively correlated.
Chapter IV described the data and findings from the analysis. Chapter V presents a summary of the findings, as well as conclusions and implications for action. Chapter V also provides recommendations for future study and closing remarks from the researcher.
CHAPTER V: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Included in Chapter V are the purpose of study, research questions, research design, population and sample, major findings, unexpected findings, conclusions, implications for actions, recommendations for further research, and concluding remarks and reflections.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this quantitative correlational study was to determine how teachers working with female principals in CBEE Star Schools rated the principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi. In addition, it was the purpose of this study to determine the teachers’ ratings of their job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey. The final purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between employee ratings of female principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. How do teachers working with female principals in CBEE Star Schools rate the principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi?

2. How do teachers working with female principals at CBEE Star Schools rate their job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey?

3. What relationship exists between employee ratings of female principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey?
Research Design

The methodology employed in this research was a quantitative correlational research design using data from two instruments, the TLSi and the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey. A quantitative correlational study uses two or more quantitative variables from the same subject group to determine if a relationship exists between the variables. A quantitative correlational design was appropriate for this study because the researcher sought to determine if a relationship existed between principal leadership styles and teacher morale and job satisfaction.

Research Question 1 (RQ1) was addressed through a descriptive analysis of quantitative data from the TLSi, which includes 10 elements of leadership that support transformational leadership Character/Integrity, Collaboration, Communication, Creativity and Sustained Innovation, Diversity, Personal/Interpersonal Skills, Political Intelligence, Problem Solving/Decision Making, Team Building, and Visionary Leadership. Research Question 2 (RQ2) was addressed through a descriptive analysis of quantitative data from the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey, which examines aspects of job satisfaction and other factors related to employee engagement. Research Question 3 (RQ3) was addressed through a correlational analysis of responses to the TLSi and the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey.

Population and Sample

The population was classroom teachers who worked at one of the 12 CBEE Star Schools in Contra Costa County that were led by a female principal. Twenty-four teachers were invited to participate in the study, which represented two teachers from each of the 12 qualifying schools. Nine participants completed both the TLSi and SHRM
surveys, and one additional participant completed only the TLSi survey. Participants included in the study were from five schools – three elementary schools and two middle schools.

**Major Findings**

The sample size for this study was too small to generalize to a larger population. However, statistically significant relationships were found in the data.

Mean scores from teacher ratings of the principal leadership skills indicated the teachers working with female principals rated their administrator as engaging in transformational behaviors across all the domains, with the highest mean for the domain of Personal and Interpersonal Skills and the lowest mean for the domain of Diversity. A high level of consistency across the domains was shown from the small standard deviations. Additionally, Career Development was positively correlated with Compensation, Workplace Engagement was positively correlated with Relationship Management and Work Environment, Compensation was positively correlated with Benefits and Work Environment, and Benefits was also positively correlated with Work Environment.

Multiple TLSi scales significantly correlated with other TLSi scales. For example, Visionary Leadership was positively correlated with Communication, Problem-Solving, and Character/Integrity, and Communication was positively correlated with Problem-Solving, Character/Integrity, and Political Intelligence. Most scales were highly correlated with two to three other scales, except Diversity and Team Building, which were not significantly correlated with any other scale.
Teacher job satisfaction scores, according to SHRM Employee Engagement Survey analysis, were highest for the Work Environment, followed closely by the Workplace Engagement and Relationship Management scales. In contrast, ratings were lowest for the Benefits and Compensation scales (areas site administrators have little control over). The range and standard deviations also showed less consistency in the data, with wide ranges for the Compensation and Benefits scales, indicating some teachers were highly satisfied in these areas and other teachers were not.

The final correlations looked at the relationship between the TLSi scales and the SHRM Employee Engagement Survey scales. The data revealed both positive and negative correlations. Compensation and Benefits were both negatively correlated with Personal/Interpersonal and Team Building, meaning teachers who were satisfied with their compensation and benefits rated their supervisors lower in terms of their personal/interpersonal skills and team building. The other statistically significant relationship was between Character/Integrity and Career Development, which were positively correlated.

**Unexpected Findings**

Minimal unexpected findings resulted from the analysis of this research. The researcher expected to find high levels of teacher job satisfaction for teachers who identified their female principals as effective leaders, more so because the schools in the study were identified as high-performing, less so because the school enrollments include a high percentage of students living in poverty.
Conclusions

Teachers working with female principals in CBEE Star Schools rated the principals’ leadership skills according to the TLSi as high. The data indicated teachers working with female principals rated their administrators as engaging in the measured behaviors to a great or very great extent across all the domains of the TLSi survey. The participants in this study perceived their female principal as an effective leader.

Teachers working with female principals at CBEE Star Schools rated their job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey. Survey responses signified varying degrees of job satisfaction. SHRM survey scores were highest for the Work Environment scale, followed by the Workplace Engagement and Relationship Management scales. Ratings were lowest for the Benefits and Compensation scales. Benefits and compensation are most often handled by payroll and human resources, they are not generally influenced by the site administrator. Additionally, benefits and compensation are often impacted by the union and the overall economy. Standard deviations indicated less consistency in the data, with wide ranges for the Compensation and Benefits scales meaning some teachers were highly satisfied in these areas and others were not. SHRM survey responses indicated less consistency and lower overall satisfaction scores than the TLSi.

Correlations between the employee ratings of their female principals’ leadership skills using the TLSi and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM (2016) Employee Engagement Survey were both positive and negative. Compensation and Benefits were both negatively correlated with Personal/Interpersonal and Team Building, meaning teachers who were satisfied with their compensation and benefits rated
their supervisors lower in terms of their personal/interpersonal skills and team building.

Site administrators are not likely to have any direct control over employee benefits and compensation, as these are generally managed by other departments (human resources, payroll). They are also influenced by the union and the overall economy. The other statistically significant relationship was between Character/Integrity and Career Development, which were positively correlated.

**Implications for Action**

Based upon the findings from this study, implications for actions included the suggestion that school districts delve more deeply into leadership and its impact on employee morale. The idea of what made an effective leader was changing (Wharton School, 2005). Rowland (2008) suggested that expanding the research over all levels of education could provide greater insights into the relationship between leadership skills and teacher morale.

Suggestions included:

1. Provide teachers, at least annually, the opportunity to anonymously rate their administrators (using the TLSi) and their own job satisfaction (using the SHRM survey). These quantitative data could provide information for evaluative purposes and help support placement of teachers and administrators to create a more effective system. It could also provide professional development and coaching opportunities.

2. Mean scores from the TLSi ranged from 4.40 to 4.69, indicating the teachers working with female principals rated their administrator as engaging in these behaviors associated with scales of Visionary Leadership, Communication,
Problem-Solving, Personal/Interpersonal Skills, Character/Integrity, Collaboration, Creativity and Sustained Innovation, Diversity, Team Building, and Political Intelligence. Use of this tool could be broadened to support the success and growth of female administrators across districts.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Further research on female leaders and their impact on employee morale and job satisfaction is suggested to strengthen the breadth of this topic. Additional research could support or refute this study’s findings. It is recommended that future research include:

1. A replication of the study with a larger sample size that includes:
   a. infant/preschool programs
   b. high schools and transition programs
   c. higher education
   d. more in-depth study at a single school sites, entire districts, and/or specific departments (i.e. special education)

2. An analysis and correlation of individual survey items in addition to the overall domains

3. A replication study that includes men in the respondent pool, or a replication of the study the includes only male participants

4. A replication of the study that includes qualitative research

5. An inquiry into race in regards to its influence on how respondents perceive the principal’s leadership skills and the employee’s job satisfaction
Concluding Remarks and Reflections

Women and leadership is a topic that interested me for decades. Young girls and women are faced with numerous barriers as they embark on their academic and professional paths. Often, females are not reared to think of themselves as leaders. I was blind to the idea that I could evolve into an effective leader until I was well into my twenties. Now that I am a woman in a position of leadership, I am aware of the many barriers that persist, some visible and invisible, many subtly or blatantly pervasive.

The leadership of the principal is imperative to the success of a school. An individual’s leadership style can inspire followers to achieve greater outcomes, or it can discourage followers to the point of underachievement (Costellow, 2011). Utilizing the TLSi and SHRM tools to measure my leadership and my staffs’ job satisfaction is an effective way to make informed decisions about next steps according to survey results and correlations.

This study supports the idea that women are highly effective leaders and that effective leadership can have an impact on employee job satisfaction.
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## APPENDIX A – SYNTHESIS MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Women in the Workplace</th>
<th>Education of Women</th>
<th>History of Women in Leadership</th>
<th>Women Leaders Today</th>
<th>Women Leaders in Business, Politics, and Education</th>
<th>Leadership Styles of Women</th>
<th>Specific Characteristics of Women Leaders in Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baig, M. (2013, December 19)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stereotyping and gender bias.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiok Foong Loke J. (2001)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagly, A., Makhijani, M., &amp; Klonsky, B. (1992)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Publication Year</td>
<td>Mentions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbormoni, A.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs, K.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtz, A.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llopis, G.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopez, H. M., &amp; Gonzalez-Barrera, A.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell, Z.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy, S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mety, M. T.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikravan, L.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson, J. R. (October 2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perupchick, H.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pflanz, M.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quast, L. (2011, February)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riffkin, R. (October 14, 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigoglioso, M. (2011, March 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandberg, S. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandberg, S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The History of Women and Education (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierney, J., November 16, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahaya, Osman, Mohammed, Gibrilla &amp; Issah.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2014).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zenger Folkman</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B – INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent and Confidentiality Form

RESEARCH STUDY TITLE: The Impact of Female School Principals’ Leadership Traits on Teacher Morale

Brandman University
16355 Laguna Canyon Road
Irvine, CA 92618

RESPONSIBLE INVESTIGATOR: Moira Zacharakis, Student, Doctoral Candidate

TITLE OF CONSENT FORM: Research Participant’s Informed Consent Form

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY: The purpose of this study is to determine how teachers of female principals at Campaign for Business and Education Excellence (CBEE) 2014 Star Schools in Contra Costa County, California (CA) rate the principals’ leadership skills using the Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi). Another purpose of this study is to have the principals’ employees’ rate their own job satisfaction using the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) (2016) Employee Engagement Survey. The final purpose of this study is to determine what correlation exists between the TLSi employee ratings of female principals at CBEE Star Schools, at the elementary, middle, and high school levels, in Contra Costa County, CA and the employees’ self-ratings of job satisfaction using the SHRM Employee Engagement Survey.

In participating in this research study, I agree to partake in two surveys. The surveys will take approximately 30 minutes each to complete. I understand that the survey includes a series of questions designed to allow me to share my lived experiences as an educator at a high-poverty, high-performing school that is led by a female administrator. Additionally, I agree, if prompted to do so, to share demographic information describing my background, training and experience.

I understand that:

a. There are no known major risks or discomforts associated with this research. Interview questions should cause me to reflect on the factors adding to and limiting my job satisfaction as an educator at a high-poverty, high-performing school led by a female administrator.

b. There are no major benefits to me for participation, but a potential may be that sharing your lived experiences as educator at a high-poverty, high-performing school that is led by a female administrator will add to the field of current knowledge and may potentially support administrators to grow in their leadership and effectiveness.
c. I understand I will not receive money for my participation in this study.


d. Any questions I have concerning my participation in this study will be addressed to Moira Zacharakis, Brandman University Doctoral Candidate. I understand Moira Zacharakis can be reached at (925) 817-8731, or Zach5701@mail.brandman.edu.


e. I understand that I may refuse to participate or withdraw from this study at any time without any negative consequences. Also, the investigator may stop the study at any time.


f. I understand that my survey responses will not be used beyond the scope of this study.

g. I also understand that none of my personal identifiable information will be released without my separate consent and that all identifiable information will be protected to the limits allowed by law. If the study design or the use of the data is to be changed, I will be so informed and my consent re-obtained. I understand that if I have any questions, comments, or concerns about the study or the informed consent process, I may write or call of the office of the Executive Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Brandman University, and 16355 Laguna Canyon Road, Irvine, CA 92618, (949) 341-7641. I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this form and the Research Participant’s Bill of Rights.

I have read the above and understand it and hereby voluntarily consent to the procedures(s) set forth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Participant or Responsible Party</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Witness (if appropriate)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Principal Investigator</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brandman University IRB August 2016
Employee Information

1. What is your job role?
   - Individual Contributor
   - Team Lead
   - Manager
   - Senior Manager
   - Regional Manager
   - Vice President
   - Management / C-Level
   - Partner
   - Owner
   - Volunteer
   - Intern
   - Other

2. What department do you work in?
   - Accounting
   - Administrative
   - Customer Service
   - Marketing
   - Operations
   - Human Resources
   - Sales
   - Finance
   - Legal
   - IT
   - Engineering
   - Product
Career Development

3. I am satisfied with my opportunities for professional growth.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

4. I am pleased with the career advancement opportunities available to me.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

5. My organization is dedicated to my professional development.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

6. I am satisfied with the job-related training my organization offers.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
7. I am satisfied that I have the opportunities to apply my talents and expertise.

- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

8. I am satisfied with the investment my organization makes in training and education.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

Work Engagement

9. I am inspired to meet my goals at work.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

10. I feel completely involved in my work.

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

11. I get excited about going to work.
12. I am often so involved in my work that the day goes by very quickly.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

13. I am determined to give my best effort at work each day.
   - I am determined to give my best effort at work each day. Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

14. When at work, I am completely focused on my job duties.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

15. In my organization, employees adapt quickly to difficult situations.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree
16. Employees here always keep going when the going gets tough.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

17. Employees proactively identify future challenges and opportunities.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

18. Employees in my organization take the initiative to help other employees when the need arises.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

19. Employees here are willing to take on new tasks as needed.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   ○ Agree
   ○ Strongly Agree

20. Employees in my organization willingly accept change.
   ○ Strongly Disagree
   ○ Disagree
   ○ Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Compensation**

21. I am satisfied with my overall compensation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

22. I am compensated fairly relative to my local market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Relationship Management**

23. Communication between senior leaders and employees is good in my organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

24. I am able to make decisions affecting my work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

26. My supervisor and I have a good working relationship.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

27. My coworkers and I have a good working relationship.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

28. Senior management and employees trust each other.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

29. Employees treat each other with respect.
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
- Agree
Benefits

30. I am satisfied with my total benefits package.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

31. I am satisfied with the healthcare-related benefits offered by my organization.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

32. I am satisfied with the amount of paid leave offered by my organization.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

33. I am satisfied with the retirement plan offered by my organization.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
   - Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
   - Agree
   - Strongly Agree

34. I am satisfied with the workplace flexibility offered by my organization.
   - Strongly Disagree
   - Disagree
Work Environment

35. My organization has a safe work environment.
○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

36. I am satisfied with my overall job security.
○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

37. My organization's work positively impacts people's lives.
○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

38. My organization operates in a socially responsible manner.
○ Strongly Disagree
○ Disagree
○ Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
○ Agree
○ Strongly Agree

39. My organization's fiscal well-being is stable.
Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly Agree

40. I am satisfied with the culture of my workplace.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly Agree

41. I understand how my work impacts the organization's business goals.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly Agree

42. My organization is dedicated to diversity and inclusiveness.

Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Neutral/Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly Agree

Survey Information:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/?sm=8%2b2%2b77U%2bHvp%2fBwsGRh1N1jlkalwHicSWxZaS5Nn%2baw8%3d
July 16, 2016

Moira Zacharakis <zach5701@mail.brandman.edu>
Doctoral Candidate
Brandman University

Dear Moira,
This email will serve to confirm our permission for you to use the Larick/White Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSI), to collect data for your Dissertation, *The Impact of Female School Principals’ Leadership Traits on Teacher Morale*. This authorization will extend from August 1, 2016 to August 1, 2017 and is for the sole purpose of collecting data related to this dissertation.

The copyright information should be prominently displayed on the instrument, and it should not be copied, distributed, or used for any other purpose. The full instrument can be placed in the appendix and should be prominently imprinted with the copyright. The actual structure for each of the domains should not be distributed nor included in the body or appendix of the dissertation.

Sincerely,

White, Patricia
Patricia Clark White, Ed.D.
Professor and Associate Dean
School of Education
pwhite@brandman.edu

16355 Laguna Canyon Road
Irvine, CA 92618
C: 949.842.5041
www.brandman.edu
APPENDIX E - TLSI

The Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi) © by Patricia Clark White and Keith Larick is used in this dissertation with permission of the authors. The TLSi may not be copied, distributed, or used in any way without prior permission of the authors.

**Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory**

**TLSi**

Please rate each skill according to the degree to which it is evident in this individual.

5 = Very great extent 4 = Great Extent 3 = Some Extent 2 = Little Extent 1 = Very Little Extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visionary Leadership:</strong> Creating a vision of the future as an ethical agent of change, who mobilizes stakeholders to transform the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Plans &amp; actions match the core values of the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Uses strategic thinking to create direction for the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communicates personal vision effectively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Involves stakeholders in creating a vision for the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inspires others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Anticipates and plans for the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mobilizes stakeholders to transform the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Challenges thinking about the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication:</strong> Leadership that effectively supports an environment of open communication where the exchange of ideas, solutions, &amp; problems are discussed inside &amp; outside the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Listens to &amp; tolerant of divergent points of view</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Uses technology &amp; social media to communicate with stakeholders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Writes in a clear, concise style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Builds strong relationships through open communication &amp; listening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Is accessible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Presents ideas &amp; information in a clear &amp; well-organized manner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Communicates an inspiring vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Communicates effectively in oral presentations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem-Solving &amp; Decision Making:</strong> Creates an environment that enables everyone to contribute productively through understanding and appreciation of differences and focus on the mission of the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Conducts effective meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Manages decisions decisively</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Involves staff in decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Organizes people &amp; resources to accomplish tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Pays attention to critical details</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Brings conflict into the open</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Sets clear goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Explains &amp; clarifies new tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal/Interpersonal Skills:</strong> Leaders that are approachable, likeable and demonstrate high emotional intelligence in motivating others toward excellence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Is approachable and easy to talk with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Provides feedback in a constructive manner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Has a good sense of humor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Displays energy in personal &amp; work goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Motivates team members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Anticipates and manages conflicts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Counsels &amp; supports team members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Provides support for personal development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Character/Integrity:</strong> Fostering trust in the organization by creating an emotional intelligent organization whose members know themselves and know how to deal respectfully and understand others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Accepts responsibility for actions &amp; decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Treats others with respect &amp; dignity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Is considerate of others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Balances personal &amp; work life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Develops trust &amp; credibility with team members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Remains calm in tense situations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Sincere &amp; straight forward</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Follows through on agreed on actions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration:</strong> Building a culture of trusting relationships and purposeful involvement that supports critical and creative problem solving and decision making through effective communication and conflict resolution.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Delegates responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Gives and receives feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Encourages open dialog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Manages unproductive behavior in teams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Participates in team meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Builds strong relationships of team members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Facilitates decision making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Gives teams members authority to accomplish tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creativity and Sustained Innovation:</strong> Developing a culture of divergent thinking and responsible risk taking that harnesses the potential of available human capital to transform the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Promotes a positive culture of change and improvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Generates new ideas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Fosters &amp; encourages creativity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Supports risk taking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Demonstrates willingness to take a courageous stand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Provides resources that support non-traditional solutions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Uses divergent fields &amp; disciplines to create something new</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Establishes clear expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Diversity: Integrate the strengths that individual and cultural differences contribute to create an organization that is equitable, respectful and morally accountable in a global society.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57. Recognizes the value of people with different talents and skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Thinks about own feelings and reactions to people before acting</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Exhibits the humility to knowledge what they don’t know</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Demonstrates empathy and sees things from other people’s perspective</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Understands that treating people fairly may mean treating them differently according to their ability and background</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Reflects and learns from experience</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Involves diverse stakeholders in planning and decision making</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Assists others to cultivate productive &amp; respectful relationships</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Team Building: Creating an effective team by instilling a cooperative atmosphere, building collaborative interaction, and encouraging constructive conflict.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65. Provides subordinates effective mentoring &amp; coaching</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Builds a culture of open communication</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Encourages divergent thinking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Challenges &amp; encourages team members</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Holds self &amp; others accountable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Empowers others to work independently</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Provides feedback for improved performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Builds a culture that is safe and promotes risk taking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Political Intelligence: Generating organizational influence to ethically advocate for causes and changes that will advance the organization’s vision and mission.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73. Builds support for organizational initiatives</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Builds trust &amp; support with constituents</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Develops key champions for organizations agenda</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Identifies &amp; maintains resources supporting the organization</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. Negotiates effectively on behalf of the organization</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Avoids negative politicking and hidden agendas</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Builds coalitions &amp; support through networking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Anticipates obstacles by engaging others to share ideas</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Transformational Leadership Skills Inventory (TLSi) © by Patricia Clark White and Keith Larick is used in this dissertation with permission of the authors. The TLSi may not be copied, distributed, or used in any way without prior permission of the authors.
### Contra Costa County Schools with Star School Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antioch Unified School District</td>
<td>Lone Tree Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brentwood Union Elementary</td>
<td>Edna Hill Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Union Elementary District</td>
<td>Discovery Bay Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Union High School District</td>
<td>Freedom High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez Unified School District</td>
<td>John Muir Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez Unified School District</td>
<td>Martinez Junior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Diablo Unified School District</td>
<td>Silverwood Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakley Union Elementary District</td>
<td>Vintage Parkway Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg Unified School District</td>
<td>Heights Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburg Unified School District</td>
<td>Los Medanos Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Contra Costa Unified School District</td>
<td>Leadership Public Schools: Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Contra Costa Unified School District</td>
<td>Richmond College Prepatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Contra Costa Unified School District</td>
<td>Middle College High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>