

INVITATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A Dissertation
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by

GWEN JEANNINE BURNS

Dr. Barbara N. Martin, Dissertation Supervisor

MAY 2007

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School,
have examined the dissertation entitled

INVITATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Presented by Gwen J. Burns

A candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education

And hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Barbara Martin, Major Advisor
Educational Administration

Dr. David Brown
School of Teacher Education

Dr. Cynthia MacGregor
Educational Administration

Dr. Don Keck
Educational Administration

Dr. Lonnie Barker
Educational Administration

DEDICATION

In honor of my loving parents:

My dear, departed mother

Odeana Barbara Jean Lamb Johnston

September 1, 1926 – June 27, 1998

and

My magnificent father

Kenneth Dean Johnston

July 28, 1925

Thank you for the gift of persistence and optimism

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Words can little express the deep and tremendous gratitude which I feel for the support and encouragement received by my family and friends as I have undertaken one of the most challenging missions of my lifetime. While my life long dream was to receive my doctorate degree, it was difficult to predict the intensity and rigor that achieving such a dream would entail.

My heartfelt gratitude goes to my wonderful husband, Steve. His love, patience, and pride in my efforts sustained me through many difficult and long nights of hard work and study. When I grew weary, as I often did, my sweet husband's words "just remember, this is why they don't give out doctoral degrees everyday" served to propel me forward.

Special thanks go to my two special angels, my precious sons, Brian and Justin Haynes. My boys have always been a continuous source of inspiration and encouragement. Thank you for all the special years that the three of us stood alone, against the world, and emerged triumphant, each in our own way. Thank you to my beautiful daughter-in-law, Carla, and my lovely step-daughter, Meagan, for their belief in my abilities to accomplish this task. I also deeply appreciate my mother-in-law, Mary's, empathy for the work involved in completing a dissertation, especially working with statistics.

Heartfelt gratitude goes to my magnificent mom and dad for instilling deep within me the desire to work hard at those things most worth accomplishing. Though my mom

passed years before I began work on my doctoral degree, she shared in my dream to achieve this goal. Untold thanks to my wonderful dad who supported me during times of need with encouragement and confidence, carrying on my mom's dream for me.

I am also appreciative to my dear friends and fellow teachers, Brenda Morrison and Amie Turner, who have always been there for me and believed in my attempt to achieve this goal. A special thanks to my friends in Cohort IV, especially Matt Pearce, as we worked on all projects together, laughing through difficult and trying times.

Finally, to my advisor, friend, and source of inspiration, Dr. Barbara Martin – many thanks for the support and belief in my research and in me. You understood and appreciated my tremendous belief in the importance of leadership that served to invite people to succeed, while serving those you lead. To my entire committee, Dr. Martin, Dr. Cindy MacGregor, Dr. Lonnie Barker, Dr. David Brown, and Dr. Don Keck, thank you for your time, assistance, and support in achieving this final goal.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the mixed design study was to examine the perceived effectiveness of leaders who made use of the invitational leadership style of leading their organization. The theoretical foundation for this study was leadership theory as viewed through the lens of varying types of leadership models. Four research questions emerged throughout the study. The population for this research study consisted of all practicing public school principals in a Midwest state, as well as the teachers who serve under their leadership. Study participants consisted of 178 individuals. The *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices* and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices* surveys were utilized to collect pertinent data, as well as through semi-structured, open-ended interviews. Findings revealed that there is a statistically significant difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools. It was also concluded that there was no significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators. Qualitative findings established that teachers believed that the invitational qualities of respect and trust were leadership qualities that were most influential to creating an effective organization, while principals agreed that trust is the predominant influencing factor. The invitational leadership factor of people proved to be the undisputed choice for teachers and principals when striving to establish an overall effective school organization. The active use of invitational leadership was proven in this study to be a leadership model that should be considered effective when seeking to create a healthy, positive, and successful organization. Implications for leadership preparatory programs and recruitment are significant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....ii

 1. ABSTRACT iv

 2. LIST OF TABLES.....ix

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

 Background..... 1

 Conceptual Underpinnings for the Study..... 4

 Statement of the Problem..... 11

 Purpose of the Study..... 13

 Research Questions..... 14

 Statement of Hypotheses.....15

 Limitations and Assumptions 15

 Design Controls.....16

 Definition of Key Terms..... 18

 Summary..... 23

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

 Introduction..... 25

 Increased Accountability 27

 Need for Effective Leadership..... 34

 Organizational Health..... 38

 Leader as a Change Agent 40

 Development of School Culture 43

 Leadership Theories..... 47

Comprehensive Description of Invitational Leadership	48
Comparison of Invitational Leadership to Other Models	55
Need for a New Leadership Model.....	60
Gender Issues in Leadership.....	64
Summary.....	68
3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	
Introduction.....	70
Problem and Purpose Overview	71
Research Questions.....	72
Statement of Hypotheses.....	72
Population and Sample	73
Data Collection and Instrumentation	76
Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey.....	77
Interview Protocol.....	80
Data Analysis.....	82
The Researcher’s Biases and Assumptions.....	84
Summary.....	84
4. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	
Introduction.....	87
Data Analysis.....	90
Data Collection Instruments.....	90
Survey Instrument.....	90
Interview Protocol.....	94

Research Questions: Analysis of Data.....	93
Findings.....	106
Statement of Research Hypotheses.....	108
Summary.....	108
5. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Introduction.....	110
Purpose of the Study.....	110
Design and Procedures.....	113
Discussion of the Findings.....	114
Conclusions.....	127
Limitations and Design Control.....	132
Implications for Practice.....	134
Recommendations for Future Research.....	136
Summary.....	137
REFERENCE LIST.....	139
APPENDICES	
A. Counties located in quadrants of Midwest State.....	155
B. Superintendent’s Informed Consent Form.....	157
C. Informed Consent Form – Teacher Interview.....	159
D. Informed Consent Form – Principal Interview.....	160
E. Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices.....	162
F. Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices.....	167
G. Principal Interview Protocol.....	172

H. Teacher Interview Protocol.....	174
I. Permission from Kate Asbill to Modify Survey.....	176
J. Teacher comments on questions 43 and 44 of survey.....	177
K. Principal comments on questions 43 and 44 of survey.....	186
L. Definition of Invitational Leadership Terms for Interview Process.....	191
M. Leadership Survey Subscales.....	193
N. Invitational Leadership Concept Map.....	194
O. IRB Approval.....	195
VITA.....	197

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Usages of Invitational Leadership Qualities in Effective versus Less Effective Schools.....	95
2. Trust Subscale for Leaders of Effective versus Less Effective Schools.....	96
3. Respect Subscale for Leaders of Effective versus Less Effective Schools.....	97
4. Optimism Subscale for Leaders of Effective versus Less Effective Schools.....	98
5. Intentionality Subscale for Leaders of Effective versus Less Effective Schools.....	99
6. Perceived Effectiveness Subscale for Leaders of Effective versus Less Effective Schools.....	100
7. Invitational Leadership Qualities Based on Gender of Principal.....	102
8. Subscale Findings for Invitational Leadership Qualities Based on Gender Differences.....	103
9. Summary of Related Research.....	116

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background

The identification of effective leadership characteristics has been a long standing controversy for educators across the nation. The critical mass of research literature supports the concept that effective leadership is significant to the successful creation of a well balanced and healthy organization (Bruffee, 1999; Bolman & Deal, 1997; Furman, 2003; Schein, 2000; Yukl, 2006). The need to clearly distinguish and define the characteristics that comprise successful and effective leadership, resulting in high quality education, is of high significance to various stakeholders such as teachers, parents, students, and community members. Effective leaders are thought to serve as a positive model and influence on the overall attitudes and beliefs of their followers (Davis, 2003; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Schein, 2000).

As a result of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2002*, educational accountability standards have increased tremendously (Stecher & Kirby, 2004). Subsequently, educational leaders are now responsible for meeting expectations unparalleled to that of previous decades (Aldridge, 2003). As previously mentioned, stakeholders are primarily concerned about providing and receiving a quality education. While what constitutes a quality education may be difficult to delineate, Guttman (2005) summarized quality education as being comprised of two principles. The first element “identifies learners' cognitive development as a major explicit objective of education systems” (p. 1), and the second principle accentuates “the role of education in promoting shared values, responsible citizenship, and creative and emotional development--objectives that are

much more difficult to measure” (p.1). Authors Horn and Kincheloe (2001) postulated that stakeholders are searching for "a high-quality education that seeks not to restrict, regulate, and contain students and teachers but to engage them in understanding new levels of thinking, of better ways of being human" (p. 38). As rigorous expectations of quality education continue to spiral, the demand for high accountability persists to increase as well. Consequently, as accountability standards increase, the need for improved effective leadership, organizational health, the leader as a change agent, and the development of a positive school culture increases in direct correspondence.

When considering educational programs and academic outcomes, public outcry has prevalently been voiced and subsequently sanctioned by the educational community at large (Rosenbach & Taylor, 1998). In response to these changing and amplified conditions of accountability, numerous leadership models have been designed to meet the leadership needs of the past several decades (Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Kezar, 2000; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000; Sergiovanni, 2000; Spears & Lawrence, 2004; Yukl, 2006). While models such as transformational and servant leadership have served educational leaders for several decades, one comprehensive model has been created that promises to provide a positive and encouraging structure to guide today’s leaders through complex times.

The relatively new model referred to is invitational leadership. The invitational leadership model was designed by William Purkey and Betty Siegel in 2002 based on the invitational theory of practice. As Purkey (1992) articulated, “Invitational theory is a collection of assumptions that seek to explain phenomena and provide a means of intentionally summoning people to realize their relatively boundless potential in all areas

of worthwhile human endeavor” (p. 5). Purkey further explained the purpose of invitational leadership:

Its purpose is to address the entire global nature of human existence and opportunity, and to make life a more exciting, satisfying and enriching experience. Invitational theory is unlike any other system reported in the professional literature in that it provides an overarching framework for a variety of programs, policies, places and processes that fit with its basic components. (p. 5)

The leadership model of invitational leadership is a comprehensive design that is inclusive of many vital elements needed for the success of today’s educational organizations. Contemporary school leaders must go far beyond the everyday tasks of budgets, making schedules, dealing with student behavior and irate parents. As Bolman and Deal (2002) ascertained:

The most important responsibility of school leaders is not to answer every question fully or make every decision correctly. They, of course, need to track budgets, comply with mandates and keep the buses running. But as leaders they serve a deeper, more powerful and more durable role when they are models and catalysts for such values as excellence, caring, justice and faith. (p. 1)

These servant types of values: excellence, caring, justice, and faith are all inherent elements of the invitational leadership model. Review of current literature firmly supports the need for a change in leadership in order to adequately meet the needs of current educational institutions (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, Harris, & Hadfield, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Rosener, 1990). Halpern (2004) affirmed that "Rapid changes . . . require

new kinds of leadership - leaders who have the necessary knowledge to achieve a goal and leaders who can manage amid the uncertainty of nonstop change" (p. 126). The necessity for a change in leadership is further warranted based on the need for an "ethic of caring" (Grogan, 2003, p. 25). Current literature also strongly supports this need for a leadership model that is caring and ethical in nature (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Bolman & Deal, 2002; Grogan, 2003; Halpin, 2003; Patton, 1997; Tallon, 1997). Grogan (2003) described leadership as being "predicated on caring about those he or she serves" (p. 24).

Invitational leadership exemplifies a model of caring as an integral part of its primary tenets and fundamental belief system. As Halpin (2003) concluded:

Social capital, which is the crucible of trust, refers to the ability of people to work together for common purposes. Invitational leadership contributes to its growth by the way in which it cares for and supports the efforts of others. (p. 84)

Invitational leadership is comprehensive in nature, consisting of many positive and essentially sound educational components (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Kelly, Brown, Butler, Gittens, Taylor & Zeller, 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005), it may well serve as a model of leadership that will positively impact the diverse and changing needs of today's educational organizations.

Conceptual Underpinnings of the Study

Accountability standards in education have increased significantly in the past few years, primarily based on the issue of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. The theoretical foundation for this study is largely based on the need for a new model of leadership which will accommodate the ever changing complexion and needs of today's

educational community (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, et al., 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Rosener, 1990).

This study was framed through the lens of leadership. As a result of an expansive literature review, five main components surfaced as recurring themes among current trends in leadership. These components consist of: increased accountability, need for effective leadership, organizational health, leader as a change agent, and development of school culture.

Increased Accountability

Today's educational leaders are faced with an onslaught of intense national, state, and local standards of accountability, while experiencing a reduction in financial allocations, resources, and public support. The level of high stakes testing, accountability, and public pressure to meet these high standards, compared to the shrinking resources and support, is unparalleled by accountability pressures of past decades. The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, proposed by President George Bush, served as a mechanism of educational reform. As Stecher and Kirby (2004) articulated, "Educational accountability became the law of the land with the passage of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*" (p. iii). When referring to new standards of accountability, Carnoy, Elmore, and Siskin (2003) concluded, "The expressed purpose of the new state accountability systems is to raise student achievement and, more generally, to improve the quality of schooling" (p. 6). While increased accountability has indeed enhanced the quality of schooling, it has also amplified the pressure to meet set standards with high performance ratings.

With the advent of the *No Child Left Behind Act* came stringent standards with which school leaders were now forced to comply. The standard of meeting AYP (annual yearly progress) became a main focus for educators, as well as striving to ensure adequate improvement for all marginalized sub-groups within the organization. While adequate funding was pledged from its inception, school districts have been left to carry most of the financial burden, with less than the promised amounts received (Aldridge, 2003; Houston, Education World School Issue, 2006).

Failure to meet the new standards of accountability results in strict sanctions against the struggling school or district. It is critical for contemporary educational leaders to possess the skills and knowledge necessary to lead their organizations during these turbulent times (Caldwell & Hayward, 1998; Davis, 2003; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Furman, 2003, Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Muijs & Harris, 2003; Schein, 2000). The desire of educational leaders to successfully meet accountability standards was aptly described by Carnoy, Elmore, and Siskin (2003) when they affirmed, “School administrators and teachers, exposed to scrutiny by published test scores, are expected to improve educational delivery to avoid ‘failing’ and to gain the rewards of high academic achievement” (p. 6).

Need for Effective Leadership

As changing times and standards create a new arena for improving skills and abilities possessed by leaders, the need for the development of effective leadership qualities becomes more important and necessary than in any other time in history (Davis, 2003; Furman, 2003; Muijs & Harris, 2003; Schein, 2000). During this period of instability it is critical that today’s leaders acquire skills that will prove effective and

reliable. Bolman and Deal (2002) concluded that effective leaders "are able to see pattern and order where others are overwhelmed by confusion" (p. 1). Effective leadership is an educational organization's best hope for dealing with confusion and unpredictable sources of financial support, increasing mandated standards, and public criticism. Moreover, authors and theorists have established that effective leadership will indeed serve as the cornerstone for future success in coping with the ever-changing educational needs of today's society (Davis, 2003; Furman, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Schein, 2000). Hallinger and Heck (1999) were quite explicit about their belief that effective leadership is greatly responsible for overall school effectiveness, as well as for student achievement.

Organizational Health

The ability to establish a healthy organization is yet another component critical to the needs of overall leadership success (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Hill, 2003; Schein, 1996; Yukl, 2006). The term *organization* has been defined as, "a complex social system of patterned interactions among people" (Yukl, 2006, p. 432). This interaction among people is critical to the success or failure of creating a healthy organization (Lencioni, 2002; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Yukl, 2006). Hill (2003) described organizational health as "an organization's ability to function effectively, to cope adequately, to change appropriately and to grow from within" (p. 1). As effective leaders seek to create an organization that is capable of growth and success, they must be attentive to all aspects that contribute to the overall health of the organization (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Lencioni, 2002; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Schein, 1996).

Currently, educational leaders must pay great attention to their organization's ability to cope and function in the midst of external and internal pressures to meet high academic and public standards (Aldridge, 2003). When highlighting the need for educational leaders to develop healthy organizations Hill (2003) concluded "exemplary school districts are purposeful, dynamic, healthy and continuously growing learning organizations that target all of their resources toward student development" (p. 1). As an effective leader attempts to build a healthy organization, it is of utmost importance that he or she be able to handle the issue of change in a diplomatic and successful manner (Kotter, 1999; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Schein, 2000; Sims & Sims, 2002).

Leader as a Change Agent

When striving to develop a healthy organization, the ability to handle change with a positive approach is an essential characteristic of an effective and successful leader. As previously established, today's educational climate is most decidedly characterized by change (Bennis, Spreitzer, & Cummings, 2001; Conger, Spreitzer, & Lawler, 1999; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Kotter, 1999; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Schein, 2000; Sims & Sims, 2002). Serving as an agent for change is not uncommon to many contemporary educational leaders. The exacting manner in which leaders handle the change process is of critical importance to the healthy growth of any organization (Bennis, Spreitzer, & Cummings, 2001; Conger, Spreitzer, & Lawler, 1999; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Kotter, 1999; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Schein, 2000; Sims & Sims, 2002).

The critical nature of how effectively leaders handle change within their organizations was encapsulated by Sims and Sims (2002) when they stated:

As the twenty-first century begins, the world is in a constant state of change, and no organization, in the United States or elsewhere, can escape the effects of operating in a continually dynamic, evolving landscape. The forces of change are so great that the future success, indeed the very survival, of thousands of organizations depends on how well they respond to change or, optimally, whether they can actually stay ahead of change. (p. 1)

Within the educational community, the need for long lasting, effectual change is a top priority for most interested stakeholders (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Kotter, 1999; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Schein, 2000). Halpin (2003) noted that effective change is most possible when the change process is handled correctly. The author further noted that people “feel able and willing to embrace change if the way in which they are requested to do so by their managers is interpreted by them as welcoming and affirming. Such positive invitations tell them that they are able, responsible and worthwhile” (p. 81). The positive handling of the change process is of particular importance during these troubled times for education (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Kotter, 1999; Leithwood & Duke, 1999).

Development of School Culture

A current trend in leadership theory is the importance of developing a positive school culture (Ayman, 1995; Martin, 2002; Peterson & Smith, 2000; Rafaeli & Worline, 2000; Schein, 2000; Tierney, 1988). It is firmly believed that the development of a strong and optimistic culture is one of the best qualities that any educational leader can strive to achieve in his or her organization (Martin, 2002; Peterson & Smith, 2000). Schein (1996) defined culture as “the set of shared, taken-for-granted implicit assumptions that a group holds and that determines how it perceives, thinks about, and reacts to its various

environments” (p. 236). The successful dealing with the ever-changing environment is a natural concern and priority for contemporary educational leaders.

The need for the development of a shared vision that reflects the culture of the organization is a top priority among effective leaders. As the vision for the creation of a positive school culture is shared, the likelihood of developing a culture that supports the needs of the organization’s members is strongly increased (Martin, 2002; Peterson & Smith, 2000; Tierney, 1988). Similarly, researchers (Lencioni, 2002; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Preskill & Torres, 1999) agree that the establishment of trust and respect are critical to the creation of a positive school culture. Interestingly, invitational leadership is built strongly on the foundation of trust and respect when creating a successful organization (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005).

Varying aspects of leadership effectiveness identified in the literature review became the specific constructs to be analyzed through the lens of leadership. The components of increased accountability, need for effective leadership, organizational health, leader as a change agent, and development of school culture surfaced as major themes to reflect on when considering leadership models and theories. The inter-relationship of these themes, as viewed through the lens of leadership, informed this study. These integrated themes were foundational to this study, serving as an outline of effective leadership characteristics necessary for organizational growth and success. One overarching question clearly emerged: As a result of current educational turmoil, do presently relied upon leadership models adequately serve today’s educational leaders?

Statement of the Problem

Today's educational climate has changed significantly in the last few years resulting in a marked increase in issues of accountability, high stakes standards, and shrinking resources available to all school districts. Schools are expected to educate children of all major and marginalized subgroups to a heightened degree never before expected by modern measures. Faced with these seemingly insurmountable tasks, educational leaders are expected to manage organizational quality while increasing the academic outcome for all stakeholders.

As a result of *No Child Left Behind* mandates "states rushed to develop accountability systems that met the requirements of the new law" (Stecher & Kirby, 2004, p. 1). Subsequently, states were directed to "establish a definition of 'adequate yearly progress' (AYP) to use each year to determine the achievement of each school district and school" (U. S. Department of Education, July 24, 2002, ¶ 2). Educators at all levels of public education began to sense the urgency of the situation, striving immediately to meet standards which seemed unattainable to all within the educational community. Educational leaders were most profoundly affected by these mandates, being held responsible for the ultimate attainment of these increased standards of accountability.

Educational leaders are currently faced with the need to develop strong programs of academic instruction, appropriate curriculum, and ongoing assessments which allows for both formative and summative tracking of students' academic achievement. Educational leaders are also responsible for building high functioning teams (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Lencioni, 2002), healthy and learning

organizations (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Hill, 2003; Schein, 1996; Yukl, 2006), effective change (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Morgan, 1998; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Schlechty, 2000), and the creation of a positive school culture (Ayman, 1995; Martin, 2002; Peterson & Smith, 2000; Rafaeli & Worline, 2000; Schein, 2000; Tierney, 1988). In order to promote these organizational qualities, leaders must model behaviors which are aligned with the organization's goals for success. Kouzes and Posner (2002) suggested "to effectively model the behavior they expect of others, leaders must first be clear about their guiding principles . . . Leaders must find their own voice, and then they must clearly give voice to their values" (p. 14). As leaders seek to find their voice and style of leadership, models or guidelines often prove helpful in creating an effective set of behaviors to emulate (Yukl, 2006).

Educational leaders have had access to numerous models of leadership by which to pattern their behaviors, roles, and responsibilities (Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Kezar, 2000; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000; Sergiovanni, 2000; Spears & Lawrence, 2004; Yukl, 2006). Due to current stringent levels of accountability and consequences, educational leaders are required to possess skills unsurpassed in previous decades. Recent research has indicated that current leadership models may well fall short in preparing contemporary leaders for the challenges of today's educational institutes (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, et al., 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Rosener, 1990). Consequently, a need exists for a new model of leadership that provides the guidance and direction that will serve the educational leaders of the twenty-first century (Billups, 1999; Burke, 2002; Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996; Stecher & Kirby, 2004; Tungate & Orie, 1998).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate in what ways and to what degree, if any, an invitational leader impacts the overall success of the public school setting. This study focused on leadership qualities and characteristics which lead to successful and consistent achievement. Achievement was measured by accountability standards as described by *No Child Left Behind* mandates and subsequent state standards referred to as the *MSIP* (Missouri School Improvement Plan) process.

A mixed-design descriptive approach was chosen to support the focus of this study. A descriptive study “describes a given state of affairs as fully and carefully as possible” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003, p. 15). In view of the fact that school organizations are comprised of numerous and varied aspects of the educational process, this study was designed to purposefully identify and articulate explicit characteristics and behaviors of leaders believed to conduct themselves in an invitational leadership manner. Of further importance to this study was the potential impact that invitational characteristics may or may not have on the overall success of an educational organization.

One aspect of leadership theory that clearly has not been extensively researched is the relatively new model of invitational leadership as outlined by Purkey and Siegel in 2002 (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000; Egley, 2003). While the invitational leadership model contains certain parallels to participative, transformational, and servant leadership, the invitational model transcends these common parallels in several elements of design. The results of this study should contribute to the current body of research and literature on invitational leadership. This study should also serve as a potential model for those individuals training future educational leaders as a viable and successful model to

emulate when dealing with the educational challenges of the twenty-first century (Day et al., 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005).

Research Questions

Initial review of literature evidenced the fact that a modest amount of research and purposeful study has been conducted on the subject of invitational leadership (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000; Egley, 2003). Asbill and Gonzalez (2000) concluded that their attempt at an extensive literature review “revealed that little had been written on the application of Invitational Theory to administrative practices” (p. 14). Egley (2003) further established “the research on the effects of Invitational Education Theory in the educational administrative process is relatively new as compared to other theories pertaining to leadership” (p. 57). Additional and supported information is needed in order to more fully understand the potential benefits of the invitational leadership model.

Research and information gained from a synthesis of related literature (Day et al., 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005) helped formulate research questions and guide this study. The researcher attempted to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools?
2. Is there a significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators?
3. What invitational leadership characteristics do the leaders implement or exhibit that lead to organizational success?

4. Which characteristics of invitational leadership do teachers and administrators view as the most influential in contributing to an overall effective school?

Statement of Hypotheses

In the attempt to answer research questions one and two, a null hypothesis was formulated by the researcher. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) defined hypothesis as “a prediction, a statement of what specific results or outcomes are expected to occur” (p. 20). The authors further explained that null hypothesis “specifies there is *no* relationship in the population” (p.236). The following null hypotheses were investigated in this study:

Hypothesis 1. There is no statistically significant difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools.

Hypothesis 2. There is no statistically significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators.

Limitations and Assumptions

According to Hayes, Young, Matchett, Mccaffrey, Cochran, and Hajduk (1992) "all research methods have their limitations" (p. 43). It is imperative that a well designed research study clearly delineate limitations of the study so that the reader is aware of the potential lack of generalization of findings to other potential studies. This study was limited by the geographical area studied and the design used by the researcher. Specific limitations are listed as follows:

1. This study was limited by geographic parameters utilized in one Midwest state.
2. This study was limited by use of one academic school year from which to derive results.

3. This study was further limited by the degree of validity and reliability of the survey instrument utilized by the researcher.
4. It was assumed that participants were open and honest in their responses and interpreted the survey instrument and interview protocol in the way in which they were intended.
5. It was assumed that participants responded to the survey/interview based on personal experiences.
6. This study was limited by the extent of experience the researcher possessed in survey and interview skills.
7. Researcher bias is assumed to be a limitation of the study as well. An attempt to control research bias was addressed through the use of the triangulation of the on-going review of data and by additional review of an educational researcher.

Design Controls

The design of this study was carefully based on a method of descriptive research. Descriptive research is particularly effective when analyzing complex educational issues which involve abilities and behaviors. The use of surveys is frequently employed when conducting descriptive research due to accessibility to analyze the thoughts and viewpoints of various individuals. Seels, Fullerton, Berry, and Horn (2004) concluded "The common denominator among such studies is the use of survey techniques for the purpose of reporting characteristics of populations or samples" (p. 257). Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) further determined that "the most common descriptive methodology is the survey, as when researchers summarize the characteristics (abilities, preferences, behaviors, and so on) of individuals or groups, or (sometimes) physical environments

(such as schools)” (p. 15). The researcher specifically sought self reporting input from superintendents and principals, as well as teachers serving under individuals thought to possess invitational leadership qualities and leaders from schools deemed to be less effective.

A cross-sectional survey was chosen by the researcher to provide a quantitative measure to the data collection process. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) defined cross-sectional survey as “information from a sample that has been drawn from a predetermined population. Furthermore, the information is collected at just one point in time” (p. 397). The cross-sectional survey provided for a greater depth of analysis when considering the need for the use of invitational leadership.

Additionally, the design of this study included the associational research format. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) described associational research as “research that investigates relationships” (p. 15). The design of associational research allows the researcher to transcend the simplicity of describing events or opinions by investigating existing relationships between concepts. This study may further be delineated as correlational, since the researcher studied the possible correlation between invitational leadership characteristics and overall positive achievement and success outcomes. Data collection and analysis allowed the researcher to investigate the possible link between invitational leadership qualities and organizational success.

Analysis of MSIP information and interviews were used as a triangulation method to buttress the information revealed from the survey process. Seidman (1998) articulated that conducting an interview is “a powerful way to gain insight into educational issues through understanding the experience of the individuals whose lives constitute education”

(p. 7). Furthermore, qualitative data gathered through follow-up interviews supported the findings gathered from the quantitative data. Subsequently, open-ended, semi-structured interviews were conducted to assist in the researcher's ability to provide rich, thick description to the research findings (Merriam, 1998). Merriam summarized rich, thick description as "providing enough description so that readers will be able to determine how closely their situations match the research situation, and hence, whether findings can be transferred" (p. 211).

A significant obstacle to the survey method of inquiry was the possibility for lack of response from subjects who were asked to respond to the surveys (Seels et al., 2004). Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) described this phenomenon as "nonresponse" (p. 407). The authors concluded that "in almost all surveys, some members of the sample will not respond" (p. 407). In an effort to overcome this obstacle, the researcher personally contacted superintendents, principals, and teacher leaders to request their approval for inclusion in this study. Assurance of anonymity was further guaranteed in attempt to control for honest and experience based responses from all participants.

Definition of Key Terms

It is important to note that certain key terms were utilized throughout this study. For the benefit of the reader in establishing a critical common language (Bruffee, 1999) the following terms have been defined to add clarification to the study:

Accountability. Stecher and Kirby (2004) explained that, "Accountability in education refers to the practice of holding educational systems responsible for the quality of their products – students' knowledge, skills, and behaviors" (p. 1).

AYP (Adequate Yearly Progress). The NCLB Act mandates “all schools, districts and states to show that students are making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in communication arts and mathematics. NCLB requires states to establish annual performance targets that would result in all students scoring at the proficient level on the state’s assessment by 2014” (Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education Website).

Accredited for Distinction in Performance. Accredited for Distinction in Performance has been defined as “districts that meet all but one of the MSIP Performance measures and all MAP and Reading standards according to the most recent Annual Performance report (APR)” (Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education Website).

Consistent Achievement/Overall Effectiveness. These terms are used interchangeably throughout this study to refer to achievement that leads to school effectiveness/school success. Achievement which is considered consistent is determined by a school district having met MSIP requirements on a regular basis, particularly if met with distinction.

Effective Schools. For the purpose of this study, the criteria of school success was defined as districts which were chosen based on their performance in meeting MSIP standards which qualified the district for the label of “*Accredited for Distinction in Performance*” for four or five successive years. Districts were also chosen based on their school’s ability to meet *AYP* (Adequate Yearly Progress) for two or more successive years.

Invitational Leadership. Leadership that is based on invitational theory which “is a collection of assumptions that seek to explain phenomena and provide a means of intentionally summoning people to realize their relatively boundless potential in all areas of worthwhile human endeavor” (Purkey, 1992, p. 5). Invitational leaders invite people within an organization to succeed. Invitational qualities demonstrated by the leader supports others in their attempt to succeed. It is important to note that that invitational leadership has been created based upon four basic assumptions that exemplify invitational leaders. The four assumptions are as follows:

1. *Optimism* – the belief that people have untapped potential for growth and development (Day et. al, 2001, p. 34).
2. *Respect* – the recognition that each person is an individual of worth (Day et. al, 2001, p.34). The belief that everyone is able, valuable, and responsible and is to be treated accordingly.
3. *Trust* – possessing “confidence in the abilities, integrity, and responsibilities of ourselves and others” (Purkey & Siegel, 2003, p. 12).
4. *Intention* – a decision to purposely act in a certain way, to achieve and carry out a set goal, (Day et. al, 2001, p. 34). Stillion and Siegel, (2005) defined *intention* as, “knowing what we intend to bring about as well as how we intend it to happen gives clarity and direction to our work” (§ 15).

Invitational leadership focuses on the framework of five areas which contribute to the success or failure of individuals. Purkey and Siegel (2003) refer to these areas as the five P’s. These five areas “exist in practically every environment” and serve as a means by which to invite others professionally (Purkey, 1992, p. 7). The five P’s consist of:

1. *People* – Purkey (1992) affirmed that “nothing is more important in life than people. It is the people who create a respectful, optimistic, trusting and intentional society” (p. 7).
2. *Places* – refers to the physical environment of an organization. It has been suggested that places are the easiest of the five areas to change due to their visibility.
3. *Policies* – “Policies refer to the procedures, codes, rules, written or unwritten, used to regulate the ongoing functions of individuals and organizations” (Purkey, 1992, p. 7).
4. *Programs* – Programs play an important role in invitational leadership “because programs often focus on narrow objectives that neglect the wider scope of human needs” (Purkey, 1992, p. 7). Invitational leaders find it important to monitor programs to insure that they fulfill the goals which they were designed for (Purkey, 1992, p. 7).
5. *Processes* – The “how something is accomplished” (Purkey & Siegel, 2003, p. 125). The final P addresses the “ways in which the other four P’s function (Purkey, 1992, p. 7). Processes can be defined as the way that people, places, policies, and programs are evident in a school.

Less Effective Schools. Less effective schools were defined as though schools which never received the MSIP status of *Accredited for Distinction in Performance*.

MSIP (Missouri School Improvement Program). “A Department of Elementary and secondary program requiring all school districts to meet specific standards and show

continuous progress in their programs” (Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education Website).

Organization. Yukl (2002) defined organization as “a complex social system of patterned interactions among people” (p. 431).

Organizational Health. Hill (2003) described organizational health as “an organization's ability to function effectively, to cope adequately, to change appropriately and to grow from within” (p. 1).

Overall Effectiveness/Consistent Achievement. (Terms used interchangeably) Overall effectiveness is defined as what is considered sufficiently effective by each state in order to successfully meet or exceed state educational standards. Overall effectiveness may also refer to the organization’s ability to create and maintain positive organizational health and culture.

Participative Leadership. Participative leadership is defined by Leithwood et al. (2000) as a leadership style which “assumes that the decision-making processes of the group ought to be the central focus for leaders” (p. 12).

School Culture. Schein (1996) defined culture as “the set of shared, taken-for-granted implicit assumptions that a group holds and that determines how it perceives, thinks about, and reacts to its various environments” (p. 236).

School Success. For the purpose of this study, the criteria of school success was defined as districts which were chosen based on their performance in meeting MSIP standards which qualified the district for the label of “*Accredited for Distinction in Performance*”. Districts were also chosen based on their school’s ability to meet *AYP* (Adequate Yearly Progress) for two or more successive years.

Servant Leadership. A leadership style that is based on influencing others through service to the people being led.

Stakeholders. Stakeholders are considered to hold a vested interest in the general outcome of a specific effort (Patton, 1997).

Transformational Leadership. A leadership style that is based on influencing others through shared goals and empowering others to achieve more than they believed possible.

Summary

Since the advent of No Child Left Behind there has been an increase in accountability in all aspects of educational endeavors. As a result of this increase in accountability, a need for highly effective leadership is of greater importance than ever before. Radd (1998) analyzed “with the growing number of documented at-risk youth a systematic approach is needed to invite students to learn and stay in school. We need to recognize and apply proven processes so that intentionally positive invitations occur for all students” (p. 19).

Thus, the focus of this study was to examine a leadership style that might provide the necessary skills needed in today’s educational organizations. Purkey and Siegel’s (2002) invitational leadership model has been suggested as a viable model to emulate in the twenty-first century. Egley (2003) argued:

Invitational Leadership is a refreshing change from the standard theories of leadership that emphasized the process of influencing others through the use of power to an alternative leadership style that promotes collaboration and shows consideration and respect for individuals in the educational system. (p. 57)

This study focused on assessing the extent, if any, an invitational leader impacts the overall success of the public school setting. Additionally, this study concentrated on leadership qualities and characteristics which lead to successful and consistent achievement. Descriptive research was employed to provide analysis of complex educational issues which involve abilities and behaviors. A survey and interviews were conducted in the attempt to identify the extent of impact experienced through the application of invitational leadership.

Chapter Two provides an expansive literature review which focused on the following related components: increasing accountability issues, need for effective leadership, organizational health, leader as a change agent, development of school culture, leadership theories, comprehensive description of invitational leadership, comparison of invitational leadership to other models, and finally the need for a new leadership model. A description of the research design and methodology is presented in Chapter Three. The presentation and analysis of the data are presented in Chapter Four of this study. Chapter Five is comprised of this study's summary, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

Chapter Two

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

One of the most controversial issues within the field of education has been that of identifying successful characteristics of leaders. Experts agree that effective leadership serves as the corner stone to success in any organization (Bruffee, 1999; Bolman & Deal, 1997; Furman, 2003; Schein, 2000; Yukl, 2006). Subsequently, the attempt to thoroughly understand what comprises effective leadership is of high importance to educators concerned with promoting excellence. Teachers, professors, superintendents, principals, and caring parents embrace a vested interest in promoting quality in educational leadership. The skills possessed by a leader are undeniable ingredients which contribute to the success or failure of any organization (Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Schein, 2000; Yukl, 2006). Although there is no singularly accepted set of leadership skills and characteristics, many researchers generally agree that effective leaders can successfully guide and influence the attitudes and productivity of their followers (Davis, 2003; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Furman, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000; Schein, 2000; Yukl, 2006).

According to Bass and Stogdill (1990), well over 8,000 books and journal articles have been written about leadership and the importance of the abilities possessed by organizational leaders. The authors further emphasized that, “From the days of Aristotle and Homer, through Machiavelli and Shakespeare, writers have explored the phenomenon of leadership and followership” (p. 4). Today’s educational community

continues to demonstrate an increased interest in the changing needs of leadership, especially in light of current social conditions.

As the complexion of modern education has transformed significantly over the past two decades, the responsibilities and functions of today's educational leaders have changed considerably as well. Contemporary educational leaders face a myriad of rigorous and intense national, state, and local standards of accountability in the midst of shrinking resources and support (Aldridge, 2003; Jennings, 2003; Penner, 1981; Shapiro, 1990). Today's school leaders also face an increase of public scrutiny which accentuates the need for strong, positive, and exceptional leadership within our public school systems (Caldwell, & Hayward, 1998).

In response to this increased need for excellent management and guidance, many leadership models have been designed and implemented to meet the ever demanding needs of the educational community (Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Kezar, 2000; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000; Sergiovanni, 2000; Spears & Lawrence, 2004; Yukl, 2006). In the midst of previously established leadership models, one relatively new model has been carefully and thoughtfully created. This model, referred to as invitational leadership, was introduced in 2002 by Purkey and Siegel. As Stillion and Siegel (2005) summarized, "Purkey . . . having studied human behavior for four decades, proposed that leaders must take an invitational stance in dealing with others and in developing themselves" (p. 4). Invitational leadership is a comprehensive model that may well serve as a template for successful educational leadership during these times of tremendous educational change and increased accountability (Ellis, 1990; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stanley, Juhnke, & Purkey, 2004; Schmidt, 1997).

The purpose of this study was to investigate in what ways and to what degree, if any, an invitational leader impacts the overall success of the public school setting. Within the context of this literature review, the following related components were carefully examined: increasing accountability issues, need for effective leadership, organizational health, leader as a change agent, development of school culture, leadership theories, comprehensive description of invitational leadership, comparison of invitational leadership to other models, and finally the need for a new leadership model. The researcher sought to use these varying components to establish and substantiate the need for considering a more specific and inclusive leadership model, such as invitational leadership, in response to the current demand for increased standards and accountability. The aforementioned components were further examined through the lens of leadership theory to validate the need for discovering new ways to lead effectively in the face of changing educational requirements and increased accountability.

Increased Accountability

The changing disposition of today's society is serving to shape the future of how education is perceived and how educators, especially educational leaders, deal with and react to the ever changing needs of the stakeholders they serve. The changing social fiber was emphasized by the Council of Chief State School Officers (1996):

The social fabric of society is changing, often in dramatic ways. On the one hand, the pattern of the fabric is being rewoven. In particular, we are becoming a more diverse society – racially, linguistically and culturally. On the other hand, the social fabric is unraveling for many children and their families. Poverty is

increasing. Indexes of physical, mental, and moral well-being are declining. The stock of social capital is decreasing as well. (p. 5)

As educational leaders witness the decline in previously mentioned societal dynamics, they realize with greater certainty that the leadership ways of the past will no longer adequately serve today's students.

Today's leaders of public school organizations are faced with a myriad of challenges that have rarely been faced in past decades. These challenges include such issues as social pressures, legal issues, increased standards and accountability, as well as quality of educational outcomes. Stecher and Kirby (2004) explained that, "Accountability in education refers to the practice of holding educational systems responsible for the quality of their products – students' knowledge, skills, and behaviors" (p. 1).

One major challenge for leaders to contend with is the consideration of what students encounter on a daily basis. Today's students are challenged with extremely difficult choices regarding peer pressure, societal standards, and mores. As students face such issues as drugs, alcohol, sexually transmitted diseases, and pressures to perform academically, leaders are forced to deal with these same issues from an administrative perspective (Cross, 1997). In dealing with these social challenges within the school setting, leaders of educational organizations must cope with these difficulties delicately and diplomatically, while dealing adequately with consequences that might prove harmful to the school setting (Sallis, 2002). Yet another challenge that today's educational leaders deal with is an increasingly litigious society (Burke, 2002). One author concluded that for educators an issue that is "fast becoming one of every educator's fears – a lawsuit" (Billups, 1999, p. 1). Additionally, Burke (2002) reflected

that “When lawsuits are filed over playground squabbles among children, or injuries suffered in a weekend basketball game, or against ministers who offer pastoral counsel, something basic has gone wrong” (p. 171). As law suits have increased, so has the pressure to conform to all areas of standards and accountability (Billups, 1999; Burke, 2002; Tungate & Orie, 1998).

As social and legal pressures have increased, the field of education has been hard hit by critics calling for higher standards of accountability for all educators. “Accountability advocates believe that student achievement will improve only when educators are judged in terms of student performance and experience consequences as a result” (Stecher & Kirby, 2004, p. 2). In response to this call for increased accountability, the United States Congress worked to redesign a previously existing education act. “In December 2001, the U.S. Congress approved a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and renamed it the ‘No Child Left Behind Act’” (Stecher, Hamilton & Gonzalez, 2003, p. 1). Stecher et al. (2003) further concluded that the No Child Left Behind Act “has broader scope and is more ambitious than any previous federal school reform legislation. One of the major changes in NCLB is an emphasis on accountability based on student test results” (p. 1). Educational leaders would now have to meet the challenge of a new set of stringent standards.

No child left behind. The proposed answer to the outcry for increased accountability came in the form of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (henceforth referred to as NCLB). The NCLB act served as a catalyst for educational reform, whether educators wanted it or not. As Stecher and Kirby (2004) voiced, “Educational accountability became the law of the land with the passage of the No Child Left Behind

Act of 2001” (p. iii). Leaders were forced to now view and analyze their organizations in specific ways they were previously unaccustomed to. The NCLB act has garnered a great many opponents, as well as supporters, for its tenets of accountability. In a speech made to a United States Department of Education Conference, John Boehner, Chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce remarked:

I was proud to work closely . . . to pass the No Child Left Behind Act. Some of us are conservatives, others are liberals. But we all share a common belief in the potential of American education. No Child Left Behind reflects that strongly held belief. It’s about hope. It says no child in America should be written off as unteachable simply because he or she happened to be born into a certain demographic group. And no school should be written off as incapable of producing results simply because it operates in a disadvantaged community.

(June 12, 2002)

Opponents to the NCLB act take quite a different view of the 2001 enacted public law.

The National Education Association stated on their web page:

The law has serious shortcomings.

- It imposes invalid one-size-fits-all measures on students, failing to recognize different children learn in different ways and with different timelines.
- Its vision of accountability focuses more on punishing children and schools by not giving them the support they need to improve.
- It favors privatization, rather than teacher-led, family-oriented solutions.

(The National Education Association, 2006)

Regardless of their view of the NCLB act, educators have been left to carry out the specific details and components of the law. As Stecher and Kirby (2004) concluded:

Although the No Child Left Behind act is hundreds of pages long and details of its implementation are quite complex, the logic of its accountability system is quite simple. The accountability system has three major components: *Goals – explicit statements of desired student performance – to convey clear and shared expectations for all parties * Assessments for measuring attainment of goals and judging success * Consequences (rewards or sanctions) to motivate administrators, teachers, and students to maximize effort and effectiveness. (p. 2)

There are stringent consequences to bear for those school districts that prove themselves unable to meet the criteria and standards set forth in the NCLB act of 2001.

Aldridge (2003) summarized the consequences of not meeting NCLB tenets as follows:

Sanctions will be placed on schools that fail to meet the adequate yearly progress (AYP) standards. If a school fails to meet AYP for two consecutive years, the school is identified as ‘needing improvement’ and school choice (e.g., vouchers) must be offered to students, at the cost of the ‘failing’ school. If the school does not meet AYP for three consecutive years, supplemental services must be provided through Title I funds. If the school fails to meet AYP for four consecutive years, corrective actions will take place. These sanctions could include replacing school staff, changing the curriculum, decreasing administrative authority, increasing the length of the school day, and changing the organizational structure of the school. If the school fails to meet the AYP for five years, all staff

could be fired and the school could be reopened as a charter school or taken over by the state. (§ 5)

Educators throughout the nation strive daily to make every attempt to fulfill the numerous standards delineated in NCLB with the constant knowledge that failure to do so would prove devastating to all interested stakeholders.

Residual problems of NCLB. Educational leaders are now faced with the dilemma of inadequate funding in the wake of No Child Left Behind mandates. As articulated by Reggie Felton (2005), director of federal relations for the National School Board Association, “While unfunded state and federal mandates long have been problems for school districts, the No Child Left Behind Act has put more pressure on school budget-makers” (§ 5 of Education World School Issue). Felton further emphasized, “When the federal law [NCLB] was passed, they [school officials] were told funding would accompany the mandates. When that did not come, they became concerned . . . Clearly, it is our position that federal funding is not adequate” (§ 6 of Education World School Issue).

School leaders have dealt with many issues as a result of the NCLB act. While funding has been a primary issue, other problems have arisen as well. Aldridge (2003) argued:

The No Child Left Behind requirements have placed further pressure on states during this crisis. Although NCLB funding increased, the total allocated still falls more than \$5 billion short of what was originally authorized. Testing, hiring of new teachers and paraprofessionals, increasing the qualifications of current

personnel, and creating data collection and warehousing systems are examples of requirements that federal spending will not fully cover. (§ 4)

Additional stress and skills required of current leaders have served to complicate the position held by leaders in educational institutions throughout the nation.

Lack of guidance and clarified direction has served as a tremendous depletion of energy, time, effort, and resources on the parts of public school leaders at the state and local levels. The American Federation of Teachers (2006) concluded in their newsletter:

Unfortunately, flaws in the law are undercutting its original promise. Guidance for states has been unclear, untimely and unhelpful, and the U.S. Department of Education's attempts to make the law more flexible have brought about only minimal improvements without addressing NCLB's larger flaws. Underlying all these issues is the pervasive problem of funding, which is far less than what was promised and far less than what is needed. (§ 2 American Federation of Teachers newsletter)

As a result of the federal government's financial cuts for the 2006-2007 educational budget, school leaders at local levels are forced to close or decrease educational programs, reduce teaching staff, increase class size, and out-source services, just to name a few compromises made by leaders. Paul Houston (2006), president of the American Association of School Administrators reflected, "Superintendents are feeling the pressure of the double whammy of accountability and tight finances. The superintendents say they [federal officials] want more and more and are giving us less and less" (§ 9 of Education World School Issue).

Unquestionably, such current and pressing issues of accountability must be addressed directly by today's educational leaders in ways that are forging new frontiers in leadership. These new frontiers in education will require skills and innovation from organizational leaders that are unrivaled by past systems and models of leadership. For these reasons, it is now more important than ever that educational leaders possess the leadership skills required to recognize, analyze, adapt, and seek solutions to the most difficult of situations (Muijs & Harris, 2003; Stetcher & Kirby, 2004; Stoll & Fink, 2003).

Need for Effective Leadership

It is only natural that public school district personnel would strive to seek positive leadership during times of difficulty. Muijs and Harris (2003) postulated that, "Effective leadership has long been established as a key factor in securing school effectiveness and school improvement" (p. 6). While effective leadership is the ultimate goal to be achieved, it must first be established what comprises effective leadership. As previously suggested, today's educational leaders are expected to possess a wider range of skills than has been expected in years prior. For this reason it is imperative that leaders attend to the matter of learning those skills necessary to achieve effective leadership (Davis, 2003; Furman, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Schein, 2000). Patton (1997) suggested that "a leader should have the knowledge of his or her organization's development by acquiring abilities in organizational change, communication, problem solving, conflict resolution, development of teamwork, human resources, shaping organizational culture and learning, and developing an organizational mission" (p. 103). Whereas these are but a few of the skills that a leader must acquire, they are important and comprehensive in nature.

While leadership effectiveness is difficult to define and delineate, it is easily recognizable to all who witness its affects. As Yukl (2006) argued, “Like definitions of leadership, conceptions of leader effectiveness differ from one writer to another” (p. 9). He further explained that “most researchers evaluate leadership effectiveness in terms of the consequences of the leader’s actions for followers and other organization stakeholders” (p. 9). Without doubt, the consequences of the leader’s actions are more imperative in today’s educational setting due to the rigorous increase in high accountability and augmentation of educational standards of excellence.

As today’s educational leaders seek to meet the ever changing demands placed upon the educational system of the twenty first century, the need for effective leadership is crucial. Effective leaders are typically characterized by possessing a strong vision for their organization. Bolman and Deal (1997), Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (2000), Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), Willower and Licata (1997), and Yukl (2006) acknowledged the importance of a leader’s ability to establish and promote a shared vision in order to help focus an organization’s goals and direction.

As Bolman and Deal (1997) suggested, “Effective leaders help establish a vision, set standards for performance, and create focus and direction for collective efforts” (p. 297). Additionally, Fairholm (1997), Morgan (1998), Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), Rosenbach and Taylor (1998), Willower and Licata (1997) believed in the importance of the leader’s abilities and skills to create a successful vision for his or her organization. Yukl (2006) emphasized that vision “should appeal to the values, hopes, and ideals of organization members and other stakeholders” (p. 295). Yukl further alleged that the

vision should be simple enough to be communicated easily. Establishing a positive vision will help leaders create and sustain a healthy and stable organization.

Yet another aspect of effective leadership is the leader's ability to vary their actions and reactions depending upon the circumstances and situations to be dealt with. As Bolman and Deal (1997) confirmed, "Wise leaders understand their own strengths, work to expand them, and build teams that can provide leadership" (p. 317). Subsequently, truly effective leaders make wide use of viewing situations through different lenses when they discover something is not working correctly (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Donaldson, 1998; Morgan, 1998; Schlechty, 2000). Effective leaders prove repeatedly their ability to view their organizations in different ways in order to best build and enhance upon the abilities of their organization.

One of the critical issues today's leaders must be proficient with is handling conflict and difficult situations (Davis, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Muijs & Harris, 2003; Yukl, 2006). Effective leaders seem to understand how to manage conflict in a positive and controlled manner. As Bolman and Deal (1997) stated, "We need more people in managerial roles who can find simplicity and order amid organizational confusion and conflict" (p. xii). While a moderate amount of conflict can prove beneficial to an organization by stimulating new ideas and concepts, too much conflict can prove debilitating to all members involved. It is vital that leaders handle conflict in a controlled and positive manner (Davis, 2003; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Katzenbach & Smith, 1993; Lencioni, 2002; Ousten, 1999; Willower & Licata, 1997; Yukl, 2006). Poorly handled conflict promotes more problems and infighting, while well

managed conflict may result in stimulating “the creativity and innovation” of an organization (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 173).

As effective leaders seek successful methods to deal with conflict within today’s strained organizations, it is essential that they make wise decisions and choices. Willower and Licata (1997) suggested utilizing reflective problem solving. The authors detailed the importance of analyzing all current situations, reflecting upon past actions and decisions, as well as considering all alternative solutions to any given problematic situation. As alternative solutions are generated, the likelihood of finding a best fit for the organization increases. Effective leaders appear to have a natural aptitude to recognize the importance of considering various solutions to difficult situations.

It is imperative that leaders within contemporary educational organizations remain calm and focused as they attempt to make decisions that are ethical and effective for their involved stakeholders (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Willower & Licata, 1997). While it is critical that an effective leader retain composure in the face of adversities, it is also important that they realize that attempting to solve conflicts require time and consideration in order to achieve the best solution to the problem. Fullan and Miles (1992) determined, “it is folly to act as if we know how to solve complex problems in short order” (p. 746). In these tumultuous times for education, leaders will need to call upon the strength and knowledge provided by leadership models and theories to help afford them the skills and expertise necessary to maneuver through uncharted waters. As today’s leaders deal with the stress of increased accountability and shrinking resources, it is vital that effective leaders strive to deal with conflicts in a positive manner that will best promote health and a sense of well-being within the organization

Organizational Health

One of the primary functions of leaders in educational organizations is that of creating a healthy and growing organization (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Hill, 2003; Schein, 1996; Yukl, 2006). The encouragement and development of meaningful working relationships has recently become one of the primary focuses of effective leaders seeking to create a healthy organization. One way leaders are able to help establish relationships in their organizations are to demonstrate supportive behaviors. Yukl (2006) stressed that effective leaders understand the importance of “showing trust and confidence, acting friendly and considerate, trying to understand subordinate problems, keeping subordinates informed, and showing appreciation for subordinates’ ideas and accomplishments” (p. 54). It is likely that a leader may develop a healthy organization if he or she demonstrates these behaviors.

As leaders consider the significance of acquiring skills in leadership practice and theory, ethics and morals, the change process, and creating a positive organizational culture, the overall health of the organization will benefit (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Preskill & Torres, 1999; Schein, 1996). When considering the creation of a healthy and thriving organization, leaders must be able to assess the current status of their organization’s ability to adapt and change as needs warrant. Schein (1996) argued that “the central condition of organizational health was the ability to cope and adapt” (p. 235). As a leader assists the organization in the ability to adapt, he or she must unquestionably be concerned with the relationships within the organization (Lencioni, 2002; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Yukl, 2006). Current trends in leadership focus on the strong and healthy relationships that must be carefully formed in order for an

organization to survive. These carefully formed relationships can help to formulate a culture of acceptance and collaboration which helps to create the overall health of the organization (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Lencioni, 2002; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Schein, 1996).

Experts believe that the formation of relationships is a central component of organizational health. As affirmed by Larson and Ovando (2001), “As members of a civilized society, we regularly enter into relationships of trust with public institutions and with those who work within them” (p. 63). The subject of trust is a strong moral and ethical issue. Trust is a valuable commodity that must be earned, established, maintained, and treasured. Lencioni (2002), Katzenbach and Smith (2003), Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), Preskill and Torres (1999), and Yukl (2006) established the importance of the ethical act of building trust as a means to build a healthy organization.

Yukl (2006) discussed the need for leaders and followers to develop a “high level of mutual trust” (p. 118). Yukl further emphasized the need for leaders and followers to trust one another when he stated, “It is difficult to delegate authority to individuals or self-managed groups when followers do not trust each other, because they will not share information or cooperate in trying to solve mutual problems” (Yukl, 2002, p.109). As effective leaders deal with difficult situations, they traditionally discover the importance of mutual trust and shared leadership as a means by which to sustain a cohesive and healthy organizational unit (Lencioni, 2002; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003). It is significant to note that this important issue of trust is a central theme in the invitational model of leadership (Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003).

In the process of developing a healthy and growing organization, a leader must also consider the organization's content and context for learning. The leader must be aware of how his or her organization creates knowledge and processes information. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) believed that, "To create knowledge, the learning that takes place from others and the skills shared with others need to be internalized, that is, reformed, enriched, and translated to fit the company's self-image and identity" (p. 11). The leader needs to also emphasize instructional practices, as well as make arrangements to accommodate the diverse needs of learners in order to help create a strong organizational unit (Cervero & Wilson, 1994). As effective leaders work to create healthy educational organizations, they must consider the salient decision of which leadership style to incorporate into their daily personal and professional life (Davis, 2003; Kezar, 2000; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000; Yukl, 2006). The leadership style chosen should also include the knowledge and ability to serve as a successful change agent during these times of educational reform.

Leader as a Change Agent

When considering the creation of a healthy and thriving organization, leaders must be able to assess the current status of their organization's ability to adapt and change as needs warrant (Bennis, Spreitzer, & Cummings, 2001; Conger, Spreitzer, & Lawler, 1999; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Kotter, 1999; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Schein, 2000; Sims & Sims, 2002). One of the greatest challenges facing educational leaders is that of school reform, bringing about necessary change in the way schools function on a daily basis (Hill, 2003). It is important for leaders to make meaningful, incremental changes within their organizations (Davis, 2003; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Katzenbach &

Smith, 1993; Lencioni, 2002). Fullan and Miles (1992) suggested that leaders make “small, easy changes rather than big, demanding ones” (p. 746). Morgan (1998) confirmed this idea when he suggested, “use small changes to create large effects” (p. 271). Small, well thought through changes will be more readily accepted by the majority of any organization’s members. A leader’s ability to serve as a change agent to bring about long lasting and effective change is an overwhelming challenge facing all educational leaders. Fullan and Miles (1992) determined that knowledge of the change process is crucial. The change process must be viewed as a learning continuum that includes active participation from all those involved.

The attempt to introduce change in an organization is often the first reaction to organizational strife or problems. Interestingly, Bolman and Deal (1997) affirmed that conflicts or problems within an organization are “natural and inevitable” (p. 172). The authors further emphasized that “from a political perspective, conflict is not necessarily a problem or a sign that something is amiss” (p. 172). As conflict and difficulties arise within an organization, it is essential that leaders view these situations through a variety of lenses (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Donaldson, 1998; Morgan, 1998; Schlechty, 2000). Bolman and Deal corroborated that the most effective leadership utilizes a varied approach when dealing with organizational conflict (p. 299).

Leaders must also understand their stakeholders’ resistance to change. Resistance to change may be interpreted as reluctance, unwillingness, lack of buy in, and fearfulness. Leaders must recognize, as Fullan and Miles (1992) articulated “change threatens existing interests and routines, heightens uncertainty, and increases complexity” (p. 750). Once leaders establish a firm understanding of the change process, they are also able to

understand individual's resistance to change. Leaders are then able to understand that reactions to change are "natural responses to transition, not misunderstood as resistance" (Fullan & Miles, 1992, p. 748). The aforementioned authors further noted that, "Education reform is as much a political as an educational process" (p. 746). It is vital that current educational leaders understand the power and policy process in order to help make the change and reform process more effectual.

The ability to facilitate and evaluate effectual change in an organization is one of the most difficult, yet crucial, tasks for any leader (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Morgan, 1998; Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995; Patton, 1997; Schlechty, 2000; Yukl, 2006). External pressures placed on an organization forces leadership and members to undergo organizational change (Morgan, 1998). Effective leaders of organizations search to find the most beneficial means by which to affect a successful reform effort (Leithwood & Duke, 1999).

An effective leader will work to bring about positive and long lasting change, when change is necessary within an organization. A leader must work carefully to bring about change in a way that the organization's members will not only experience complete buy in, but be pleased with the eventual outcome of the change effort. As Schein (2000) forewarned, "change programs fail because they do not take into consideration the underlying culture" (p. xxviii). The effort to change organizations for the better must be well planned by all interested stakeholders.

Katzenbach and Smith (2003) and Lencioni (2002) believed that teams are a critical component for successful change. It is essential that leaders encourage their followers to establish the types of characteristics that will help them to form into a

cohesive working unit (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Bruffee, 1999; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Lencioni, 2002). Characteristics such as trust, shared leadership, accountability, and interdependence serve to bond individuals into a team, as opposed to a working group (Katzenbach & Smith, 2003). Bruffee (1999) affirmed that, “People who take part in a collaborative enterprise such as this exceed, . . . what no one of them alone could have learned, accomplished, or endured” (p. 9).

Yet another aspect of the change process is that of recognizing the organization’s culture. Fullan and Miles (1992) emphasized “changes in structure must go hand in hand with change in culture” (p. 748). The culture of an organization must be clearly identified and understood in order to create effective change. Schein (1996) suggested that any change process is likely to experience failure if the culture of an organization is ignored. Bolman and Deal (1997) and Katzenbach and Smith (2003) further emphasized that it is important for leaders to recognize that there is no one, single method for leading a change effort.

Development of School Culture

Current trends in leadership focus on the strong and healthy relationships that must be carefully formed in order for an organization to survive. These carefully formed relationships can help to formulate a culture of acceptance and desire to achieve excellence (Ayman, 1995; Martin, 2002; Peterson & Smith, 2000; Rafaeli & Worline, 2000; Schein, 2000; Tierney, 1988). To help ensure a healthy and growing organization, leaders must be ever vigilant to develop a culture that reflects the vision of the organization in which they lead. Schein (1996) defined culture as “the set of shared, taken-for-granted implicit assumptions that a group holds and that determines how it perceives,

thinks about, and reacts to its various environments” (p. 236). As today’s fast paced society is ever changing, it is more imperative than ever that effective leaders create cultures that deal successfully with their environment (Martin, 2002; Peterson & Smith, 2000; Tierney, 1988).

Consequently, one of the most important aspects of leadership is being able to establish a healthy and positive organizational culture. The leader is a vital component in creating the culture of an organization, as affirmed by Tierney (1988) when he suggested that, “many administrators intuitively understand that organizational culture is important” (p. 6). Tierney further acknowledged that within the last ten years, “organizational culture has emerged as a topic of central concern to those who study organizations” (p. 2).

Creating a sense of ownership and shared leadership is a viable part of creating a positive culture. Respect and trust also serve as primary components of an organization’s healthy culture (Lencioni, 2002; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Preskill & Torres, 1999).

The task of identifying an organization’s culture is a difficult one, a task that requires time and effort to correctly recognize the various nuances of the existing culture. Effective leaders are aware of this task and take the responsibility seriously, realizing as Schein (1996) affirmed that culture is “a social force that is invisible yet very powerful” (p. 239). The power of culture may evidence itself in a variety of ways. Martin (2002) articulated that, “Manifestations of culture include rituals, stories, humor, jargon, physical arrangements, and formal structures and policies, as well as informal norms and practices” (p. 55). Effective leaders strive to ensure that existing cultures are protected and enhanced upon in the most positive ways possible.

The ability to establish a culture of support, encouragement, warmth, and acceptance requires a great deal of effort and hard work on the part of organizational leaders. Developing a place where students and teachers like to be does not spontaneously occur. The effort must be carefully thought through and planned. As Hansen (1998) suggested, the efforts to improve school culture requires that dedicated individuals make a concerted and conscious effort to improve and enhance the culture and conditions of the school, "So that teachers can teach better and students can learn more" (p. 15).

An important issue for today's leaders to consider is the creation of a positive school culture that will support the building of relationships within the organization. As Kneese, Fullwood, Schroth, and Panakake (2003) concluded, "Studies on school climate show positive results when healthy relationships are formed among students and between students and their teachers" (p. 42). Teachers and students share an undeniable stake in the culture of the school in which they teach and learn. As effective leaders become increasingly aware of accountability issues, they pay greater attention to the relationships which are nurtured and encouraged among various stakeholders. Review of literature (Flannery & Vanterpool, 1990; McCombs & Whisler, 1997; Millis, 1990; Oldroyd & Hall; Witcher, 1993) strongly supports the need for emphasis on academics, an atmosphere of caring, an exciting and motivating curriculum, professional team work, and a positive home and school relationship when seeking to create a positive school culture. As Witcher (1993) advocated:

Within schools exhibiting such a climate, an atmosphere that generates high faculty morale is evidenced by increased job satisfaction and productivity. There

also exists an aura of cohesiveness as well as an increased sense of school pride. These schools are often characterized by a high rate of student attendance and academic achievement. (p. 3)

This increased achievement rate is a desired goal for all leaders concerned with meeting accountability standards of excellence.

As leaders seek to create a positive school culture it is essential that they understand what takes place within the culture of their organization. Schein (2000) believed that in order to understand what goes on in any organization, you must first understand the cultural assumptions of that organization (pp. xxiii - xxiv). Leaders must also be aware of subcultures (Schein, 2000) that exist within organizations. Various subcultures rely on underlying assumptions that must be understood by an organization's leader. An effective leader must be able to understand that, "One cannot create, for example, a climate of teamwork and cooperation if the underlying assumptions in the culture are individual and competitive, because those assumptions will have created a reward and control system that encourages individual competitiveness" (Schein, 2000, p. xxix). Similarly, Schein argued that a leader can not create a climate of empowerment and participation if the underlying belief of the culture is that everyone must do whatever the boss says they should do. Truly effective leaders began to understand that leadership through coercion and fear proved ineffectual when attempting to create a productive team. Researchers and practitioners began to seek models of leadership which would provide a positive example of how to lead organizations to success (Davis, 2003; Kezar, 2000; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000; Yukl, 2006).

Leadership Theories

Once leadership researchers moved beyond the analysis of leadership skills they began to develop leadership theories by which to identify various leadership qualities and trends. Davis (2003) concluded that, “Leadership was the object of intense study during the last half of the twentieth century and there is now an immense body of research and theory on the subject” (p. 8). The topic of leadership has been of high interest since it is believed that the qualities possessed by the leader is what helps to make certain organizations succeed while others may founder and fail. The concept of followership is also linked to leadership theory, because leaders and followers make up the composition of any organization. Davis argued that the “concept of leadership is clarified further by thinking more carefully about the role of followers” (p. 11). It is important to consider leadership theories as a means to “distinguish leaders from nonleaders” (Davis, 2003, p. 10).

While Yukl (2006) identified leadership theories as belonging to one of four categories: (1) intra-individual process, (2) dyadic process, (3) group process, or (4) an organizational process (p. 15), Davis (2003) identified six categories of leadership. Davis (2003) referred to these six categories as: “trait theories, power and influence theories, behavioral theories, contingency theories, cultural and symbolic theories, and cognitive theories” (p. 8). Numerous theorists have sought to create leadership models that fit within these various categories described by Yukl and Davis (Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Kezar, 2000; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000; Sergiovanni, 2000; Spears & Lawrence, 2004; Yukl, 2006).

Various leadership theories have been developed throughout the years which include: directive, instructional, participative, charismatic, transformational, transactional, and servant leadership, to name but a few (Davis, 2003; Kezar, 2000; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000; Yukl, 2006). While directive and instructional leadership fall within the contingency and cognitive theory realm for example, theories such as transformational and servant leadership belongs in the cultural and symbolic category, addressing the personal and ethical needs of the leader's organization (Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000 a, 2000 b; Spears & Lawrence, 2004). A more recent leadership model which also addresses the personal and ethical needs of an organization has been introduced to the educational community. "A relatively new entry into the field is that of invitational leadership" (Stillion & Siegel, ¶ 9, 2005). Invitational leadership is a comprehensive model which merits further consideration from educational leaders.

Comprehensive Description of Invitational Leadership

It has been authenticated throughout this literature review (Aldridge, 2003; Jennings, 2003; Penner, 1981; Shapiro, 1990; Stillion & Siegel, 2005) that a new day has transpired for contemporary leaders, requiring skills and knowledge exceeding that of previous needs in leadership (Caldwell & Hayward, 1998).

As today's leaders seek to acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to prove effective in current educational organizations, it becomes important to realize that there are no simple answers to achieve leadership excellence. Bolman and Deal (2002) affirmed, "When you look at examples of effective leadership, it becomes clear that it's not related to any one style, personality, gender or ethnicity. Many pathways point to

effective leadership. But some qualities are consistent across effective leaders” (p. 1). The critical task is to find the combination of qualities and characteristics that will consistently provide leaders with the skills and knowledge to succeed on a regular basis. Purkey and Siegel (2002) attempted to blend leadership qualities, values, and principles when they developed the invitational leadership theory and model for inviting success from all interested stakeholders. In their book *Becoming an Invitational Leader* Purkey and Siegel (2003) described, “this model shifts from emphasizing control and dominance to one that focuses on connectedness, cooperation, and communication” (p. 1).

The invitational leadership model seeks to invite all interested stakeholders to succeed (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005). As noted by Day, Harris, and Hadfield (2001) invitations are “messages communicated to people which inform them that they are able, responsible and worthwhile” (p. 34). These messages are corresponded through “inter-personal action, but also through institutional policies, programmes [sic], practices, and physical environments” (Day et al., 2001, p. 34).

Interestingly, invitational leadership has a highly personal and ethical component included within the constructs of the model. Stillion and Siegel (2005) articulated that invitational leaders work to establish an environment where workers are able to achieve their goals and potential while participating in the shared vision and mission of the group. The abovementioned authors further determined “Invitational leadership intentionally creates positive physical places to work and puts into place policies that reflect the optimism of the leader and lead to trust and respect among workers” (§ 9). These basic

values and principles are fundamental to ethical leadership and “share much in common with Greenleaf’s servant leadership theory” (Stillion & Siegel, 2005, ¶ 10)

It is important to note that invitational leadership has been created based upon four basic assumptions that exemplify invitational leaders. The assumptions are optimism, respect, trust, and intentionality. Day et al. (2001) described these four assumptions as follows:

Optimism – the belief that people have untapped potential for growth and development

Respect – the recognition that each person is an individual of worth

Trust — possessing “confidence in the abilities, integrity, and responsibilities of ourselves and others” (Purkey & Siegel, 2003, p. 12).

Intention – *Intention* – a decision to purposely act in a certain way, to achieve and carry out a set goal, (Day et. al, 2001, p. 34). Stillion and Siegel, (2005) defined *intention* as, “knowing what we intend to bring about as well as how we intend it to happen gives clarity and direction to our work” (¶ 15).

These four principles serve as core values to invitational leadership.

Optimism is a fundamental component of invitational leadership. Social reformer, John Gardner (1990), reflected that “a prime function of a leader is to keep hope alive”. Stillion and Siegel (2005) depicted the optimism of a leader as one “who can reframe problem situations as opportunities and view the impossible as merely difficult” (¶ 14 p.).

In the midst of today’s difficult challenges and high accountability standards, the characteristic of optimism could prove to be a dynamic element to success for educational organizations. Stillion and Siegel (2005) argued that “Optimistic leaders

embrace both challenge and change, expecting that the outcome will be a positive one” (§ 14). Today’s educational institutions and stakeholders need to experience the positive outcomes that the value of optimism may bring.

The value of respect is one of the most innate needs of all human nature (Purkey, 1992). Purkey (1992) affirmed that “people are able, valuable, and responsible and should be treated accordingly” (p. 6). Respect in others demonstrates a basic belief in the worth and value of our fellow workers, students, parents, and leaders. Showing respect to fellow organizational members “leads to an inviting, inclusive workplace where diversity is the norm and every individual can flourish” (Stillion & Siegel, 2005, § 12).

The value of trust is closely related to respect. Purkey and Siegel (2003) defined trust as “having confidence in the abilities, integrity and responsibilities of ourselves and others” (p. 12). Trust is a crucial element that contributes to the success of an organization. Conversely, lack of trust serves as a barrier to the development of cohesive team work and efforts. As Lencioni (2002) analyzed “Trust lies at the heart of a functioning, cohesive team. Without it, teamwork is all but impossible” (p. 195). Subsequently, building trust is a critical element for any successful leader to possess.

Intentionality is another important component to the invitational leadership model. As Stillion and Siegel, (2005) concluded that “knowing what we intend to bring about as well as how we intend it to happen gives clarity and direction to our work” (§ 15). Developing and maintaining specific and clear intentions facilitates the process of organizational growth and success. As Purkey (1992) articulated “Intentionality can be a tremendous asset for educators and others in the helping professions, for it is a constant

reminder of what is truly important in human service” (p. 9). Invitational leaders are purposefully intentional in their work and their efforts with all stakeholders.

Additionally, Purkey and Siegel (2003) postulated a specific framework by which schools can become "invitational" by concentrating on five areas contributing to success or failure: places, policies, programs, processes, and people. The authors believed that each one of these elements contribute to the creation of a positive school climate and ultimately a healthy and successful organization. The personality of a place is at once noticeable to observers. It is evident if the environment is sterile, empty, and lifeless or warm, exciting and filled with the personalities of all those who inhabit that space. As Purkey (1992) affirmed “places are the easiest to change because they are the most visible element in any environment. They [places] also offer the opportunity for immediate improvement” (p. 7). Since places are so visible, they are essential to promote in a positive manner, as well as being more readily managed aspects of an organization’s image.

The area of policies is another component of success or failure in invitational leadership. Leaders must determine if their organization’s policies serve only to restrict and confine, squelching all sense of individuality, or whether they create positive and productive opportunities for the organization (Fowler, 2004). Policies of schools which are successful and possess a positive school culture are created to encourage and seek a win/win result. Covey (1989) described win/win as a mindset that constantly seeks to benefit mutually in all human interactions. Schools that establish such policies seek to create a cooperative, rather than a competitive arena.

The establishment of attractive programs becomes yet another element in Purkey and Siegel's (2003) framework for establishing a positive and successful organization. Most often, school leaders are guilty of offering very few options and choices. According to Hansen (1998), students often feel "disinvited in school" due to the fact that they always feel overlooked. No one cared enough to encourage their participation in sports or other school activities, they receive papers with a grade only lacking additional comments, and their absences were rarely, if ever, noticed by their teachers. Hansen further explained that, "these students suffered from a caring disability; not enough educators cared to invite them to participate in school life" (p. 16). Schools that possess a positive school culture appear to make great effort to provide for a variety of creative and attractive programs (Witcher, 1993). Rigorous academic courses taught by outstanding teachers help to increase the effectiveness of the instructional program, as well as raise the standards for academic achievement (Edmonds, 1979; McCombs & Whisler, 1997).

Processes are yet another vital component of the invitational leadership model (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005). In many schools, the participation process is limited to here's the deal, take it or leave it (Cleveland, 2002). Cleveland (2002) concluded that some leaders desire to be "presumed to be 'in charge'" (p. 1). However, leaders that make the effort to establish a successful school culture seem to be much more aware of the need to include all stakeholders in as many of the decision making processes as possible. According to Hansen (1998), "Schools that are noted for possessing a positive school climate encourage decision making characterized by participation, cooperation, and

collaboration. Students are encouraged to take responsibility, to be involved, and to speak with their own voices" (p. 17).

The final element of Purkey and Siegel's (2003) framework of five areas contributing to success or failure is the aspect of people. In this essential area, the most important element for leaders developing a successful school is the people that comprise the school and its many facets. People are the one resource that is most guaranteed to make a difference in creating a positive school culture. Hansen (1998) confirmed, "Investment in people results in effective change" (p. 17). Involving people in as many activities that require cooperation and positive results is an excellent way to help individuals become part of an effective team. It is also an outstanding starting place in developing a more positive work and learning environment. It should be noted that it is critically important to provide people with the recognition that they have earned (Hansen, 1998). Teachers and students alike enjoy the feeling of being appreciated for a job well done. This simple truth is a fundamental need of all of humankind (Halpin, 2003; Tallon, 1997).

Yet another aspect of meeting the needs of the people of an organization is the creation of relationships (Bruffee, 1999; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Lencioni, 2002; Tallon, 1997). The formation of positive relationships is an integral part of creating a successful school. As Kelly et al. (1998) suggested, "Every child deserves a school that is inviting, academically challenging, and safe. The overall ambiance of the school and quality of instruction are enhanced as the school develops a 'concordant relationship' among the students, parents, teachers, and administrators" (p. 62).

The five areas described above are often referred to as the “five P’s” of the invitational leadership model. Purkey and Siegel (2003) refer to these five P’s as a means by which to invite others professionally. As the authors concluded the, “five powerful factors – people, places, policies, programs, and processes (the five P’s) – are highly significant for their separate and combined influence on Invitational Leadership” (p. 104). Purkey and Siegel continued to affirm the importance of the five P’s when they proclaimed, “The combination of these five P’s offers an almost limitless number of opportunities for the Invitational Leader, for they address the total culture or ecosystem of almost any organization” (p. 104). The inclusion of the five P’s significantly assists in making invitational leadership a unique and holistic leadership model (Stillion & Siegel, 2005). The researcher has included a concept map which shows the connection between the four basic assumptions and the five P’s of the invitational leadership model (see Appendix N).

Comparison of Invitational Leadership to Other Models

At this juncture in the literature review it is essential that a thorough comparison be made between invitational leadership and a few other predominantly recognized models of leadership. For the purpose of this study, a comparison will be drawn between the invitational leadership model and the participative, transformational, and servant models of leadership.

Participative leadership was coined by Yukl in 1994 to include the concepts of group, shared, and teacher leadership (Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000, p. 14). Participative leadership is defined by Leithwood et al. (2000) as a leadership style which “assumes that the decision-making processes of the group ought to be the central focus

for leaders” (p. 12). Leithwood and Duke (1999) believed that participative leadership was founded on the principles of organizational effectiveness, democratic principles, and moral leadership. In participative leadership “authority and influence are available potentially to any legitimate stakeholder in the school based on their expert knowledge, their democratic right to choose, and/or their critical role in implementing decisions” (Leithwood & Duke, 1999, p. 51).

Similar to the participative leadership model, invitational leadership shares the belief in active participation of interested stakeholders and the fundamentals of moral and ethical leadership. The invitational leadership model, is however, a more inclusive, holistic approach to leadership “that addresses the total environment in which leaders function” (Purkey & Siegel, 2003, p. x). While believing in active participation of organizational members, invitational leadership seeks to achieve a balance of authority and influence throughout the organization (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005).

The leadership models of transformational and servant leadership have received the most acclaim in the last few decades as excellent leadership models to attempt to emulate (Davis, 2003; Leithwood & Duke, 1999; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000 a, 2000 b; Spears & Lawrence, 2004; Yukl, 2006). Both models possess similar tenets that call upon the leader to lead in exemplary ways. Like invitational leadership, these leadership models strive to assist leaders in the endeavor to support their organizational members in empowering ways (Davis, 2003; Farling, Stone & Winston, 1999; Hoyle, 2002; Sergiovanni, 2000; Spears & Lawrence, 2004). While transformational and servant

leadership share many similar characteristics, subtle differences between the two models do exist.

Transformational leadership is characterized by an adjustment in purpose and resources of all members involved in the leader-follower affiliation. Furthermore, Leithwood and Duke (1999) surmised that transformational leadership expects “an elevation of both” leaders and followers, “a change ‘for the better’” (p. 49). Rosenbach and Taylor (1998) added that “Transformational leadership involves strong personal identification of followers with the leader” (p. 3). The authors further explained that the transformational leader strives to motivate “followers to perform beyond expectations by creating an awareness of the importance of designated outcomes” (p. 3) Transformational leaders achieve this “in such a way that all followers share values and beliefs and are able to transcend self-interest and tie the goal to the higher-order needs of self-esteem and self-actualization” (Rosenbach & Taylor, 1998, p. 3). Transformational leaders allow followers to create a mental image of the shared vision and convert these shared goals into effective action. Transformational leadership calls for a transforming experience for the leader and for the follower. As Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (2000 b) affirmed, “transformational leadership is a powerful stimulant to improvement” (p. 37).

Servant leadership is often viewed as an expansion upon transformational leadership (Farling, Stone & Winston, 1999; Hoyle, 2002; Sergiovanni, 2000; Spears & Lawrence, 2004). Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) concluded that “servant leaders are indeed transformational leaders” (p. 49). However, servant leadership has been characterized by Yukl (2006) as including the tenets of “nurturing, defending, and empowering followers” (p. 420). Yukl further explained that servant leaders must pay

attention to the “needs of followers and help them become healthier, wiser, and more willing to accept their responsibilities” (p. 420). Servant leaders are able to instill a certain trust in their followers. As Ciulla (1998) articulated, "People follow servant leaders freely because they trust them" (p. 17).

Servant leadership seems comparable to transformational leadership in its goal of fostering vision, trust, and empowering followers (Spears & Lawrence, 2004). However, servant leadership was noted by authors Farling, Stone, and Winston (1999) as further possessing “variables of vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service" (p. 49). Servant leaders are concerned more with the welfare of their followers than with their own welfare. “Serving others is the means by which the servant leader facilitates the accomplishing of their desired goals. Merely serving is not the means by which to get results, but the behavior of serving is the result” (Farling, Stone & Winston, 1999, p. 49). Numerous researchers (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Ciulla, 1998; Farling, Stone & Winston, 1999; Hoyle, 2002; Sergiovanni, 2000; Spears & Lawrence, 2004; Yukl, 2006) have deemed servant leadership to be of high ethical and moral value within the field of leadership. The leadership models of transformational and servant leadership have proven valuable resources to educational leaders seeking the most excellent leadership characteristics available. By emphasizing positive and ethical qualities in themselves and in their followers, transformational and servant leaders have been able to achieve elevated standards of leadership in the past few decades (Ciulla, 1998; Farling, Stone & Winston, 1999; Hoyle, 2002; Sergiovanni, 2000; Spears & Lawrence, 2004).

Stillion and Siegel (2005) reflected that “invitational leaders accept the basic premise of servant leadership; that those who would lead must be willing to serve, but go

beyond this premise to attempt to describe the values and roles that invitational leaders must play in their organizations” (¶10). Invitational leadership indeed holds closely to many of the same beliefs and components of the transformational and servant leadership models. One similarity is that of creating and sharing of a vision. Purkey and Siegel (2003) affirmed, “Invitational leaders seek to enroll associates in a vision of greatness – to offer them a vivid and compelling picture of human endeavor” (p. 6). The elements of trust and respect are also shared components of invitational, transformational, and servant leadership. As the creators of invitational leadership, Purkey and Siegel (2003) spoke of the importance of trust to their model when they espoused, “Trust is critical to Invitational Leadership because it recognizes the interdependence of human beings” (p. 12). The authors further delineated the importance of respect to the invitational model when they concluded, “Nothing is more important to Invitational Leadership than respect for people – the belief that we and our associates are able, valuable, and responsible, and should be treated accordingly” (p. 7).

Yet another component that invitational leadership shares with previously mentioned models is that of being at all times moral and ethical. “Invitational Leadership is at heart a moral activity, intentionally expressing respect and trust in ourselves and others, personally and professionally” (Purkey & Siegel, 2003, p. 19). Invitational leadership also similarly seeks to empower members of the organization. As Purkey and Siegel (2003) advocated, “The Invitational Leader is unique in asking others to meet their goals as a condition of his or her own success . . . encouraging others in their quest for self-fulfillment is embedded in the principles of Invitational Leadership” (p. 23). The

authors further concluded that “leadership, then, becomes a *mutual* commitment between colleagues, rather than a series of orders issued from the top down” (p. 23).

While the invitational leadership model shares several common components with the participative, transformational, and servant leadership models, a few intrinsic and decisive differences exist, however. The main points of differentiation are the elements of optimism and intentionality. The five areas contributing to success or failure: places, policies, programs, processes, and people are also unique to the invitational model. As formerly explained, the values of optimism and intentionality are believed to be important characteristics for effective leaders to acquire. The concentrated effort of values and principles as they apply to places, policies, programs, processes, and people are also vital for effective leaders to attend to when attempting to create a positive and successful organization. These important and unique qualities serve to make usage of the invitational leadership model an excellent choice during these times of critical need and increased accountability for educational leaders (Day et al., 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005).

Need for a New Leadership Model

Throughout this literature review evidence has been provided to substantiate the tremendous need for direction that involves numerous characteristics of effective leadership (Caldwell, & Hayward, 1998; Davis, 2003; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Furman, 2003, Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Muijs & Harris, 2003; Schein, 2000), and leadership that will transcend models and theories previously utilized (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, et al., 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Rosener, 1990). The need for leadership that transcends previous models has been validated by literature which calls for increased standards for

accountability issues (Billups, 1999; Burke, 2002; Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996; Stecher & Kirby, 2004; Tungate & Orié, 1998), the need for effective leadership during these progressively more difficult times (Billups, 1999; Burke, 2002; Cross, 1997; Stecher & Kirby, 2004), the need for organizational health (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Hill, 2003; Schein, 1996; Yukl, 2006), the leader as a change agent (Bennis, Spreitzer, & Cummings, 2001; Conger, Spreitzer, & Lawler, 1999; Kotter, 1999; Sims & Sims, 2002), and the development of a positive school culture (Ayman, 1995; Martin, 2002; Peterson & Smith, 2000; Rafaeli & Worline, 2000; Schein, 2000; Tierney, 1988).

Various researchers (Day, et al, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Ogawa & Bossert, 1995; Rosener, 1990) have called for more participatory leadership during these difficult times in education. Rosener (1990) confirmed that, “Challenges, such as cost containment, accountability to the public, globalization, integrating technology, and measuring student outcomes, require more participatory forms of leadership than have existed in the past” (p. 119). Additionally, Day et al. (2001) articulated, “The evidence is sufficient to suggest that existing theories of leadership do not adequately reflect or explain the current practice of effective leaders” (p. 26). The aforementioned authors further described that the critical mass of literature supports “a person-centered philosophy that placed emphasis upon improving teaching and learning via high expectation of others” (p. 26). As these authors affirmed, current theories of leadership remain inadequate to meet the needs of current day leaders (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, et al., 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Rosener, 1990). As public scrutiny and accountability standards increase, a change in current leadership style and theory appears to be warranted.

A tremendous need exists for today's schools to become institutions of academic excellence (Flannery & Vanterpool, 1990; McCombs & Whisler, 1997; Millis, 1990; Oldroyd & Hall; Witcher, 1993), while concentrating on creating an organization that cares and serves all interested stakeholders (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Bolman & Deal, 2002; Grogan, 2003; Halpin, 2003; Patton, 1997; Tallon, 1997). Bolman and Deal (2002) indicated an increased need for caring school systems that "serve the best interests of the institution and its stakeholders" (p. 1). The authors further acknowledged "this implies a profound and challenging responsibility for leaders to understand the needs and concerns of those they serve" (p. 1). The invitational leadership model uniquely answers the appeal for increased leadership standards (Day, et al., 2001; Kelly, et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005). Invitational leaders impact the organizational system in many positive ways (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005). As Ogawa and Bossert (1995) confirmed, "leadership must affect more than individual actions; it must influence the system in which actions occur" (p. 233). A need exists for a leadership model that systematically and holistically addresses the internal and external essentials of an organization. Invitational leaders concentrate on the creation of organizations that are people-centered and success oriented, while dealing with all necessary aspects of the organization (Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005).

Day et al. (2001) acknowledged that invitational leaders "engaged in people-centered leadership, constantly creating, maintaining, reviewing and renewing the learning and achievement cultures for students, staff and the close communities of

parents” (p. 26). When referring to the establishment of an achievement oriented culture the authors further established “that invitational leaders modeled this in the many thousands of daily interactions through which common visions, expectations, standards, relationships and definitions of effectiveness were formed, framed, supported and tested” (p. 26). Invitational leadership adequately provides the needed guidelines and direction to support organizational growth and success.

Due to increased standards and accountability, public education is now facing a need for excellent leadership, unparalleled to any other time in recent or past history (Aldridge, 2003; Caldwell & Hayward, 1998; Jennings, 2003; Penner, 1981; Shapiro, 1990). Kouzes and Posner (2003) acknowledged that, “Leadership matters. And it matters more in times of uncertainty than in times of stability. And since leadership matters more in times of uncertainty, then leadership development should matter more now than ever” (p. 23). This strong statement seems reflective of the preponderance of current literature which supports the increased and ever present need for excellent leadership (Aldridge, 2003; Caldwell & Hayward, 1998; Jennings, 2003; Penner, 1981; Shapiro, 1990). Kouzes and Posner further advocated, “If today’s leaders want tomorrow’s organizations to thrive, they have an obligation to prepare a new generation of leaders” (p. 23). Ginsberg and Plank (1995) similarly postulated that leaders must begin to engage “in activities aimed at improving educational opportunities everywhere and for all children” (p. 31). As society seeks to improve educational opportunities for children, educational institutions must also seek to improve, especially within the leadership arena.

The body of knowledge gathered throughout this literature review suggested that the invitational theory of practice (also referred to as ITOP) may serve as an answer to

Kouzes and Posner's, Ginsberg and Plank's, as well as many other researcher's plea for a more comprehensive model of leadership to meet the needs of today's educational climate. Numerous researchers (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005) support invitational leadership as a viable model to serve the needs of today's educational institutes. As Stanley, Juhnke, and Purkey (2004) affirmed, "ITOP presents a way of creating and maintaining schools that are both safe and conducive to academic success" (p. 1). Stanley, et al. further concluded that "Schools that have applied ITOP have reported positive changes . . . Moreover, improvement in such areas as student performance levels, teacher morale, faculty attendance rates, and school safety have also been recorded" (p. 1). Halpin (2003) similarly reported that "invitational leadership contributes . . . by the way in which it cares for and supports the efforts of others" (p. 84). In further corroboration that invitational leadership serves as a positive influence for today's educational institutes, Stoll and Fink (2003) argued, "The result of such leadership is a *moving school*, populated with colleagues committed to learning, learning together, and who share a belief that learning should be valued for its own sake and for others' well-being and development" (p. 114). Reviewed literature supported the belief that the invitational leadership model will serve as a positive source to help prepare tomorrow's educational leaders.

Gender Issues in Leadership

The issue of gender differences in leadership has been researched for numerous years (Cleveland, Stockdale, & Murphy, 2000; Rosenbach & Taylor, 1998; Rosener, 1990; Stelter, 2002). Research has long supported the precept that males are perceived to

be more competent than females when considering work related issues. “Earlier researchers postulated that most workers believed women to be less competent than men in the workplace” (Henderson, 1994, p. 51). Henderson (1994) further described that male and female workers preferred male supervisors for they “were believed to possess the characteristics of good managers-emotional stability, ability to make correct decisions, analytic ability, and the like” (p. 51). Henderson further found that this general preference for male leadership created a specific hierarchy of leadership. Henderson argued, “The erroneous belief that males are more competent than female workers has resulted in a hierarchy of preferred leaders in the following descending order: (1) white males, (2) nonwhite males, (3) white females, and (4) nonwhite females” (p. 52).

Conversely, Krantz (1998) reported that while superiors generally preferred ‘masculine’ traits in their leaders, it was found that “‘feminine’ traits were more highly valued by subordinates” (p. 150). As a result of extensive gender research, Rosener (1990) established that women consistently strive to create positive interactions with fellow co-workers and followers. Rosener further contended that female leaders “encourage participation, share power and information, enhance other people’s self-worth, and get others excited about their work” (p. 120).

While males have typically held positions of authority, women have slowly begun to break into upper management positions in the last several decades. "The relative scarcity of women in top leadership roles is not a new phenomenon and can be demonstrated both in national U.S. and international terms" (Stelter, 2002, p. 1). Henderson (1994) further argued that “despite many gains, women are still grossly underrepresented in professional and managerial jobs” (p. 58).

Social perceptions have greatly contributed to the issues of gender in leadership. Stelter (2002) concluded that "Where gender is perceived within the context of social status, female leaders may be perceived more negatively than male leaders" (p. 1). The author further articulated that "traditional perspectives of leadership center on masculine-oriented concepts of authoritarian and task-oriented behavior, then these same perspectives may contribute to a 'glass ceiling' essentially prohibiting relationship-oriented (i.e. feminine) leadership behaviors from being recognized as viable leadership behavior" (Stelter, 2002, p. 1).

As women attempt to break through this imposed glass ceiling, it is important to continue to research how men and women vary in their leadership styles. Stelter (2002) emphasized that "gender differences in leadership can be accounted for through a variety of rationale. From interpersonal relationships to social role expectations to differences in perception and styles, men and women may indeed lead differently in addition to being 'followed' differently" (p. 1). Most assuredly general agreement exists that men and women will naturally vary in their leadership styles. Asbill (2000) postured that "using the command-and-control style of managing, a style traditionally associated with males, is not the only way to succeed" (p. 58). While differing leadership styles is to be expected, one can not underestimate the still prevalent propensity to stereotype based on gender. Stelter (2002) postulated that "superiors may rely more on gender stereotypes and assumptions in describing and rating male and female leadership effectiveness and performance" (p. 1) than on any other standard of effectiveness.

While Rosener (1990) affirmed that "effective leaders don't come from one mold" (p. 121), she noted that female leaders have been forced to pattern their leadership

styles, to a large degree, based on successful male leadership behaviors. Rosener articulated that “the first female executives imitated their successful male role models in order to get into top management” (p. 123). Henderson (1994) added that “women in leadership positions are often in a Catch-22 situation: they are devalued if they display ‘feminine’ behaviors (nurturing, cooperative, passive) and chided when they exhibit ‘masculine’ behaviors (assertiveness, independence, aggressiveness)” (p. 52). In a more positive light, Rosener suggested that she “sees a ‘second wave’ of successful women who are not adopting styles and habits of successful men, but are drawing on skills and attitudes they have developed as women” (p. 124).

It is, therefore, generally accepted that men and women lead in different ways. Current research concerning gender issues in leadership suggested that, "Women . . . are naturally socialized towards skills in participative leadership, collaborative group management, and quality interpersonal relations . . . , whereas men’s styles have been more described as goal-directed”(Stelter, 2002, p. 1). Rosener (1990) cautioned however, against attributing transformational and participative leadership only to women leaders since numerous male leaders also demonstrate these positive leadership characteristics.

Rosenbach and Taylor (1998) confirmed the need to consider gender issues as “an important challenge for leadership” (p. 56). In the attempt to fully understand the characteristics that lead to successful leadership within today’s organizations, it is imperative that gender issues be considered. Henderson (1994) advocated “therefore the major issue is not men versus women. Instead, it is fairness for all workers regardless of their gender” (p. 54). Additionally, Stelter (2002) affirmed "The successful organization

of the future will not only understand leadership in terms of gender but also its contribution to workforce and organizational effectiveness" (p. 1).

Summary

The review of literature concerning characteristics possessed by effective leaders focused on the positive attributes which contribute to the creation of a successful organization. The literature reviewed also sought to establish the need for a positive and moral model of effective leadership. The following related components were carefully examined: increasing accountability issues, need for effective leadership, organizational health, leader as a change agent, development of school culture, leadership theories, comprehensive description of invitational leadership, comparison of invitational leadership to other models, and finally the need for a new leadership model. These components were utilized to frame the need for a change in leadership direction. The critical concept of gender issues in leadership was addressed as a point of interest for continued study.

In today's uncertain times, strong leadership is needed now, more than at any other time in history. As Bolman and Deal (2002) so affirmed, "The tragedies of Sept. 11 and their aftermath are only one factor in a widespread crisis of meaning and moral authority. It is in times like these that leadership is both most difficult and most needed" (p. 1). Information gained from the literature review strongly supported the need for a new leadership model, such as invitational leadership. Schmidt (1997) stated that one of the things he was most convinced of was "that invitational theory and practice consists of viable philosophy and a useful model of caring for oneself and others in genuine and authentic ways" (p. 205). Caring and authentic behaviors and principles on the part of

today's leaders could prove significant in solving the leadership crisis that has been thrust upon public schools.

It is an undeniable fact that today's leaders have high expectations and great accountability standards to meet. Indeed, a noble goal for any leader is to help his or her followers to achieve more than they ever thought possible. By researching the characteristics and possible impact of invitational leaders, this study helped determine the usefulness of considering the unique theory and model of invitational leadership and its affect on creating a healthy and successful organization. Delineated in Chapter Three will be the methods and research design of the study. A rationale for including a mixed design is provided. Contained in Chapter Four are the analysis of the data explained in chapter three, while presented in Chapter Five are the findings, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research to be conducted.

CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Today's educational leaders are faced with challenges that appear to be increasing exponentially with each new academic school year. As a result of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, the issue of increased accountability is of principle importance to educators nationwide (Stecher & Kirby, 2004). Subsequently, effective leadership within educational organizations has come under increased scrutiny, demonstrating the need for exemplary leadership at all educational levels (Davis, 2003; Furman, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Schein, 2000). As the need for effective leadership escalates, the necessity for new leadership models to emulate increases as well (Billups, 1999).

A comprehensive review of literature provided evidence to substantiate the current need for strong and effective leadership (Caldwell & Hayward, 1998; Davis, 2003; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Furman, 2003; Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Muijs & Harris, 2003; Schein, 2000), as well as leadership that will transcend models and previously utilized theories (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, et al., 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Rosener, 1990). One little known theory, invitational leadership, has been recommended as a leadership model to consider for today's educational leaders to emulate (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000; Day, et al., 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005). Current research on invitational leadership is limited (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000) and "the research on the effects of Invitational Education Theory in the educational administrative process is relatively new as compared to other theories pertaining to leadership" (Egley, 2003, p. 57).

Consequently, this study was intended to investigate the possible outcomes achieved by those exhibiting invitational leadership qualities.

In chapter three the research design and methodology for this study is offered. A mixed design of quantitative and qualitative information was chosen to analyze to what degree, if any, invitational leaders impact the overall success of the public school setting. The sample and population has been carefully delineated for the edification of the reader. The protocol for collecting data was detailed as well. Two hypotheses were formulated for the researcher's prediction of possible outcome, along with detailed procedures for data analysis. Additionally, an explanation of the researcher's biases and assumptions are offered.

Problem and Purpose Overview

Increased accountability standards and ever changing demands placed on today's educational leaders have created the distinct need for a leadership model to emulate that transcends current leadership models (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, et al., 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Rosener, 1990). The model of invitational leadership is thought by numerous researchers (Day et al., 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005) to be worthy of serious consideration for future use by educational leaders in the twenty-first century.

The purpose of this study was to investigate in what ways and to what degree, if any, an invitational leader impacts the overall effectiveness of the public school setting. This study focused on leadership qualities and characteristics which lead to successful and consistent achievement. Underscored throughout the study is the need for effective leadership, the nurturing of organizational health, the leader serving as a change agent,

and the development of a positive school culture. Moreover, the researcher sought to identify any significant differences between the leadership behaviors of female and male leaders.

Research Questions

Research and information gained from a synthesis of related literature (Day et al., 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005) helped formulate research questions and guide this study. The researcher attempted to find answers to the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools?
2. Is there a significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators?
3. What invitational leadership characteristics do the leaders implement or exhibit that lead to organizational success?
4. Which characteristics of invitational leadership do teachers and administrators view as the most influential in contributing to an overall effective school?

Statement of Hypotheses

In the attempt to answer research questions one and two, null hypotheses were formulated by the researcher. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) defined hypothesis as “a prediction, a statement of what specific results or outcomes are expected to occur” (p. 20). The authors further explained that null hypothesis “specifies there is *no* relationship

in the population” (p. 236). The following null hypotheses were investigated in this study:

Hypothesis 1. There is no statistically significant difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools.

Hypothesis 2. There is no statistically significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators.

Population and Sample

The population for this research study consisted of all practicing public school principals in a Midwest state. Teachers who serve under the leadership of these principals comprised a large part of this study’s population as well. The leaders in this study’s population were selected utilizing a multi-tiered sampling process. This study set forth to examine the possible relationship of identified invitational qualities and the affect they might have on the leader’s organization.

Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) described the importance of a research sample as “individuals who will participate (be observed or questioned) as a part of the study” (p. 96). The researcher utilized a purposeful sample to examine the specific constructs which emerged as a result of the extensive review of literature. Merriam (1998) summarized purposeful sampling to be “based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned” (p. 61). It was the intent of the researcher to investigate as fully as possible the characteristics of individuals believed to be invitational leaders in comparison to those who may not demonstrate invitational leadership qualities.

To assist in achieving a purposeful sampling, a multi-tiered criteria process was carefully devised. The first criterion was geographical in nature, as the researcher divided a Midwest state into quadrants. Counties located in each quadrant were specifically identified for principal selection purposes (see Appendix A). In order to select principals from schools considered effective in meeting high accountability standards, the researcher identified all school districts based on their district's performance in meeting Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) standards which qualified the district for the label of "*Accredited for Distinction in Performance*". The researcher further required that the district had successfully met the MSIP standards with distinction for four or five years, assuring greater consistency of effective achievement. *Accredited for Distinction in Performance* has been defined as "districts that meet all but one of the MSIP Performance measures and all MAP and Reading standards according to the most recent Annual Performance report (APR)" (Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education Website). Conversely, once districts had been identified as effective based on receiving Distinction in Performance, the researcher then identified districts to be considered less effective if they had never received recognition for *Accreditation for Distinction in Performance* status. After data was disaggregated for each school district in the Midwest state, the researcher selected one school district considered to be effective and one school district considered to be less effective from each of the four quadrants of the state to be included as participants in the research study. Subsequently, a total of four districts considered to be effective and four districts considered to be less effective were incorporated into the quantitative and qualitative portions of this research study.

Further criteria were then applied in order to stratify for improved, purposeful sampling. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (2003), “Stratification ensures that the sample is representative” and reflects what the research is intended to study (p. 486). Once the researcher identified eight districts throughout the selected Midwest state, the researcher applied additional criteria by which to assure that leadership of each school could be attributed to the characteristics of the current leader. Each district ultimately chosen to be included in this study had to meet the criteria of their leadership team having served in their current position for an average range of three to five years. This criterion was supported by Conger et al. (1999) as they affirmed that evidence supports the fact that a time frame for effective change “takes place over three to five years” (p. 246). Principal’s average tenure of three to five years was identified based on the Department of Elementary & Secondary Education Directory. The final criterion applied was that of gender consideration, which was identified for the purpose of distinguishing between possible differences in leadership characteristics based on gender.

With stratification completed, the additional technique of representative sampling was utilized during the collection of data for research analysis. Representative sampling is applied in order to accomplish generalizability, which increases the “degree to which a sample represents the population of interest” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003, p. 109). Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) concluded that whenever representative sampling is used “generalization is made more plausible if data are presented to show that the sample is representative of the intended population on at least some relevant variables” (p. 110). Districts and principals were chosen as part of this study’s representative population based on their ability or lack of ability to demonstrate effective school performance.

Once districts and principals had successfully met the researcher's criteria for inclusion in this study, the researcher contacted each district's superintendent and principals to establish their involvement in the study. Each principal was asked to identify one teacher leader who could serve as a contact person to help in the data collection process. All participants were informed of the details of the study, how long surveys and interviews would take, anticipated time frame for the study, what to expect during the study, and ensured that all information would be anonymous and protected for each study participant.

While the targeted audience for this research study was primarily intended for the educational community, it is believed, however, that the research contained throughout this study should prove valuable to leaders within a wide range of public and private organizations. The tenets of invitational leadership are based on positive characteristics which should prove strengthening to the leadership of any organization.

Data Collection and Instrumentation

Two issues of ethical consideration served as an ever present standard by which the researcher conducted all data collection and analysis of results. The issues of informed consent and the protection of all study participants were of critical importance throughout the research project. Participants should be fully informed of any and all potential risks or hazards that may be involved in any research study (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003, p. 58). The informed consent form, which was provided to all participants, detailed the intent of the study, the use of potential findings, and any consequences for the participant (Seels, Fullerton, Berry, & Horn, 2004). Superintendents of districts were asked to sign an informed consent form which described the survey and interview process

(see Appendix B), giving their permission for their district employees to participate in the research study. All principals and teachers who were surveyed were provided with a cover letter which clearly described the research and informed consent process, denoting that “by completion of this attached survey it is implied that you agree to participate in this study and waive the requirement for a written consent” (see Appendix E and F). Principals and teachers chosen among the five percent of the participants to be interviewed were requested to sign informed consent forms for the interview process (see Appendices C and D). Preceding all data collection efforts, all participants had the opportunity to read the consent form, demonstrate understanding of its content, and sign the appropriate informed consent form with the proviso that participation was strictly on a voluntary basis and could be ceased at any time during the study’s research duration.

Each leader who qualified for the study was surveyed utilizing a modified version of the *Leadership Survey* developed by Asbill (2000), and renamed *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices* for the purpose of this study (see Appendix E). Teachers serving under the leaders were surveyed as well, utilizing the *Leadership Survey* with appropriate modification and renamed *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices* (see Appendix F). In order to add depth and rich description to the study, five percent of all principals and teachers surveyed were interviewed, utilizing a semi-structured, open-ended question protocol (see Appendices G and H).

Teacher and Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey

Kate Asbill developed a leadership survey which was “validated with input from a panel of experts” (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000, p. 17). Asbill’s survey was drawn from an extensive review of leadership literature and from literature available concerning

Invitational Education theory. The author adapted her survey from the *Invitational Teaching Survey* (ITS), which was originally developed by Amos, Purkey, and Tobias in 1985. Interestingly, Asbill named the survey *Leadership Survey* in the attempt to eliminate any possible bias that might have naturally occurred by naming it “The Invitational Leadership Survey” (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000, p. 18). In an attempt to best suit the purpose of this research study, the researcher modified some items found on Asbill’s leadership survey for teachers (see Appendix F), with the intent of creating a survey that would more directly fit the design of this particular study. The researcher also created an additional survey which mirrored the teacher’s survey utilizing wording to represent the administrator’s point of view (see Appendix E). The researcher renamed the two modified surveys to adequately reflect the purpose of this study. The surveys were renamed *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices* (TPLP) (see Appendix F) and *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices* (PPLP) (see Appendix E). The researcher sought and received permission to adapt Asbill’s (2000) leadership survey in order to best meet the needs of this study (see Appendix I).

The teacher’s survey consisted of a 44-item scale which was designed to ascertain educators’ perceptions of their principal’s leadership characteristics. The principal’s survey also consisted of a 44-item scale created to assess the leader’s perceptions of their own personal leadership characteristics. Both surveys utilized the Likert-type scale as part of the instrument’s design, employing a scale of 1 to 5, 1 representing strongly disagree to 5 representing strongly agree. Items 38-41 utilized a 1 to 5 scale with 1 representing not effective to 5 representing very effective. Using a Likert-type scale provides for a closed-ended response, while reducing the possibility for ambiguity

(Dunn-Rankin, Knezek, Wallace, & Zhang, 2004; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). All but eight survey questions were written in a positive manner. The negative items were purposefully included to serve as a cross reference to assure that participants were responding in a legitimate and careful manner. Negative survey items were ranked in reverse order to assist in the statistical analysis process. Subsequently, a 1 response would be ranked as a positive 5, while a 5 would be ranked with a value of 1 on all negative stated questions. Item number 42 provided for the demographic purpose of identifying gender. Item numbers 43 and 44 consisted of two open-ended questions which provided the respondent the opportunity for written comments. When entering the responses of principals and teachers into the SPSS statistical package, principal responses were coded as a one, while teacher responses were coded as a two, in order to clearly distinguish between leader and teacher responses.

Survey questions were selected to replicate the components or subscales of the invitational theory, as well as perceived leadership effectiveness. The subscales of trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived effectiveness were included in the study (see Appendix M). The subscale of trust consisted of survey questions number 1, 2, 11, 13, 15, 26, 32, and 35. The subscale of respect consisted of survey questions number 4, 5, 14, 18, 20, 21, 25, 27, 33, 36, and 37. The subscale of optimism was comprised of survey questions number 7, 8, 9, 16, 19, 22, 23, 24, and 28. The intentionality subscale consisted of survey questions number 3, 6, 10, 12, 17, 29, 30, 31, and 34, while the effectiveness subscale included questions number 38, 39, 40, and 41. A *t*-test was conducted on each subscale to ascertain any significant differences that might exist. The underlying principles of personally and professionally inviting leadership qualities were imbedded in

the survey. The various subscales assisted in the coding of all qualitative data that was utilized later in the study to provide rich, thick description to the study (Merriam, 1998). Teachers and principals were also provided with items 43 and 44 for written comments which provided them the opportunity to reflect on current leadership qualities. The opportunity to write additional comments was also afforded at the end of the survey for ancillary annotation. These comments added to the depth of the study and to the overall comprehensive understanding of effective leadership (see Appendix J and Appendix K).

Asbill piloted the survey and presented the leadership survey to a panel of 12 judges with the intent of validation. The survey instrument was found to “have a .97 level of reliability, indicating a high degree of internal consistency for this instrument” (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000, p. 18). Modifications adapted for this research study were so minimal that there should be no sizable affect on the reliability or validity of the instrument.

Interview Protocol

In the attempt to specifically address research questions three and four, and in order to add a rich description to the quantitative results, five percent of the participants in the survey process were selected to be included in follow-up interviews conducted by the researcher. The interview protocols (see Appendices G and H) were piloted by four principals and seven teachers in the attempt to test for clarity and consistency in quality and purpose. The interview protocols consisted of eleven semi-structured, open-ended questions in the endeavor to ascertain enriched insight into leaders’ and followers’ perceptions of invitational leadership qualities and their affect on organizational success. This technique of triangulation added to the rich, thick description provided in this study (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Hayes et al., 1992; Merriam, 1998; Newman & Benz, 1998).

The conceptual development of the interview protocols used in this study was based on the extensive review of available literature. The eleven question interview protocol (see Appendices G and H) for both administrators and teachers were based distinctly on the invitational leadership's four assumptions, as well as the five factors which contribute to success or failure of an organization.

Prior to the interview session, each participant was provided with a copy of the definitions of invitational leadership's four assumptions of optimism, respect, trust, and intention, as well as definitions of the five factors of people, places, policies, programs, and processes (see Appendix L). The researcher conducted both phone and electronic interviews. The researcher sought to put each participant at ease before the actual interview session began. When appropriate, the participant was asked for their expressed permission for the researcher to tape record the interview. Once permission was received, the interviews were conducted in a professional and non-biased manner, ranging in time duration from 60 to 70 minutes in length. Phone interviews were successfully tape recorded and later transcribed verbatim. Upon completion of transcripts, each individual interviewed by phone was given the opportunity to read over their interview responses with the understanding that they were free to change or clarify any of their statements. Interviews conducted by electronic means were allowed due to lack of time on the part of a few of the participants. Electronic interviews were collated and coded in a similar manner as were the phone interviews.

Once interviews were completed, the organizational system of coding was employed in order to effectively manage collected data (Merriam, 1998). The researcher

sought to categorize data into subscales for the purpose of establishing thematic connections throughout collected data (Seidman, 1998).

Data Analysis

The data from the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices* (TPLP) (see Appendix F) and *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices* (PPLP) (see Appendix E) derived from selected districts, principals, and their faculties were collected, tabulated, and analyzed. For research questions one and two, data was entered into the SPSS statistical package, version 11.5, to obtain detailed analysis of survey data. As the data were entered, the responses of principals were coded as a one, while teacher responses were coded as a two, in order to clearly distinguish between leader and teacher responses. The following statistical methods were utilized to analyze research questions one and two:

Research Question 1. In the attempt to ascertain if a difference existed between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools, an independent samples *t*-test for uncorrelated means was calculated. Asbill (2000) concluded that “the *t*-test is used in inferential statistics as a tool for analyzing data to find differences in variables” (p. 86).

Research Question 2. In order to distinguish differences between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators, an independent samples *t*-test for uncorrelated means was calculated. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) defined *t*-test as “a parametric statistical test used to see whether a difference between the means of two samples is significant” (p. 241). The *t*-test was therefore used to determine the level of

significance, if any, between male and female administrators and how they apply invitational leadership qualities.

Subscales. A *t*-test was also utilized to determine differences among the variables represented by subscale components. The subscales of trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived effectiveness were analyzed separately to ascertain pertinent information concerning the leadership qualities comprised in the invitational leadership model.

The following qualitative approach was employed to address research questions three and four:

Research Questions 3 and 4. The qualitative approach of interviewing was employed to determine the characteristics that leaders implement to help lead an organization to success and to ascertain which attributes of invitational leadership teachers and administrators view as most influential in the goal to contribute to an overall effective school. The use of interviews contributed to the enriched description contained within this study.

Additional data analysis included the collection and analysis of district documents such as district AYP, statistical profile of each district, student data such as drop out rates and graduation analysis, as well as the district's report card available on the DESE website. These artifacts helped to supplement the researcher's depth of understanding of each district's organizational beliefs and priorities.

The Researcher's Biases and Assumptions

One distinct underlying assumption of the researcher was the basic belief that school leaders exert the ability to impact and influence the success or failure of their

educational organization. The researcher's experiences with various leaders, both negative and positive in nature, have impacted the researcher's belief in the significant role that the leader plays in their organization. The researcher's interactions with varying types of educational organizations and many varied individuals serving within the organizations have also influenced the researcher to believe that certain ethical qualities should be present in leadership behaviors.

Due to these natural researcher biases and assumptions, every care was taken to interpret and analyze data in a non-biased and analytical manner. Furthermore, care was taken to provide for triangulation of data to assist in reducing biases and assumptions on the part of the researcher.

Summary

The review of literature reveals that increased accountability has amplified the need for a new leadership model for today's leaders to emulate (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, et al., 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Rosener, 1990). The lesser known theory of invitational leadership has been recommended by numerous researchers (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000; Day, et al., 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005) as a potential theory to serve as an effective model for educational leaders to pattern their leadership styles after in the attempt to create healthy and successful academic organizations.

The primary goal of this research study was to examine and investigate the potential degree to which invitational leadership qualities impact an educational organization. Additionally, the researcher sought to identify which attributes of invitational leadership, if any, do teachers and administrators view as the most influential

in contributing to the overall success of the educational organization. Furthermore, the researcher sought to identify any significant differences between the leadership behaviors of female and male leaders.

The population of this study was comprised of a purposeful sampling of practicing public school principals in a Midwest state during the 2006-2007 school year. The selected districts' and principals' faculties were also included as part of the population sample. Numerous stratified criteria were applied for the selection of all study participants. Moreover, specific criteria were employed to ensure consistency of what constituted school success.

The data were gathered utilizing the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices* (TPLP) (see Appendix F) and *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices* (PPLP) (see Appendix E). The surveys were comprised of a 44-item scale for teachers and leaders. The surveys were designed to assess teachers' and educational leaders' perceptions of leadership characteristics, as well as assess the perceptions of leadership characteristics' impact on overall school success. The Likert-type scale was utilized for the leadership survey as part of the survey instrument's design. The survey instrument was found to "have a .97 level of reliability, indicating a high degree of internal consistency for this instrument" (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000, p. 18).

With the intent of buttressing the results gained from the quantitative research, follow-up interviews were conducted by the researcher. Triangulation was achieved through the conduction of interviews, which consisted of eleven semi-structured, open-ended questions, as well as through the analysis of various district documents. One interview protocol was designed for teachers, while a mirrored protocol was developed

for the principals. Five percent of all survey participants were selected to be interviewed. The qualitative results from the interviews allowed for the inclusion of rich, thick description to the research study.

An independent-samples *t*-test was calculated to determine if differences existed between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools. To establish differences between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators, an independent samples *t*-test for uncorrelated means was calculated employing the 11.5 version of the SPSS program. The qualitative use of interviews were utilized to ascertain the characteristics that leaders implement in the attempt to lead an organization to success. Interviews also served to establish which attributes of invitational leadership teachers and administrators view as most influential in the goal to contribute to an overall effective school. All quantitative results were triangulated with findings gained during follow-up interviews, as well as the review of district documents in order to provide rich description to the study.

Included in Chapter Four are a presentation of the quantitative and qualitative data and an analysis of each research question and hypotheses. Contained in Chapter Five is a summary of the conclusions based on the findings, as well as implications and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The intent of this study was to examine the role that leadership characteristics play in the creation of organizations deemed to be effective. As various aspects of educational accountability and organizational health were examined (Fullan & Miles, 1992; Hill, 2003; Schein, 1996; Yukl, 2006), the prospect of the need for a new leadership model was considered. Research has indicated the necessity of providing for a leadership model that exceeds models and theories formerly utilized (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, et al., 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Rosener, 1990).

The purpose of this study was to investigate in what ways and to what degree, if any, an invitational leader impacts the overall success of the public school setting. This study further focused on leadership qualities and characteristics which lead to successful and consistent achievement (Ayman, 1995; Martin, 2002; Peterson & Smith, 2000; Rafaeli & Worline, 2000; Schein, 2000; Tierney, 1988). Achievement was measured by accountability standards as described by *No Child Left Behind* mandates and subsequent state standards referred to as the *MSIP* (Missouri School Improvement Plan) process.

Prior to the initiation of the data collection process, the researcher sought approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University which would grant research authorization (see Appendix O). In order to collect the necessary data for this research project certified personnel from 14 elementary, middle school, and high schools were surveyed. The population for this research study consisted of all practicing public

school principals in a Midwest state. Teachers who serve under the leadership of these principals comprised a large part of this study's population as well.

Independent-samples *t*-tests for uncorrelated means were conducted to determine the differences that might exist between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools, and to examine differences between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators. Independent *t*-tests were also performed on each of the five subscales in order to ascertain any significance that might exist among the components of trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived effectiveness. A 0.05 significance level was established for all statistical tests conducted.

The researcher conducted follow-up interviews with five percent of the participants who completed the surveys, in order to triangulate the comprehensive data collected throughout the study. Follow-up interviews were also employed in order to provide a rich, thick description to the quantitative results achieved. All participants interviewed were certified personnel, currently employed in a public school system. All of the interviews conducted were recorded and transcribed by the researcher. The interview protocols (see Appendices G and H) consisted of eleven semi-structured, open-ended questions. The researcher carefully coded each transcript for specific comments which related to any of the five subscales of the study. The researcher made special note of interviewees' responses that pertained to the subscale components of trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived effectiveness. Additionally, the researcher coded responses which pertained to the five areas that the invitational leadership model espouses to contribute to success or failure of an organization: places, policies, programs,

processes, and people. These patterns in responses added depth and substance to the quantitative data collected by means of surveys conducted. Additional data analysis included the collection and analysis of district documents such as district AYP, statistical profile of each district, and student data such as drop out rates and graduation analysis, as well as the district's report card available on the DESE website. These artifacts helped to supplement the researcher's depth of understanding of each district's organizational beliefs and priorities.

The data were analyzed in an endeavor to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools?
2. Is there a significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators?
3. What invitational leadership characteristics do the leaders implement or exhibit that lead to organizational success?
4. Which characteristics of invitational leadership do teachers and administrators view as the most influential in contributing to an overall effective school?

The following research hypotheses have been evaluated to offer response to the stated research questions:

Hypothesis 1. There is no statistically significant difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools.

Hypothesis 2. There is no statistically significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators.

Presented in this chapter is an analysis of the data collected, description of the data collection instruments, analysis of the research questions and hypotheses, and a summary of the findings.

Data Analysis

Population

The population for this research study consisted of the principal and all certified staff of 14 schools which participated in this study. The population more specifically consisted of an n of 14 principals, and an n of 164 teachers currently employed by eight public school districts. All schools were geographically located in a Midwest state and were selected utilizing a purposeful sampling which consisted of a multi-tiered criteria process. Of the 14 principal surveys sent out to participating schools, all 14 surveys were returned, yielding a return rate of 100%. Of the 252 teacher surveys sent out to participating schools, 164 were returned, yielding a return rate of 65 %. A sample of five percent of the participants who completed the *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices* survey and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices* survey were interviewed using an eleven semi-structured, open-ended question protocol.

Data Collection Instruments

Survey Instrument

Each leader who qualified for the study was surveyed utilizing a modified version of the *Leadership Survey* developed by Asbill (2000), and renamed *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices* for the purpose of this study (see Appendix E). Teachers serving

under the leaders were surveyed as well, utilizing the *Leadership Survey* with appropriate modification and renamed *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices* (see Appendix F). These surveys were used to measure the four principles of invitational leadership characteristics: trust, respect, optimism, and intentionality, as well as the aspect of perceived leadership effectiveness. The surveys were also utilized to provide quantitative data to assist in answering the research questions posed in this study.

The teacher's survey consisted of a 44-item scale which was designed to ascertain educators' perceptions of their principal's leadership characteristics. The principal's survey also consisted of a 44-item scale created to assess the leader's perceptions of their own personal leadership characteristics. Both surveys utilized the Likert-type scale as part of the instrument's design, employing a scale of 1 to 5, 1 representing strongly disagree to 5 representing strongly agree. Items 38-41 utilized a 1 to 5 scale with 1 representing not effective to 5 representing very effective. Using a Likert-type scale provides for a closed-ended response, while reducing the possibility for ambiguity (Dunn-Rankin, Knezek, Wallace, & Zhang, 2004; Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003). All but eight survey questions were written in a positive manner. The negative items were purposefully included to serve as a cross reference to assure that participants were responding in a legitimate and careful manner. Negative survey items were ranked in reverse order to assist in the statistical analysis process. Subsequently, a 1 response would be ranked as a positive 5, while a 5 would be ranked with a value of 1 on all negative stated questions. Item number 42 was a demographic question to ascertain gender.

Two open-ended questions, item numbers 43 and 44, were included on the survey in order to provide respondents the opportunity to express additional thoughts and ideas concerning data collected on the survey instrument. The written comments solicited from respondents were employed to attach deeper significance and meaning to the study. The written responses provided valuable information about principal and teacher perceptions of leadership practices.

Kate Asbill developed a leadership survey which was “validated with input from a panel of experts” (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000, p. 17). Asbill (2000) piloted the survey and presented the leadership survey to a panel of 12 judges with the intent of validation. Asbill utilized Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha to ascertain the internal consistency of reliability for the *Leadership Survey*. “The reliability of the *Leadership Survey* was calculated and found to be .97 for all items” (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000, p. 93). These measures signified a high level of reliability for the *Leadership Survey* which was used in modified form for this study. Modifications adapted for this research study were considered so minimal that there should be no sizable affect on the reliability or validity of the instrument.

Interview Protocol

The conceptual development of the interview protocols used to gather qualitative data in this study was based on the extensive review of available literature. The eleven question interview protocol (see Appendices G and H) for both administrators and teachers were based distinctly on the five subscales included in this study, as well as the five factors which contribute to success or failure of an organization. These five factors

are more commonly referred to as the five P's of the invitational leadership theory comprised of: people, places, policies, programs, and processes.

The interview protocol was piloted by four principals and six teachers who were currently employed in public school systems. The principals and teachers were asked to provide specific feedback concerning the clarity of the interview protocol. They were asked to make suggestions which might facilitate improvement of the interview process (Merriam, 1998). The use of the follow-up interview process added depth and dimension to the research study through triangulation and elaboration of data collected. The information elicited through the interview method provided an enhanced facet to the data collected that would not have been possible through the survey process alone (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2003; Hayes et al., 1992; Merriam, 1998; Newman & Benz, 1998; Seidman, 1998). The interview process also served as a tool for respondents to clarify or expound on thoughts they had developed during the survey process. The follow-up interviews provided for additional insight for the researcher as well.

Research Questions: Analysis of Data

Responses to the *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices* survey and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices* survey collected from the certified staff members of the 14 schools included in the study were carefully entered into the SPSS statistical package, version 11.5. Data were analyzed using the independent samples *t*-test for uncorrelated means. Statistical significance was determined at the .05 level of confidence. The statistical procedures were employed to answer research questions one and two:

Research Question 1. Is there a difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools?

An independent –samples *t*-test was calculated to assess the difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools. The test was proven to be significant, $t(175.344) = 4.99, p < .001$, which rejected the research hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools. Schools considered to be effective ($M = 3.93, SD = .43990$) on the average received consistently higher attributes of effective leadership qualities than those schools considered to be less effective ($M = 3.65, SD = .30255$). Additional comparison of the means reveals a significant difference in the leaders of effective schools' application of invitational qualities as opposed to leadership qualities demonstrated by school leaders in those schools considered to be less effective (see Table 1). Represented in Table 1 is the overall average for the component of effectiveness. The researcher totaled and averaged the subscale answers from the survey in order to generate an average score for this overall component.

Table 1

Usages of Invitational Leadership Qualities in Effective versus Less Effective Schools

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Effective Schools	108	3.9325	.43990	.04233
Less Effective Schools	70	3.6542	.30255	.03616

Note. While an even number of Effective and Less Effective Schools were included in this study, significantly fewer Less Effective Schools responded to the survey instrument. The average subscale numbers shown above reflect the scores received on Likert-type items that ranged from a 1 (strongly disagree) to a 5 (strongly agree).

Further investigation into the differences that might exist between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools included analysis of the five subscales derived from The *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey (PPLP)* and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey (TPLP)*. These subscales were used to measure the four assumptions of invitational leadership qualities and the aspect of perceived leadership effectiveness. Independent *t*-tests were performed on each of the five subscales in order to ascertain any significance that might exist among the components of trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived leadership effectiveness. A 0.05 significance level was established for all statistical tests conducted. The results achieved were as follows:

Trust. On the *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey (PPLP)* and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey (TPLP)* the subscale of trust consisted of survey questions number 1, 2, 11, 13, 15, 26, 32, and 35. These questions were included on the survey to ascertain if the quality of trust was present in the leader's

current leadership style. The researcher totaled and averaged the answers from the surveys in order to generate the subscale average scores, these scores were then compared in the *t*-test. An independent *t*-test was calculated on the subscale of trust which rendered a significance of, $t(171.433) = 3.386, p = .001$ (see Table 2). Schools considered to be effective ($M = 4.36, SD = .579$) on the average received consistently higher scores on the subscale of trust than those schools considered to be less effective ($M = 4.10, SD = .440$).

Table 2

Trust Subscale for Leaders of Effective versus Less Effective Schools

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Effective Schools	108	4.36	.579	.056
Less Effective	70	4.10	.440	.053

Schools

Note. While an even number of Effective and Less Effective Schools were included in this study, significantly fewer Less Effective Schools responded to the survey instrument. The average subscale numbers shown above reflect the scores received on Likert-type items that ranged from a 1 (strongly disagree) to a 5 (strongly agree).

Respect. On the PPLP and the TPLP the subscale of respect consisted of survey questions number 4, 5, 14, 18, 20, 21, 25, 27, 33, 36, and 37. These questions were incorporated in the survey in order to determine a leader's level of respect. The researcher totaled and averaged the answers from the surveys in order to generate the subscale average scores, these scores were then compared in the *t*-test. An independent *t*-test was calculated on the subscale of respect which rendered a significance of, $t(175.130) = 3.138, p = .002$ (see Table 3). Schools considered to be effective ($M = 4.04,$

$SD = .495$) on the average received consistently higher scores on the subscale of respect than those schools considered to be less effective ($M = 3.84$, $SD = .344$).

Table 3

Respect Subscale for Leaders of Effective versus Less Effective Schools

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Effective Schools	108	4.04	.495	.048
Less Effective Schools	70	3.84	.344	.041

Note. While an even number of Effective and Less Effective Schools were included in this study, significantly fewer Less Effective Schools responded to the survey instrument. The average subscale numbers shown above reflect the scores received on Likert-type items that ranged from a 1 (strongly disagree) to a 5 (strongly agree).

Optimism. On the PPLP and the TPLP the subscale of optimism was comprised of survey questions number 7, 8, 9, 16, 19, 22, 23, 24, and 28. These questions were included on the survey with the purpose of identifying a leader’s ability to demonstrate the leadership characteristic of optimism. The researcher totaled and averaged the answers from the surveys in order to generate the subscale average scores, these scores were then compared in the *t*-test. An independent *t*-test was calculated on the subscale of optimism which rendered a significance of, $t(169.164) = 4.604$, $p < .001$ (see Table 4). Schools considered to be effective ($M = 4.37$, $SD = .535$) on the average received consistently higher scores on the subscale of optimism than those schools considered to be less effective ($M = 4.03$, $SD = .422$).

Table 4

Optimism Subscale for Leaders of Effective versus Less Effective Schools

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Effective Schools	108	4.37	.535	.051
Less Effective Schools	70	4.03	.422	.050

Note. While an even number of Effective and Less Effective Schools were included in this study, significantly fewer Less Effective Schools responded to the survey instrument. The average subscale numbers shown above reflect the scores received on Likert-type items that ranged from a 1 (strongly disagree) to a 5 (strongly agree).

Intentionality. On the *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* (PPLP) and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* (TPLP) the intentionality subscale consisted of survey questions number 3, 6, 10, 12, 17, 29, 30, 31, and 34. These questions were integrated into the survey to ascertain if the quality of intentionality was present in the leader's current leadership style. The researcher totaled and averaged the answers from the surveys in order to generate the subscale average scores, these scores were then compared in the *t*-test. An independent *t*-test was calculated on the subscale of intentionality which rendered a significance of, $t(173.586) = 3.008, p = .003$ (see Table 5). Schools considered to be effective ($M = 4.28, SD = .584$) on the average received consistently higher scores on the subscale of intentionality than those schools considered to be less effective ($M = 4.06, SD = .425$).

Table 5

Intentionality Subscale for Leaders of Effective versus Less Effective Schools

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Effective Schools	108	4.28	.584	.056
Less Effective Schools	70	4.06	.425	.051

Note. While an even number of Effective and Less Effective Schools were included in this study, significantly fewer Less Effective Schools responded to the survey instrument. The average subscale numbers shown above reflect the scores received on Likert-type items that ranged from a 1 (strongly disagree) to a 5 (strongly agree).

Perceived Effectiveness. On the PPLP and the TPLP the effectiveness subscale included questions number 38, 39, 40, and 41. These questions were incorporated into the survey to establish respondent's perceptions of their current leader's overall effectiveness in their position of leadership. The researcher totaled and averaged the answers from the surveys in order to generate the subscale average scores, these scores were then compared in the *t*-test. An independent *t*-test was calculated on the subscale of perceived effectiveness which rendered a significance of, $t(175.130) = 3.138, p = .002$ (see Table 6). Schools considered to be effective ($M = 4.25, SD = .748$) on the average received consistently higher scores on the subscale of perceived effectiveness than those schools considered to be less effective ($M = 3.59, SD = .662$).

Table 6

Perceived Effectiveness Subscale for Leaders of Effective versus Less Effective Schools

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Effective Schools	108	4.25	.748	.072
Less Effective Schools	70	3.59	.662	.079

Note. While an even number of Effective and Less Effective Schools were included in this study, significantly fewer Less Effective Schools responded to the survey instrument. The average subscale numbers shown above reflect the scores received on Likert-type items that ranged from a 1 (strongly disagree) to a 5 (strongly agree).

During the course of the interview process, the voices of study participants supported numerous quantitative findings. As the subscale of perceived effectiveness was analyzed, the research further noted that teachers in effective schools were much more likely to agree with their principal's perception of his or her own leadership behaviors than were those from schools considered to be less effective. Most frequently, principals of less effective schools scored themselves very high in utilizing invitational leadership qualities of effective leadership, while their faculty scored them consistently lower on their usage of effective leadership behaviors. One survey respondent said of their principal, "It is January 7th and my principal has not visited my room once. I feel he does not stick to school policies when dealing with discipline issues. He is too soft." While another interviewee articulated, "There is no real rhyme or reason as to the 'how' things get done around here. It is rather hit and miss I'm sorry to say."

Conversely, one survey comment from an effective school setting stated, "Our current principal is a very capable leader. She has good communication and

organizational skills. She leads with respect for the individual so that all feel they are valued and can be successful.” A particularly moving interview session rendered the following response, “My principal is highly effective. Good leadership is intentional. Just as a ship needs a captain, a school needs good leadership to move from good to great. A leader should be proactive, compassionate and willing to be a servant to others.”

When principals considered to be effective in their leadership endeavor were asked how they implemented the invitational leadership qualities of trust, respect, optimism, and intentionality one leader succinctly stated, “Each of these qualities are pivotal to the creation of a team that works. I try to consistently demonstrate each of these qualities to my staff members.” The leader further explained, “You never know what any given person is going to need on any given day, so you must be demonstrating these positive characteristics on an ongoing basis in order to build a strong foundation for success.” Similarly one principal noted, “I believe if I exhibit each of these characteristics on a consistent and daily basis, my staff will feel better about what they do and therefore they will be more productive, which has to be good for kids.”

Research Question 2. Is there a significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators?

An independent –samples *t*-test was conducted to evaluate if there is a significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female leaders. The test was found to not be significant, $t(175) = -.365, p = .716$, which retained the research hypothesis that there is no statistically significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators. The invitational leadership qualities of male administrators ($M = 3.80, SD = .33922$) on the average received similar

scores concerning the usage of invitational leadership qualities as did their female counterparts ($M = 3.83$, $SD = .43237$). Additional comparison of the means revealed no appreciable difference in the usage of invitational leadership qualities based on the gender of the administrator (see Table 7). An overall average for the component of gender is represented in Table 7. The researcher totaled and averaged the subscale answers from the survey in order to generate an average score for this overall component.

Table 7

Invitational Leadership Qualities Based on Gender of Principal

Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Male Principals	7	3.8008	.33922	.05734
Female Principals	7	3.8294	.43237	.03628

Note. An even number of male and female principals were selected from Effective Schools and Less Effective Schools to be included in this study. The average subscale numbers shown above reflect the scores received on Likert-type items that ranged from a 1 (strongly disagree) to a 5 (strongly agree).

As shown in Table 7, the researcher sought to assure an equitable comparison of male and female administrators. This outcome was achieved through careful selection of schools within districts considered to be effective and those deemed to be less effective in order to achieve a purposeful and equitable balance between the gender categories.

Further investigation into the subscale results for trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived effectiveness revealed little appreciable difference between the way male and female leaders utilize the invitational leadership qualities to assist in the creation of an effective organization (see Table 8).

Table 8

Subscale Findings for Invitational Leadership Qualities Based on Gender Differences

Subscale	Variable	<i>N</i>	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Trust	Male	7	4.24	.420	.071
	Female	7	4.26	.571	.048
<i>p</i> = .001					
Respect	Male	7	4.00	.359	.061
	Female	7	3.96	.471	.040
<i>p</i> = .002					
Optimism	Male	7	4.18	.419	.071
	Female	7	4.25	.543	.046
<i>p</i> < .001					
Intentionality	Male	7	4.18	.463	.078
	Female	7	4.20	.556	.047
<i>p</i> = .003					
Perceived Effectiveness	Male	7	3.94	.645	.109
	Female	7	4.00	.817	.069
<i>p</i> = .002					

Note. An even number of male and female principals were selected from Effective Schools and Less Effective Schools to be included in this study. The average subscale numbers shown above reflect the scores received on Likert-type items that ranged from a 1 (strongly disagree) to a 5 (strongly agree).

Research questions three and four were completely qualitative in nature. Follow-up interviews, as well as written comments on the two surveys used in this study, were

employed to achieve corroborating information that would add depth and dimension to the preceding quantitative results.

Research Question 3. What invitational leadership characteristics do the leaders implement or exhibit that lead to organizational success?

As the researcher sought to find patterns and themes among the transcripts of interviewees and written comments on the TPLP, a few distinct trends became notably clear. Teachers were very decisive that the invitational qualities of respect and trust were most important when considering the creation of organizational success. One teacher interviewee succinctly stated, “If a leader doesn’t have the trust of their staff, they will not be an effective leader.” The quality of respect was considered even more important by teachers. Based on interview results and survey written comments, it appeared clear that teachers feel strongly effected by the presence or absence of the leadership characteristics of respect and trust as implemented by their leaders. One interviewee elaborated, “I don’t feel my principal respects me, so I feel ill at ease every time I am in her presence.” Conversely, one survey participant wrote, “My principal is always positive and treats each person with respect. Feeling respected for what I do means the world to me.”

Principals were more evenly split among the qualities of optimism, respect, and trust. However, based on interview and survey written comments, principals demonstrated a stronger belief that the characteristic of trust was most important when creating an invitational atmosphere. One principal responded when interviewed, “I feel that trust is the most important aspect of leadership, for trust nurtures all the other

assumptions that make up effective leadership.” This elemental statement appeared to be the general consensus among principals included in this study.

Research Question 4. Which characteristics of invitational leadership do teachers and administrators view as the most influential in contributing to an overall effective school?

Follow-up interviews and written comments on the TPLP and the PPLP strongly revealed that teachers and principals were in 100% agreement that the invitational leadership factor of people was the single most influential characteristic that contributes to the overall effectiveness of an organization. Without hesitation, interviewees responded to this question which sought to ascertain what factor they believed to be most influential in contributing to effective organizations, with the belief that people are the central aspect that must be attended to. Written comments on returned surveys also contributed to the overwhelming theme that the needs of people must be considered above all else. Principals and teachers agreed that the way people are treated comprise a significant component which contributes to the success or failure of an organization. One teacher commented, “I feel our principal is very effective because she puts people first, above all else. She takes the stance that if your people aren’t happy, nothing productive is going to happen.” Similarly, a principal remarked, “The most important thing in any organization is the people. Relationships are the cornerstone to everything that takes place in my organization.” When asked about the most important factor to address when building an effective organization, yet another principal answered simply, “people, people, people. That’s what it’s all about!”

This research question revealed an unanticipated theme within the written comments and interviewee responses. The theme that repetitively emerged was that of principals or leaders who showed favoritism for members of an organization. A surprising number of comments focused on the specific aspect of leaders that consistently show favoritism toward certain members of their organizations, while demonstrating disfavor to the remainder of the organization's members.

A few written comments received on the surveys included such examples as: "There are favored teachers within the district, their input is final over other's opinions", "My principal is quite young and show favoritism toward all the younger teachers. The older, more experienced teachers are left to feel inadequate, ignored, and old", and "My principal shows so much favoritism that it has completely fragmented our faculty." One interviewee shared, "I have pretty much given up trying to excel at my job. Since I'm not one of the 'in teachers', it really doesn't matter what I do, my principal won't pay any attention to what I achieve. The worst part is, because I'm not one of her 'favorites' my students ultimately suffer in the long run."

Findings

The results of this study indicated that there is a significant difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools. Furthermore, additional analysis revealed that no significant differences exist between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators. A representative sample of 178 teachers and principals from a Midwest state completed the 44 question *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey (PPLP)* and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey (TPLP)*. Imbedded within the

survey were the five subscales of trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived effectiveness.

Analysis of the survey data revealed significant implications for the usage of invitational leadership qualities by those leaders in effective schools, as opposed to those leadership characteristics employed by leaders of less effective schools, which rejected research hypothesis one. It is of further importance to note that while slight differences did exist between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators, the differences were so minimal that they are not considered to be significant which retained research hypothesis two.

Qualitative findings supported the results of quantitative measures, adding greater depth and meaning to the overall study. Follow-up interviews and written comments on surveys contributed to the analysis process. Interview results and survey written comments revealed that teachers identified the leadership characteristics of respect and trust as critical leadership qualities to implement when striving to establish an effective organization. A teacher interviewee stated, "Our principal shows us trust and respect by valuing our professional judgment. This has proven important to our entire staff." Principals demonstrated a belief that the characteristic of trust was most important when creating an invitational atmosphere. One principal interviewee affirmed, "Being visible, talking with my staff, being able to laugh with them, knowing about their personal lives and talking about mine are all ways that I build trust among my staff members."

Additional qualitative data revealed that principals and teachers agreed unanimously about the factor that is most influential in contributing to an overall effective school. The invitational leadership factor of people was identified by all

respondents as the single most influential aspect that assists in the creation of a healthy and successful organization. Evidence of this people centered focus was acknowledged when one principal stated, “My biggest focus is to let my teachers know that I support and appreciate them 100%.”

Statement of Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. There is no statistically significant difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools.

Based upon the analysis and the research data as presented in Table 1 this hypothesis is rejected at the .05 level of confidence. The usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools were found to be statistically significant.

Hypothesis 2: There is no statistically significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators.

Based upon the analysis and the research data as presented in Table 7, this hypothesis is retained. No significant differences between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators were found.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate in what ways and to what degree, if any, an invitational leader impacts the overall success of the public school setting. The researcher also sought to examine the role that leadership characteristics play in the creation of organizations deemed to be effective.

Analyses of the data gathered from the *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey (PPLP)*, *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey (TPLP)*,

and follow-up interviews of five percent of the survey respondents, provided findings for the research questions posed in this study. The researcher collected data in order to ascertain if a significant difference exists between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools. The researcher further investigated to determine if there is a significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators.

Additionally, the characteristics of trust and respect were identified by teachers to be highly influential for leaders to implement when creating a successful organization. Principals were divided among the characteristics of optimism, respect, and trust. Administrators, did however, feel more strongly that trust was a crucial component when implementing effective leadership behaviors. Teachers and principals were in complete agreement that the invitational leadership factor of people was the single most important issue to attend to when seeking to create a successful, healthy organization.

Qualitative data collected helped to support and buttress the findings revealed through quantitative means. Both forms of data contributed to the depth of findings and results garnered throughout this mixed-design research study. Qualitative findings afforded a more extensive view of the perceptions of teachers and principals' concerning what constitutes effective leadership.

In the final chapter of this research study, the researcher will more extensively underscore the findings which resulted from this study. Conclusions based on the data analyses are also discussed in Chapter Five, as well as implications for practice and recommendations for future study.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The characteristics that prove critical for effective leadership were examined in this study. The researcher more specifically investigated the possible impact that invitational leadership might have on the creation of an effective organization. Presented in this chapter is the purpose of the study, as well as the design and procedures utilized in the research investigation. A detailed review of the findings is included, as well as the conclusions, limitations, implications for practice, and recommendations for further research.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate in what ways and to what degree, if any, an invitational leader impacts the overall effectiveness of the public school setting. This study focused on leadership qualities and characteristics which lead to successful and consistent achievement. Underscored throughout the study are changing accountability standards, the need for effective leadership, the nurturing of organizational health, the leader serving as a change agent, and the development of a positive school culture. Moreover, the researcher sought to identify any significant differences between the leadership behaviors of female and male leaders.

While there have been many studies conducted on leadership effectiveness, as well as studies on effective schools, the role invitational leadership might play in the assistance in creating effective organizations, as well as enhancing upon overall leadership effectiveness, has not been fully examined (Asbill & Gonzalez, 2000; Egley,

2003). While the invitational leadership model contains certain parallels to participative, transformational, and servant leadership, the invitational model transcends these common parallels in several elements of design. The results of this study should contribute to the current body of research and literature on invitational leadership.

Recent research has indicated that current leadership models may well fall short in preparing contemporary leaders for the challenges of today's educational institutes (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, et al., 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Rosener, 1990). Consequently, a need exists for a new model of leadership that provides the guidance and direction that will serve the educational leaders of the twenty-first century (Billups, 1999; Burke, 2002; Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996; Stecher & Kirby, 2004; Tungate & Orie, 1998).

The invitational leadership model uniquely answers the appeal for increased leadership standards (Day, et al., 2001; Kelly, et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005). Invitational leaders impact the organizational system in many positive ways (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005). As Ogawa and Bossert (1995) confirmed, "leadership must affect more than individual actions; it must influence the system in which actions occur" (p. 233). A need exists for a leadership model that systematically and holistically addresses the internal and external essentials of an organization. Invitational leaders concentrate on the creation of organizations that are people-centered and success oriented, while dealing with all necessary aspects of the organization (Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005).

The research questions guiding this study were as follows:

1. Is there a difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools?
2. Is there a significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators?
3. What invitational leadership characteristics do the leaders implement or exhibit that lead to organizational success?
4. Which characteristics of invitational leadership do teachers and administrators view as the most influential in contributing to an overall effective school?

The following research hypotheses were evaluated in an effort to answer the research questions:

Hypothesis 1. There is no statistically significant difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools.

Hypothesis 2. There is no statistically significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators.

These research questions and accompanying hypotheses were engendered as a result of an extensive literature review concerning the need for effective leadership in the wake of increased accountability standards. Although there are numerous leadership theories to use as models for leadership behaviors (Hallinger & Heck, 1999; Kezar, 2000; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 2000; Sergiovanni, 2000; Spears & Lawrence, 2004; Yukl, 2006), many researchers believe that a new leadership model is warranted to meet

the needs of the demands of the twenty-first century (Billups, 1999; Burke, 2002; Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996; Stecher & Kirby, 2004; Tungate & Orie, 1998).

Various researchers (Day, Harris & Hadfield, 2001; Kelly et al., 1998; Purkey, 1992; Purkey & Novak, 1996; Purkey & Siegel, 2003; Stillion & Siegel, 2005) support invitational leadership (also referred to invitational theory of practice - ITOP) as a viable model to serve the needs of today's educational institutes. As Stanley, Juhnke, and Purkey (2004) affirmed, "ITOP presents a way of creating and maintaining schools that are both safe and conducive to academic success" (p. 1).

Design and Procedures

Data for this mixed-design study were attained through the administration of two survey instruments. The *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* (PPLP) (see Appendix E) and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* (TPLP) (see Appendix F) modified from Asbill's (2000) *Leadership Survey*, was administered to 178 certified faculty members from fourteen public schools participating in the study.

The *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* evaluated the four assumptions of invitational leadership: trust, respect, optimism, and intentionality, as well as perceived effectiveness. The *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* contained 41 statements using a five-point Likert-scale to report the participant's perceptions of their current leader. One survey item provided for the demographic of gender, while the final two items provided for the opportunity for written comments.

Qualitative data were collected through follow-up interviews of five percent of the respondents who completed the *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices* Survey and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices* Survey. The interviews consisted of a semi-structured interview protocol interrelated to the potential characteristics that comprise effective leadership, especially that of invitational leadership components.

The quantitative data were analyzed using the SPSS 11.5 statistical package to examine the potential differences between leadership behaviors of leaders of effective versus less effective schools, as well as possible differences in leadership qualities between male and female leaders. Independent samples *t*-tests for uncorrelated means were conducted to determine the differences that might exist between the practice of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools, and to examine differences between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators. Independent *t*-tests were also performed on each of the five subscales in order to ascertain any significance that might exist among the components of trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived effectiveness. A significance level of $p < .05$ was established for all tests conducted.

Discussion of the Findings

The results of this research study of effective leadership characteristics in relation to the current literature available on this topic are examined in the following section. The predominant themes from the review of related literature encompassed research on effective leadership characteristics (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Katzenbach & Smith, 2003; Yukl, 2006), and invitational leadership (Asbill, 2000; Purkey, 1995; Purkey & Siegel,

2003). Bolman and Deal (1997) considered effective leadership characteristics as they related to utilizing various lenses by which to analyze the effectiveness of an organization. Katzenbach and Smith (2003) viewed effective leadership through the tenets of the six characteristics which build highly effective teams, while Yukl (2006) analyzed effective leadership through decades of multiple research findings. Kelly et al. (1998) and Day et al. (2001) discussed effective leadership characteristics as they related to the invitational leadership model. Purkey (1995) first addressed his concept of invitational education as it related to the overall educational process. Subsequently, Purkey and Siegel (2003) developed the invitational leadership model to address the specific skills necessary for leaders to create a successful and effective organization. The researcher gleaned information from available research and applied the information in a new way. To the researcher's knowledge, this study represents a unique perspective that combines the analysis of both effective leadership characteristics and the tenets of invitational leadership as it applies to the creation of an effective and successful organization. A summary of existing research, including the current findings is displayed in Table 9.

Table 9

Summary of Related Research

Researcher	Effective Leadership Characteristics	Invitational Leadership (I. L.) Theory	Effective Leadership and I. L. applied to Effective Organizations
Purkey (1995)		▲	
Bolman & Deal (1997)	▲		
Kelly et al. (1998)	▲	▲	
Asbill (2000)	▲	▲	
Day et al. (2001)	▲	▲	
Katzenbach et.al. (2003)	▲		
Purkey & Siegel (2003)		▲	
Yukl (2006)	▲		
G. Burns (2007)	▲	▲	▲

Interesting and relevant findings have been established, as well as educationally meaningful implications have been identified throughout the course of this study. It is the researcher's belief that this study showed that a generalization can be made that the use of invitational leadership tenets and the creation of an effective organization are highly correlated.

Finding 1

In consideration of the first research question, this study showed that a significant difference does in fact exist between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools. When quantitatively analyzed, a comparison of the means revealed a significant difference in the leaders of effective schools' application of invitational qualities as opposed to leadership qualities demonstrated by school leaders in those schools considered to be less effective (see Table 1 in chapter four).

The results of the analysis were so significant that one can confidently conclude that leaders in schools that have been identified by stringent state measures to be effective (MSIP), are recurrently practicing leadership behaviors that produce positive results. As surveys were entered into the SPSS statistical package, the researcher visually noted the consistency by which the teachers scored leaders in effective schools. While a few trends or patterns were noted, the majority of the surveys were answered in a very consistent, across the board manner by the majority of all teachers.

As teachers and principals answered interview questions openly and honestly, it became increasingly apparent that teachers and principals who worked in effective schools were strongly cognizant of the effective leadership skills which led to the organization's overall success. One teacher interviewee commented, "My principal possesses the exact skills to make this school run smoothly. While we hit a few rough spots, I feel certain at all times that we will pull together as a staff to emerge successful due to the direct leadership of our principal." A particularly moving interview session with a teacher from an effective school rendered the following response, "My principal is

highly effective. Good leadership is intentional. Just as a ship needs a captain, a school needs good leadership to move from good to great. A leader should be proactive, compassionate and willing to be a servant to others.” The consistent use of invitational leadership tenets were found to assist in the creation of a successful and healthy organization.

Finding 2

The research question pertaining to gender showed that within the context of this study, there were no significant differences between invitational leadership qualities demonstrated by male or female leaders (see Table 7 in chapter four). While slight differences may be noted on the various subscales of trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived effectiveness, the differences were so negligible, it can not be considered statistically important. This study established what the researcher believed at the onset of the research project, that quite simply, effective leadership behaviors will prove effective, regardless of the gender of the leader. Positive annotations from written comments and interviewees praised the efforts of effective leaders, regardless of gender. Leadership characteristics considered to be effective and helpful in the creation of successful organizations were not based on the gender of the leader, but rather based on the leader’s effective behaviors exhibited.

While numerous researchers discuss at length the differences that exist between the leadership styles of men and women, the results from this study did not support that belief. The findings from this study can be generalized to the supposition that effective leadership qualities should simply be considered effective, regardless of the gender of the leader. It is not difficult to envision that male and female leaders might well ascribe to

such positive leadership attributes as establishing trust among their organization's members, convey respect for their employees, express encouragement, or compliment a job well done. Indeed, positive and effective leadership behaviors remain positive and effective, regardless of the individual demonstrating them.

Subsequently, it seems reasonable to infer that effective leadership takes on many facets, as Rosener (1990) suggested "effective leaders don't come from one mold" (p. 121). When seeking to create a healthy and successful organization, the most critical aspect to consider is that of the implementation of effective leadership skills. As Stelter (2002) affirmed "The successful organization of the future will not only understand leadership in terms of gender but also its contribution to workforce and organizational effectiveness" (p. 1).

Finding 3

When considering the outcome of the third research question of this study, the researcher sought to discern which invitational leadership characteristics leaders implement or exhibit that lead to organizational success. Interestingly, teachers and principals expressed strong opinions concerning the four assumptions (trust, respect, optimism, and intentionality) of invitational leadership. Each characteristic of effective leadership were viewed as important contributing factors when seeking to create a successful organization.

Additional investigation into the five subscales derived from The *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* (PPLP) and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* (TPLP) were used to measure the four assumptions of

invitational leadership qualities and the aspect of perceived leadership effectiveness. The following specific results were found:

Trust. The subscale of trust is “critical to Invitational Leadership because it recognizes the interdependence of human beings” (Purkey & Siegel, 2003, p. 12). Purkey and Siegel (2003) concluded that “the leader who has established trust throughout his or her organization has come a long way toward ensuring the ultimate success of that organization” (p. 13). Similarly, individuals interviewed for this study strongly agreed that trust was a critical component of what comprised effective leadership. One principal responded when interviewed, “I feel that trust is the most important aspect of leadership, for trust nurtures all the other assumptions that make up effective leadership.” Yet another principal interviewee acknowledged, “To my staff, knowing that I trust what they do each day is a big deal to them. In turn, I have had several teachers tell me that they trust me and know that I will support them no matter what. These types of things build mutual trust.” One teacher interviewee succinctly stated, “If a leader doesn’t have the trust of their staff, they will not be an effective leader.” This fundamental statement appeared to be the general consensus among teachers and principals.

Respect. The subscale of trust is yet another important feature of the invitational leadership model. The value of respect within the leadership arena is critical and most basic to organizational effectiveness. Respect denotes the simple belief that people possess worth and value and should be treated as such. Stillion and Siegel (2005) espoused that, “The recognition of the fact that all people are valuable and must be respected leads to an inviting, inclusive workplace where diversity is the norm and every individual can flourish” (p. 6). Respect was a frequent topic of written responses on both

the PPLP and the TPLP, with respondents identifying the importance they attribute to respect as a critical component to overall leadership effectiveness. Interviewees responded particularly strongly on the concept of respect and the important role it played in their feelings toward their current leader. One interviewee elaborated, “I don’t feel my principal respects me, so I feel ill at ease every time I am in her presence.” Conversely, one survey participant wrote, “My principal is always positive and treats each person with respect. Feeling respected for what I do means the world to me.” One interviewee poignantly affirmed, “I feel respect is very important. If a teacher and/or student are respected, they can optimally perform up to their potential and understand the intentions set forth by administrative policies. If respect is evident, the work place will be more positive and a trust will then be established.” Repeatedly, the aspect of respect occurred as an essential characteristic that teachers, in particular, desired to have their principals show them on a regular basis. Numerous written comments and interviewees voiced the opinion that when a principal displays respect for his or her staff, a positive atmosphere begins to be created, an atmosphere that promotes excellence and satisfaction within the organization. It is therefore, inherently obvious that the invitational leadership assumption of respect is pivotal to successful acquisition of effective leadership.

Optimism. The characteristic of optimism is yet another essential component of invitational leadership. John Gardner (1990) suggested that a primary purpose of a leader is to maintain hope and optimism. Purkey and Siegel (2003) ascribed the optimistic leader as an individual who is able to reframe problematic situations as opportunities and consider the impossible to be simply difficult. Numerous participants in the survey process responded positively to their leader’s ability to be encouraging and enthusiastic.

One respondent wrote, “My principal is very enthusiastic and positive, and that contagious spirit spreads.” A principal from an effective school acknowledged, “I believe attitude is contagious. I try to remain positive at all times and communicate future visions for our school in positive terms. I confront behaviors that are negative and try to help the staff member turn those behaviors to positive ones.” Yet another principal acknowledged, “You can’t be afraid to deal with negative behaviors in your building. Working to turn the negatives to positives helps to create a sense of optimism for the future. I always try to live by the following: ‘Praise in public, constructively criticize in private’.” One teacher interviewee said of her principal, “His ability to take things in stride and remain positive spills over to his staff; this creates a sense of optimism in our building. It is quite simply a fun place to work.” Undeniably, the invitational leadership characteristic of optimism serves to contribute a tremendous increase in organizational members’ desire to work to assure excellence and success in all they do.

Intentionality. Hockaday, Purkey, and Davis (2001) defined intentionality as, “the ability of individuals to link their inner consciousness and perceptions with their purposes and actions” (p. 1). More simply stated, intentionality entails “having an end in sight”. Stillion and Siegel (2005) believed that “purpose and meaning are inherent parts of intentionality” (p. 7). The ability to act in a planned, purposeful, and focused manner is a significant component of invitational leadership. Throughout the interview process interviewees appeared to be less certain of this component of their leader’s behaviors. After probing further, the researcher was able to discover that the leaders of effective schools appeared to be more distinct in their ability to share a purposeful vision and mission with faculty than were those leaders of less effective schools. Similarly, leaders

of effective schools were much more likely to believe strongly in the component of intentionality than were the leaders of less effective schools. One principal from a school considered to be effective firmly stated, “Everything you do must be with clear intent. ‘If you don’t know where you’re going you’re never going to get there’. As a leader it is critical that everything we do is with purpose.” One teacher interviewee said of her principal, “She strives to be clear with her intentions at all times. Occasionally her intentions don’t always mesh with the will of the majority, but she follows through with the path she sets. I believe this has helped bring us to a better place as a school.” When asked about the characteristic of intentionality, one teacher from a less effective school had this to say about the leader she works under, “I guess he tries to have a plan and work that plan, though often he seems very disorganized and making things up as he goes. It seems there is little purpose to what or why things are done.” One interviewee stated simply, “Good leadership is intentional.” As with previous mentioned invitational leadership assumptions of effective leadership characteristics, the characteristic of intentionality is central for leaders to adhere to if they desire to bring about effective and long-lasting change and excellence to an organization.

Perceived Effectiveness. While it is considered that a variety of characteristics encompass effective leadership, Bolman and Deal (2002) affirmed that “some qualities are consistent across effective leaders” (p. 1). Yukl (2006) affirmed that “most researchers evaluate leadership effectiveness in terms of the consequences of the leader’s actions for followers and other organization stakeholders” (p. 9). Since the main intent of this study was to examine the role that leadership characteristics play in the creation of organizations deemed to be effective, it was imperative to establish the perceptions of

current educators concerning the overall effectiveness of their organization's leader. Interestingly, when completing the PPLP or the TPLP surveys, respondents from schools considered to be effective by MSIP standards were much more likely to respond with an agree or strongly agree on the four questions concerning effectiveness than were respondents from schools considered to be less effective based on MSIP standards. Teachers are quite certain whether their leader is effective or ineffective. Interviewees and written statements garnered from the surveys clearly revealed teacher's opinions on effective leadership. It is a quality that is at once felt, though perhaps difficult to exactly pinpoint. As one interviewee surmised, "I don't need DESE telling me whether or not my school is effective or not, or whether my leader is effective or not. The feeling of effectiveness, or lack thereof, is in the air each and everyday I walk into my building. An effective leader is a force to behold, while an ineffective leader is one to avoid." Written statements acquired from surveys from less effective schools included such comments as: "My principal is ineffective at solving problems amongst staff members", "Our principal doesn't want to 'rock the boat', even if it's the right decision that makes someone unhappy", and "My principal demonstrates a general sense of disrespect for his faculty." Perhaps more succinctly one teacher wrote, "Something is lacking to ultimately achieve change, positive change in our school."

Conversely, written comments from teachers working in schools deemed to be effective articulated, "My principal is organized and decisive. She cares for both students and staff", and "Our current principal is a very capable leader. She has good communication and organizational skills. She leads with respect for the individual so that all feel they are valued and can be successful." Ultimately, effective leadership skills,

practiced on a consistent basis, lead to effective and generally more excellent outcomes than haphazardly ordering the leadership skills that one ascribes to. Since a hopeful outcome of effective leadership is to help transform the perceptions of those around us in positive ways, one teacher's comment perhaps most aptly summed up the goal of effectiveness when she wrote, "My principal is encouraging and enthusiastic – she makes me look forward to coming to school despite student challenges."

Finding 4

The final question that helped to guide this study revealed numerous interesting findings. The researcher sought to determine which characteristics of invitational leadership teachers and administrators viewed as the most influential in contributing to an overall effective school or organization. When asked what aspect they considered most influential in contributing to an overall effective school, teachers and principals overwhelmingly agreed that "people" within an organization was the most influential factor to consider when seeking the establishment of any successful organization. While the other factors of places, policies, programs, and processes were addressed, it was fascinating to observe that each respondent offered the same answer to this question; people are the most influential element in an organization. It is important to note that regardless of the background of the teachers and principals, effective or less effective schools, each firmly believed in the factor of people.

One teacher responded, "All people of an organization have to be what is most important. Sadly, not all leaders are well versed in this critically important skill. When you work under a leader that lacks in people skills, all you can think about is how you can get out this negative situation." Similarly, one principal commented, "I believe the

number one reason why people lose their job is because of their lack of people skills, whether they are the teacher, principal, or superintendent you must treat people in a positive manner.”

Virtually all interviewees shared poignant stories of leaders who had placed a high priority on people within an organization, or sadly, those leaders who mistreated the people of an organization. This question then led the researcher to an unexpected theme within the written comments and interviewee responses. The theme that repeatedly emerged was that of principals or leaders who showed favoritism for members of an organization. Interestingly, this problem appeared more prevalent among leaders of less effective schools, nevertheless a few leaders from effective schools were reported as demonstrating this less than desirable leadership trait as well. One interviewee commented, “Some teachers are allowed to not follow the rules and others are held accountable to the letter of the law. Some teachers are the principal’s ‘buddies’.” A few written comments received on the surveys included such examples as: “There are favored teachers within the district, their input is final over other’s opinions”, “My principal, with several of her friends, make decisions which best suits themselves and their beliefs”, and “My principal sometimes comes across as having ‘favorites’ and others don’t get a chance to shine.” One interviewee shared, “I have pretty much given up trying to excel at my job. Since I’m not one of the ‘in teachers’, it really doesn’t matter what I do, my principal won’t pay any attention to what I achieve. The worst part is, because I’m not one of her ‘favorites’ my students ultimately suffer in the long run.”

As the researcher collated survey information, it was observed that specific patterns of responses prevailed for certain principals. It became clear for a few principals,

which teachers were among the leader's "favorites" and which teachers were not favored. Ultimately, as we consider the influential issue of people, it is of great importance that leaders remain cognizant of how they treat each and every member of their organization. This is a matter of respect and consideration that, as discussed previously, is paramount to effective leadership.

Conclusions

Research Question 1. Is there a difference between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools?

The results of this study indicated the characteristic behaviors typically ascribed to by leaders of schools deemed to be effective differ consistently from those leaders of schools deemed to be less effective. In order to achieve these results, 178 certified personnel from 14 schools currently working in public school districts in a Midwest state were surveyed using the *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey*. Follow-up interviews were conducted on five percent of the respondents to the two survey instruments.

The data first confirmed that there were significant differences between the usages of invitational leadership qualities in effective schools versus less effective schools. The significance levels were, in fact, so compelling that it is reasonable to suggest that the principals leading in those schools found through the MSIP process to be more effective, ascribe to invitational leadership behaviors on a regular basis. It was further established through written comments and follow-up interviews that teacher's perceptions of these leaders were consistently more positive and affirming than the perceptions of leaders in schools determined to be less effective. Perhaps one teacher

interviewee put it best when she concluded, “I’ve worked for effective principals and I’ve worked for ineffective principals. Without a doubt, everything that the effective principal does is more people oriented and positive in nature. The ineffective principals seem to always just be putting in their time.”

Further investigation into five subscales derived from The *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* (PPLP) and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* (TPLP) were used to measure the four assumptions of invitational leadership qualities and the aspect of perceived effectiveness of leadership. Significance levels on each of the five subscales of trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived effectiveness were noteworthy. Consistently, leaders of effective schools were scored high on these important leadership behaviors, whereas leaders of schools determined to be less effective received scores that were customarily lower. Additionally, the teacher’s perceptions of leaders in less effective schools were consistently sporadic and less decisive of those from effective school organizations. Follow-up interviews and additional survey comments were also more consistently positive concerning the leadership qualities in effective schools; conversely negative comments were more predominant from follow-up interviews and additional survey comments from less effective schools.

Research Question 2. Is there a significant difference between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators?

The data from the study were further used to determine if there were significant differences between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators. It can be concluded from the data that no significant differences existed

between the invitational leadership qualities of male and female administrators. Closer investigation of subscale results for trust, respect, optimism, intentionality, and perceived effectiveness revealed no substantial difference between the way male and female leaders utilize the invitational leadership qualities to assist in the creation of an effective organization.

Leadership characteristics considered to be effective and helpful in the creation of successful organizations were not based on the gender of the leader, but rather based on the leader behaviors exhibited. These findings conclude that effective leadership should be considered effective, regardless of gender. It appears reasonable to assume, as Rosener (1990) affirmed, “effective leaders don’t come from one mold” (p. 121). Male and female leaders who ascribe to positive invitational leadership characteristics on a consistent basis should be equally successful in their attempt to implement effective leadership qualities which results in a healthy and successful organization.

Research Question 3. What invitational leadership characteristics do the leaders implement or exhibit that lead to organizational success?

Follow-up interviews with survey respondents substantiated the quantitative findings of this study. The interviewees were anxious to share their ideas about what they believed effective leadership should consist of. They were equally eloquent about the characteristics that leaders should not emulate when attempting to build a highly effective team, resulting in the creation of a positive and healthy organization.

Teachers were particularly articulate about the leadership characteristics that they believed most critical when implementing steps to create a genuinely successful and effective learning environment in these days of high accountability standards and external

scrutiny of the educational process. Teachers felt strongly about the invitational qualities of respect and trust as vital leadership behaviors to practice when considering the creation of organizational success. The quality of respect was considered even more imperative when teachers reflected on what principals do, or fail to do, when attempting to build a highly effective team. Based on interview results and survey written comments, it appeared obvious that teachers feel strongly effected by the presence or absence of the leadership characteristics of respect and trust as implemented by their leaders.

Interestingly, authors such as Lencioni (2002), and Katzenbach and Smith (2003) identified respect and trust as primary components of a healthy and successful organization. One survey comment simply stated, “My principal demonstrates trust and respect for me, other staff members, and the students as well. That’s all I really need in order to do my job.”

When sharing their beliefs about important leadership characteristics which lead to the establishment of effective organizations, principals were more equally split among the qualities of optimism, respect, and trust. However, based on interview and survey written comments, principals confirmed a more prevalent belief that the characteristic of trust was most important when creating an invitational atmosphere. A principal interviewee firmly stated, “Trust is the bottom line. It is the beginning and the end of all things that will make a learning environment work.” Review of current literature strongly supports the principals’ commitment to trust as a significant component of effective leadership. Lencioni (2002), Katzenbach and Smith (2003), Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995), Preskill and Torres (1999), and Yukl (2006) recognized the importance of the ethical act of building trust as a vital means by which to build a healthy organization.

Research Question 4. Which characteristics of invitational leadership do teachers and administrators view as the most influential in contributing to an overall effective school?

When asked what aspect they considered most influential in contributing to an overall effective school, teachers and principals overwhelmingly agreed that “people” within an organization was the most influential factor to consider when seeking the establishment of any successful organization. It was interesting to observe that not one individual offered any other answer to this question. It is, therefore, easy to surmise that members of an organization be they leaders or followers; agree that people should be placed as a top priority within any organization. As one teacher concluded, “All people of an organization have to be what is most important. Sadly, not all leaders are well versed in this critically important skill.” Purkey and Siegel (2003) firmly believed that the most important element for leaders developing a successful school is the people that comprise the school and its many facets.

An unexpected theme was identified through written comments and interviews. The aspect of leaders who show favoritism for members of an organization was a repeated pattern throughout written comments and interviews. Interestingly, this problem appeared more prevalent among leaders of less effective schools, nevertheless a few leaders from effective schools were reported as demonstrating this less than desirable leadership trait as well. One teacher’s comments revealed, “My principal comes across as having ‘favorites’ and others don’t get a chance to shine.” Yet another teacher shared, “I have pretty much given up trying to excel at my job. Since I’m not one of the ‘in

teachers', it really doesn't matter what I do, my principal won't pay any attention to what I achieve."

Inherently, favoritism is a means by which to exclude certain individuals. Since the issue of people is so critical to the creation of an effective organization, steps should be taken to assure that people within an organization are recognized for their contributions and treated in a fair and equitable manner.

Limitations and Design Control

There were numerous limitations to this research study; however the researcher took every precaution to diminish the effects of these limitations on the study. The researcher obtained input and assistance from experienced researchers throughout the course of this study. The researcher recognized the following limitations:

1. This study was limited by geographic parameters utilized in one Midwest state.
2. This study was limited by use of one academic school year from which to derive results.
3. This study was further limited by the degree of validity and reliability of the survey instrument utilized by the researcher.
4. It was assumed that participants were open and honest in their responses and interpreted the survey instrument and interview protocol in the way in which they were intended.
5. It was assumed that participants responded to the survey/interview based on personal experiences.
6. This study was limited by the extent of experience the researcher possessed in survey and interview skills.

7. Researcher bias is assumed to be a limitation of the study as well. An attempt to control research bias was addressed through the use of the triangulation of the on-going review of data and by additional review of an educational researcher.

While steps were taken to minimize the effects of the limitations, it must be assumed that limitations have a certain effect on the overall concluding results. The design of this study was carefully based on a method of descriptive research. Descriptive research is particularly effective when analyzing complex educational issues which involve abilities and behaviors. The use of surveys is frequently employed when conducting descriptive research due to accessibility to analyze the thoughts and viewpoints of various individuals. Seels, Fullerton, Berry, and Horn (2004) concluded "The common denominator among such studies is the use of survey techniques for the purpose of reporting characteristics of populations or samples" (p. 257). The researcher specifically sought self reporting input from superintendents and principals, as well as teachers serving under individuals thought to possess invitational leadership qualities and leaders from schools deemed to be less effective. A significant obstacle to the survey method of inquiry was the possibility for lack of response from subjects who were asked to respond to the surveys (Seels et al., 2004). Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) described this phenomenon as "nonresponse" (p. 407). The authors concluded that "in almost all surveys, some members of the sample will not respond" (p. 407). In an effort to overcome this obstacle, the researcher personally contacted superintendents, principals, and teacher leaders to request their approval for inclusion in this study. Assurance of anonymity was further guaranteed in attempt to control for honest and experience based responses from all participants.

Additionally, the design of this study included the associational research format. Fraenkel and Wallen (2003) described associational research as “research that investigates relationships” (p. 15). The design of associational research allows the researcher to transcend the simplicity of describing events or opinions by investigating existing relationships between concepts. Data collection and analysis allowed the researcher to investigate the possible link between invitational leadership qualities and organizational success.

Analysis of MSIP information and interviews were used as a triangulation method to buttress the information revealed from the survey process. Examination of MSIP information such as district AYP, statistical profile of each district, and student data such as drop out rates and graduation analysis, as well as the district’s report card facilitated the researcher’s ability to establish patterns of effectiveness and consistent achievement for schools participating in the study. The use of the follow-up interview was also a critical component of this research study. Seidman (1998) articulated that conducting an interview is “a powerful way to gain insight into educational issues through understanding the experience of the individuals whose lives constitute education” (p. 7). Furthermore, qualitative data gathered through follow-up interviews supported the findings gathered from the quantitative data.

Implications for Practice

The findings of this study suggest that a strong correlation exists between the usage of invitational leadership characteristics and the creation of an effective organization. It is therefore important to consider the application of the invitational leadership model among current and future organizational leaders. Since the invitational

leadership theory “is believed to be a process for improving schools” (Asbill, 2000, p. 109) an important implication for practice would be for school districts to pay close attention to the tenants of invitational leadership, applying them accordingly to their educational setting.

Extensive review of literature and written comments and interview results from this study strongly support the belief that principals have the power to positively affect the creation of an effective learning organization. It is therefore suggested the invitational leadership theory be utilized at the university level to assist in the training of future leaders. In so doing, future leaders may be educated in the skills and knowledge necessary to acquire leadership behaviors and qualities that can positively transform an organization.

Yet another implication for practice may be derived from the invitational leadership’s assumption of intentionality. It is recommended that all leaders become well versed in the issue of intentionality. Intentionality has been defined as, “a decision to purposely act in a certain way, to achieve and carry out a set goal, (Day et. al, 2001, p. 34). Founders of the invitational leadership model, William Purkey and Betty Siegel, articulated that, “Intentionality is at the very heart of Invitational Leadership. Of the four principles, intentionality plays the paramount role in Invitational Leadership because it is the element that gives any human activity purpose and direction” (Purkey & Siegel, 2003, p. 19). It is additionally advocated that active use of intentionality be initiated at all levels of an organization.

Based on the findings of how influential the aspect of people are to the creation of a successful and healthy organization, it is essential for school leaders to work to develop

the positive people skills and necessary communication skills to maintain the necessary level of treatment that members of an organization deserve. Steps should be taken to assure that people within an organization are recognized for their contributions and treated in a fair and equitable manner.

The results of this study indicate that in order for effective organizations to be created and maintained, positive leadership skills must be acquired and practiced consistently by leaders. Reflective practices on one's leadership skills and people skills should be assessed frequently in order to maintain optimal benefit for the organization. Further implications for practice should include not only educational institutes, but the application of invitational leadership principles to the business world as well.

Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this study should contribute to the current body of research and literature on invitational leadership, as well as what effective leadership behaviors are comprised of. Due to increased standards and accountability, public education is now facing a need for excellent leadership, unparalleled to any other time in recent or past history (Aldridge, 2003; Caldwell & Hayward, 1998; Jennings, 2003; Penner, 1981; Shapiro, 1990). It is therefore recommended that additional studies be conducted on the invitational leadership model to further ascertain its reliability and validity as a viable training model for leaders.

It is recommended that the study be replicated in other states other than the Midwest state focused on in this study. This replication would improve upon the amount of generalized assumptions that could be based on the study.

Yet another recommendation for future research would be to add a socio-economic component to the study. In addition to the effective versus less effective component, a socio-economic component could prove enlightening to the educational community.

Additionally, the issue of gender and how it relates to leadership qualities could be enhanced upon for further findings in this area. Perhaps a larger population could be sampled that might reveal different findings than those achieved in this study.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate in what ways and to what degree, if any, an invitational leader impacts the overall effectiveness of the public school setting. This study focused on leadership qualities and characteristics which lead to successful and consistent achievement. Significant findings resulted in the belief that invitational leadership characteristics do, indeed, influence the development of successful organizations, as measured by the *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey* and the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey*. The findings further clarified the importance of the daily interactions of the principal in relation to their teachers.

Throughout the literature review provided in this study, evidence has been provided to substantiate the tremendous need for direction that involves numerous characteristics of effective leadership (Caldwell, & Hayward, 1998; Davis, 2003; Fullan & Miles, 1992; Furman, 2003, Hallinger & Heck, 1999), and leadership that will transcend models and theories previously utilized (Bolman & Deal, 2002; Day, et al., 2001; Rosener, 1990).

Based on the findings in this study, it is believed that the invitational leadership model should serve as a practice to emulate in order to achieve positive results in effective leadership. Halpin (2003) articulated that “invitational leadership contributes ... by the way in which it cares for and supports the efforts of others” (p. 84). Reviewed literature and study results supported the belief that the invitational leadership model should serve as a positive source to help prepare educational leaders for the challenges they face in creating effective and successful educational organizations.

Works Cited

- Aldridge, J. (2003). Rethinking the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. *Childhood Education, 80*(1), 45. Retrieved March 21, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5002563042>
- American Federation of Teachers newsletter. (September, 2006). NCLB: Let's Get it Right. Retrieved January 31, 2006, from:
<http://www.aft.org/topics/nclb/index.htm>
- Amos, L., Purkey, W., & Tobias, N. (1985). The development of the invitational teaching survey. Paper presented at the American Research Association Convention, Chicago, IL.
- Asbill, K., & Gonzalez, M. L. (2000). Invitational Leadership: Teacher perceptions of Inviting principal practices. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice, 7*(1), 14-27.
- Ayman, R. (1995). Leadership perception: The role of gender and culture. In Chemers and R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research perspectives and directions* (pp. 137-166). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Bass, B., & Stogdill, R. (1990) *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*. (3rd ed.) New York: Free Press.
- Bennis, W., Spreitzer, G. M., & Cummings, T. G. (Eds.). (2001). *The Future of Leadership: Today's Top Leadership Thinkers Speak to Tomorrow's Leaders*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved April 1, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=107829360>
- Billups, A. (1999, November 21). Educators Learn from Lawsuits: But the Fear of Costly

Litigation Haunts Teachers and Inhibits Instruction. *The Washington Times*, p. 1.

Retrieved April 22, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001836426>

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2002, February). Leading with Soul and Spirit: Effective Leadership in Challenging Times Boils Down to Qualities Such as Focus, Passion and Integrity. *School Administrator*, 59, 21+. Retrieved April 3, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5000694741>

Bruffee, K. A. (1999). *Collaborative learning: Higher education, interdependence, and the authority of knowledge* (2nd ed.). Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Burke, T. (2002). *Lawyers, Lawsuits, and Legal Rights: The Battle over Litigations in American Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Caldwell, B. J., & Hayward, D. K. (1998). *The Future of Schools: Lessons from the Reform of Public Education*. London: Falmer Press. Retrieved April 22, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=103389209>

Carnoy, M., Elmore, R., & Siskin, L. S. (Eds.). (2003). *The New Accountability: High Schools and High Stakes Testing*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer. Retrieved April 11, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=108631589>

Cervero, R. M., & Wilson, A. L. (1994). *Planning responsibility for adult education: A guide to negotiating power and interests*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Ciulla, J. B. (Ed.). (1998). *Ethics: The Heart of Leadership*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers. Retrieved April 3, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=28028087>
- Cleveland, H. (2002, September/October). Leadership the Get-It-All-Together Profession; the Core Issue of Leadership Is the Paradox of Participation: How Do You Get Everybody in on the Act and Still Get Things Done? *The Futurist*, 36, 42+. Retrieved April 24, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5000614614>
- Cleveland, J. N., Stockdale, M., & Murphy, K. R. (2000). *Women and Men in Organizations Sex and Gender Issues at Work*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved July 26, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=24471453>
- Conger, J., Spreitzer, G., & Lawler, E. E. (1999). Introduction: the Challenges of Effective Change Leadership. In *The Leader's Change Handbook: An Essential Guide to Setting Direction and Taking Action*, Conger, J. A., Spreitzer, G. M., & Lawler, E. E. (Eds.) (pp. xxxi-xlv). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Retrieved April 1, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=108171917>
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (1996, November 2). Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders. Retrieved January 31, 2006, from: <http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/isllcstd.pdf>
- Covey, S. R. (1989). *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Cross, Beverly E. (1997). Self-Esteem and Curriculum: Perspectives from Urban Teachers. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision*, 13, 70-92.
- Davis, J. R. (2003). Leadership and administration: Building practical definitions. *Learning to lead: A handbook for postsecondary administrators* (pp. 3-17). Westport, CT: American Council on Education and Praeger Publishers.
- Day, C., Harris, A., & Hadfield, M. (2001). Grounding Knowledge of Schools in Stakeholder Realities: A Multi-Perspective Study of Effective School Leaders. *School Leadership & Management*, 21(1), 19-42.
- Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., & Halpin, S. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Leader Development for Transforming Organizations: Growing Leaders for Tomorrow*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved March 21, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=104347356>
- Donaldson, J. F. (1998). The nature and role of the organizational sponsor. In P. S. Cookson (Ed.), *Program planning for the training and continuing education of adults* (pp. 175-206). Melbourne, FL: Kreiger Publishing.
- Dunn-Rankin, P., Knezek, G. A., Wallace, S., & Zhang, S. (2004). *Scaling Methods*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved June 16, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=106444005>
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(10), 15-24.
- Education World School Issues. (January 25, 2006). Budgeting in the Accountability Age. Article Retrieved January 31, 2006, from: http://www.education-world.com/a_issues/issues/issues422.shtml

- Egley, R. (2003). Invitational leadership: Does it make a difference? *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*, 9, 57-70.
- Ellis, T. I. (1990). *Invitational learning for counseling and development* (Report No. R188062011). Ann Arbor, MI: ERIC Clearinghouse on Counseling and Personnel Services. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED315702)
- Fairholm, G. W. (1997). *Capturing the Heart of Leadership Spirituality and Community in the New American Workplace*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers. Retrieved March 28, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=6883440>
- Farling, M. L., Stone, A. G., & Winston, B. E. (1999). Servant Leadership: Setting the Stage for Empirical Research. 49. Retrieved April 3, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001896125>
- Flannery, B., & Vanterpool, M. (1990). A model for infusing cultural diversity concepts across the curriculum. In L. Hilsoni (Ed.) *To improve the academy: Resources for student, faculty, & institutional development. The professional and organizational development network in higher education* (pp. 159-175). Stillwater, OK: New Forums.
- Fowler, F. C. (2004). *Policy studies for educational leaders*. Upper Saddle River, NJ.: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2003). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (5th edition). Boston, MA. McGraw-Hill.
- Fullan, M. G., & Miles, M. B. (1992). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 73(10), 745-752.

- Furman, G. (2003). The 2002 UCEA Presidential Address. *UCEA Review*, XLV (1), 1-6.
- Gardner, J. (1990). *On Leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Ginsberg, R., & Plank, D. (1995). A Nation at Risk: Ugly Duckling No Longer. In *Commissions, Reports, Reforms, and Educational Policy*, Ginsberg, R. & Plank, D. N. (Eds.) (pp. 19-38). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers. Retrieved May 4, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=26006398>
- Grogan, M. (2003). Laying the groundwork for a reconception of the superintendency from feminist postmodern perspectives. In M. D. Young & L. Skrla (Eds.), *Reconsidering feminist research in educational leadership* (pp. 9-34). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Guttman, C. (2005, March/May). Defining Quality and Inequality in Education. *UN Chronicle*, 42, 49+. Retrieved April 11, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5009683543>
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1999). Can leadership enhance school effectiveness? In Bush et al. (Eds.) *Educational management: Redefining theory, policy and practice*, (pp. 178-190). London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Halpern, D. F. (2004). 6 The Development of Adult Cognition: Understanding Constancy and Change in Adult Learning. In *Leader Development for Transforming Organizations: Growing Leaders for Tomorrow*, Day, D. V., Zaccaro, S. J., & Halpin, S. M. (Eds.) (pp. 125-150). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved April 18, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=104347473>
- Halpin, D. (2003). *Hope and Education: The Role of the Utopian Imagination*. London:

RoutledgeFalmer. Retrieved April 20, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=108053476>

Hansen, J. (1998). Creating a School Where People Like to be. *Educational Leadership, 56*, 14-17.

Hayes, J. R., Young, R. E., Matchett, M. L., Mccaffrey, M., Cochran, C., & Hajduk, T. (Eds.). (1992). *Reading Empirical Research Studies: The Rhetoric of Research*.

Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved May 22, 2006, from

Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=99633183>

Henderson, G. (1994). *Issues and Strategies Issues and Strategies*. Westport, CT:

Praeger. Retrieved January 14, 2007, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=9611823>

Hill, G. D. (2003, May). Organizational Health: Using an Assessment Tool to Diagnose

Internal Conditions and Relationships before Writing a Prescription. *School*

Administrator, 60, 26+. Retrieved April 1, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001920711>

Hockaday, S., Purkey, W. W., & Davis, K. (2001). Intentionality in Helping

Relationships: The Influence of Three Forms of Internal Cognitions on Behavior.

Journal of Humanistic Counseling, Education and Development, 40(2), 219+.

Retrieved March 17, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst:a=5002422436>

Horn, R. A., & Kincheloe, J. L. (Eds.). (2001). *American Standards: Quality Education*

in a Complex World, the Texas Case. New York: Peter Lang. Retrieved April 11, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=109289729>

Hoyle, J. R. (2002, September). The Highest Form of Leadership: How We Can Help Tomorrow's Leaders Catch the Spirit. *School Administrator*, 59, 18+. Retrieved April 3, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5000812547>

Jennings, J. (2003). IT in a Time of Budget Cuts: How School Funding Will Affect the Quality of Education. *T H E Journal (Technological Horizons In Education)*, 30(6), 14+. Retrieved April 22, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001963800>

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). The discipline of teams. *Harvard Business Review*, 71 (2), 111-120.

Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (2003). *The wisdom of teams: Creating the high-performance organization*. New York: Harper Business Essentials.

Kelly, P., Brown, S., Butler, A., Gittens, P., Taylor, C., & Zeller, P. (1998). A Place to Hang our Hats. *Educational Leadership*, 56, 62-64.

Kezar, A. (2000). Pluralistic leadership: Incorporating diverse voices. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(6), 722-743.

Kneese, C., Fullwood, H., Schroth, G., & Pankake, A. (2003). Decreasing School Violence: a Research Synthesis. In *Ensuring Safe School Environments: Exploring Issues, Seeking Solutions*, Fishbaugh, M. S., Berkeley, T. R., & Schroth, G. (Eds.) (pp. 39-54). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Retrieved April 2, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=104636692>

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). Challenge is the Opportunity for Greatness.

Leader to Leader. 28, 16-23.

Kotter, J. P. (1999). Chapter Four The Eight Steps to Transformation. In *The Leader's*

Change Handbook: An Essential Guide to Setting Direction and Taking Action,

Conger, J. A., Spreitzer, G. M., & Lawler, E. E. (Eds.) (pp. 87-99). San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass. Retrieved April 1, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=108172017>

Krantz, J. (1998). 3 Lessons from the Field: An Essay on the Crisis of Leadership in

Contemporary Organizations. In *Contemporary Issues in Leadership*, Rosenbach,

W. E. & Taylor, R. L. (Eds.) (4th ed., pp. 40-58). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Retrieved December 26, 2006, from Questia database:

<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=27155931>

Larson, C. L., & Ovando, C. J. (2001). *The color of bureaucracy: The politics of equity in*

multicultural school communities. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Lehr, J. B. (2003). Using Learner-Centered Education to Prepare Teachers for Ethical

Leadership. *Education*, 124(1), 55+. Retrieved April 22, 2006, from Questia

database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5002018668>

Leithwood, K., & Duke D. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In

J. Murphy and K. Seashore-Louis (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Educational*

Administration (2nd edition). 45-72.

Leithwood, K., Jantzi D., & Steinbach, R. (2000). Changing leadership: A menu of

- possibilities. In *Changing leadership for changing times* (pp. 3-20). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (2000). Transformational leadership as a place to begin. In *Changing leadership for changing times*, (pp. 21-39). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Martin, J. (2002). Pieces of the puzzle: What is culture? What is not culture? *Organizational culture: Mapping the terrain* (Chapter 3). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McCombs, B. L., & Whisler, J. S. (1997). The learner-centered classroom. In B. L. McCombs and J. S. Whistler *The learner centered classroom and school: Strategies for increasing student motivation and achievement* (pp 63-101) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Millis, B. (1990). Helping faculty build learning communities through cooperative groups. In L. Hilsoni (Ed.), *To improve the academy: Resources for student, faculty, & institutional development. The professional and organizational development network in higher education* (pp. 43-58). Stillwater, OK: New Forums.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website. (2006). Division of School Improvement - Missouri School Improvement Program. Retrieved on June 15, 2006:
<http://dese.mo.gov/divimprove/sia/msip/AnnualDistinctioninPerformanceAward.doc>

- Morgan, G. M. (1998). *Images of organization* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Muijs, D. & Harris, A. (2003). Assistant & Deputy heads: Key leadership issues and Challenges. *MiE*, 17 (1), 6-8.
- National Education Association Newsletter. (2006). November. No Child Left Behind. Retrieved January 16, 2006: <http://www.nea.org/esea/index.html>
- Newman, I., & Benz, C. R. (1998). *Qualitative-Quantitative Research Methodology: Exploring the Interactive Continuum*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. Retrieved June 16, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=9396012>
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: The Oxford University Press.
- Ogawa, R. T., & Bossart, S. T. (1995). Leadership as an organizational quality. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31(2), 224-243.
- Oldroyd, D., & Hall, V. (1997). Identifying needs and priorities in professional development. In L. Kydd, M. Crawford, and C. Riches (Eds.), *Professional development for educational management* (pp. 130-147). Bristol, PA: Open University Press.
- Ousten, J. (1999). School effectiveness and school improvement: Critique of a movement. In Bush et al. (Eds). *Educational management: Redefining theory, policy and practice* (p. 166-177). London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text*. Thousand

Oaks, CA: Sage.

Penner, R. G. (Ed.). (1981). *The Congressional Budget Process after Five Years*.

Washington, DC: American Enterprise Institute. Retrieved April 22, 2006, from

Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=91889800>

Peterson, M.F., & Smith, P.B. (2000). Sources of meaning, organizations, and culture:

Making sense of organizational events. In N.M. Ashkanasy, C.P.M. Wilderom, &

M.F. Peterson (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational culture & climate* (pp. 101-

115). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Preskill, H., & Torres, R. (1999). *Evaluative Inquiry for learning in organizations*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Purkey, W. (1992). An introduction to invitational theory. *Journal of Invitational Theory*

and Practice, 1(1), 5-14.

Purkey, W., & Novak, J. (1996). *Inviting school success: A self-concept approach to*

Teaching and learning. (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Purkey, W., & Siegel, B. (2003). *Becoming an invitational leader: A new approach to*

professional and personal success. Atlanta, GA: Humantics.

Radd, T. R. (1998). Developing an inviting classroom climate through a comprehensive

Behavior-management plan. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*. 5(1),

19-30.

Rafaeli, A., & Worline, M. (2000). Symbols in organizational culture. In N.M.

Ashkanasy, C.P.M. Wilderom & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of*

organizational culture & climate (pp. 71-84). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications.

- Rosenbach, W. E., & Taylor, R. L. (Eds.). (1998). *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* (4th ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Retrieved March 28, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=2715587>
- Rosener, J. (1990, November/December). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 119-125.
- Sallis, E. (2002). *Total Quality Management in Education*. London: Kogan Page. Retrieved April 22, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=108731819>
- Schein, E. H. (1996). Culture: The missing concept in organization studies. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 229-240.
- Schein, E. H. (2000). Sense and nonsense about culture and climate. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. P. M. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Culture & Climate* (pp. xxiii-xxx). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage Publications.
- Schlechty, P. C. (2000). Leading a school system through change: Key steps for moving reform forward. In *Educational Leadership* (pp. 182-201). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schmidt, J. (1997). Making and Keeping Friends: Ready to Use Lessons, Stories, and Activities for Building Relationships. *Journal of Invitational Theory and Practice*, 9, 201-207.
- Seels, B., Fullerton, K., Berry, L., & Horn, L. J. (2004). 12 Research on Learning from Television. In *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology*, Jonassen, D. H. (Ed.) (2nd ed., pp. 249-320). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

- Erlbaum Associates. Retrieved May 27, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=104857849>
- Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (2000). Leadership as Stewardship: "Who's Serving Who?" In *Educational Leadership*, (pp. 269-286). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shapiro, S. (1990). *Between Capitalism and Democracy: Educational Policy and the Crisis of the Welfare State*. New York: Bergin & Garvey. Retrieved April 22, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=14228056>
- Sims, S. J., & Sims, R. R. (2002). Employee Involvement is Still the Key to Successfully Managing Change. In *Changing the Way We Manage Change*, Sims, R. R. (Ed.) (pp. 33-54). Westport, CT: Quorum Books. Retrieved April 1, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=101319882>
- Spears, L., & Lawrence, M. (Eds.). (2004). *Practicing Servant Leadership: Succeeding Through Trust, Bravery, and Forgiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stanley, P. H., Juhnke, G. A., & Purkey, W. W. (2004). Using an Invitational Theory of Practice to Create Safe and Successful Schools. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 82(3), 302+, Retrieved March 17, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www. Questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5006659872>
- Stecher, B., Hamilton, L., & Gonzalez, G. (2003). *Working Smarter to Leave No Child Behind: Practical Insights for School Leaders /*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand. Retrieved April 23, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=102669485>

- Stecher, B., & Kirby, S. N. (Eds.). (2004). *Organizational Improvement and Accountability: Lessons for Education from Other Sectors*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand. Retrieved March 14, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=103028724>
- Stelter, N. Z. (2002). Gender Differences in Leadership: Current Social Issues and Future Organizational Implications. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(4), 88+. Retrieved July 26, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5000787422>
- Stillion, J., & Siegel, B. (November, 2005). Expanding Invitational Leadership: Roles for the Decathlon Leader. Retrieved January 31, 2006, from
http://www.kennesaw.edu/ilec/Journal/articles/2005/siegel_stillion/expand_leadership/exp...
- Stoll, L., & Fink, D. (2003). *It's about Learning (and It's about Time)*. New York: Routledge/Falmer. Retrieved April 2, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=108319509>
- Tallon, A. (1997). *Head and Heart: Affection, Cognition, Volition as Triune Consciousness*. New York: Fordham University Press. Retrieved April 24, 2006, from Questia database: <http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=52320252>
- Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59(1), 2-21.
- Tungate, D. E., & Orie, D. P. (1998). Title IX Lawsuits. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(8), 603+. Retrieved April 22, 2006, from Questia database:
<http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5001331551>

U. S. Department of Education Conference. (June 12, 2002). Retrieved January 31, 2006
from: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/secletter/020724.html>

U. S. Department of Education. (July 24, 2002). Retrieved January 30, 2006 from:
<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/secletter/020724.html>

Willower, D. J., & Licata, J. W. (1997). *Values and valuation in the practice of educational administration*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Witcher, A. E. (1993). Assessing School Climate: An Important Step for Enhancing School Quality. *NASSP Bulletin*, 77, 1-5.

Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A

Counties located in quadrants of Midwest State

Quadrant One: Adair

Andrew
Atchison
Boone
Buchanan
Caldwell
Carroll
Cass
Chariton
Clay
Clinton
Cooper
Daviness
DeKalb
Gentry
Grundy
Harrison
Holt
Howard
Jackson
Johnson
Lafayette
Linn
Livingston
Macon
Mercer
Nodaway
Pettis
Platte
Putnam
Randolph
Ray
Saline
Schuyler
Sullivan
Worth

Quadrant Two: Audrain

Callaway
Clark
Knox
Lewis
Lincoln
Marion
Monroe
Montgomery
Pike
Ralls
Scotland
Shelby
St. Charles
St. Louis Co.
St. Louis City
Warren

Quadrant Three: Barry
Barton
Bates
Benton
Camden
Cedar
Christian
Cole
Dade
Dallas
Douglas
Greene
Henry
Hickory
Jasper
Laclede
Lawrence
McDonald
Miller
Moniteau
Morgan
Newton
Ozark
Polk
Pulaski
St. Clair
Stone
Taney
Vernon
Webster
Wright

Quadrant Four: Bollinger
Butler
Cape Girardeau
Carter
Crawford
Dent
Dunklin
Franklin
Gasconade
Howell
Iron
Jefferson
Madison
Maries
Mississippi
New Madrid
Oregon
Osage
Pemiscot
Perry
Phelps
Reynolds
Ripley
Scott
Shannon
St. Francois
St. Genevieve
Stoddard
Texas
Washington
Wayne

Appendix B

Informed Consent Form Superintendent

Dear Participant:

Thank you for considering participation in my study on leadership practices in public schools which lead to successful and consistent achievement. This study is part of my dissertation research for a doctoral degree in educational leadership and policy analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia. The information gathered should be useful in the field of professional development of school leaders, as well as add to the body of knowledge concerning excellence in leadership.

For the study, schools were selected from four quadrants of the state of Missouri. From the selected schools, all principals and teachers from each school will be included. Your staff's participation will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete the *Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices* (PPLP) or the *Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices* (TLP) instrument. Five percent of the survey participants, including principals and teachers, will be randomly selected to participate in the interview process. The interview process will take approximately half an hour to one hour of the participant's time.

Before you make a final decision about your participation, I need to explain how your rights as participants are protected:

1. Participation in the study is completely voluntary. Your staff may withdraw from participation at any time they wish without penalty, including in the middle of completing the PPLP or TLP, or after it is completed. Your staff's consent to participate or refusal to participate will not affect their employment in any way. Your staff may also decline to answer any questions that they feel uncomfortable answering during the survey or interview process. Your staff will be encouraged to contact me with any questions or concerns about their participation. You can call me at (417)-234-0023 during the day and (417)-890-7382 in the evening. In addition, you are also welcome to contact the dissertation advisor for this research study, Dr. Barbara Martin, who can be reached at (816)-373-6427.

The University of Missouri does not compensate human subjects if discomfort eventually results from the research. Nonetheless, the university holds medical, professional, and general liability insurance coverage, and provides its own medical attention and facilities if participants suffer as a direct result of negligence or fault from faculty or staff associated with the research. In such unlikely event, the Risk Management Officer should be contacted immediately at (573) 882-3735 to obtain a review of the matter and receive specific information. Related ethical guidelines about Protection of Human Subjects set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations "45 CFR 46" will be upheld. This statement is not to be construed as an admission of liability.

2. Your identity and your district's identity will be protected in reporting of results. I will not list any names of participants, or their corresponding institutions, in my dissertation or any future publications of this study.

● Confidentiality. Participants' answers will remain confidential, anonymous, and separate from any identifying information. Only the researcher and the dissertation supervisor will have access to identifiable

data. Collected data will be kept locked and destroyed three years after completion of this study. Participants' identity and district or school affiliation will not be published. Data will be aggregated for statistical analysis and summarized for reporting, protecting participants' confidentiality at all times.

This research has been preauthorized by the Institutional Review Board-IRBs of the University of Missouri-Columbia. If you have further questions regarding research participants' rights, please contact the University of Missouri-Columbia Campus Institutional Review Board at (573) 882-9585, or visit <http://www.research.missouri.edu/cirb/index.htm> or <http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm> For inquiries about the survey or your district's participation, please contact the researcher Gwen J. Burns at (417) 234-0023, or at (417) 890-7382, or by email at gburns@spsmail.org You may also contact the dissertation supervisor Dr. Barbara Martin at (816)-373-6427.

If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in research, please feel free to contact the University of Missouri-Columbia campus Institutional Review Board at (573)-882-9585.

If at this point you are still interested in participating, please fill out the consent form below. Keep a copy of this letter for future reference. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Gwen J. Burns

I, (Name) _____, (District) _____, (Date) ____/____/____
give consent for my district's staff to participate in this research project and understand the following:

1. Your responses will be used for dissertation research and potential future publications.
2. Your participation is voluntary, and may be withdrawn at any point in the study prior to submission of the survey or interview process.
3. Your identity will be protected in all reports of the research.
4. Your consent or refusal to participate in this study will not affect your employment in any way.

Signature

Please keep a copy of this consent letter for your records.

Appendix C

Informed Consent – Teacher Interview

I, (Name _____), (District _____), (Date ___/___/___) consent to participate in this research project and understand the following:

PROJECT BACKGROUND: This project involves gathering data through a survey and various interviews investigating the factors of how an administrator's leadership characteristics may assist in the creation of an overall successful organization. Two randomly chosen individuals will be chosen to be interviewed. The data will be collected for analysis and may be published. You must be 18 years of age to participate.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this study focused on leadership qualities and characteristics which lead to successful and consistent achievement.

VOLUNTARY: The interview is voluntary. You may refuse to answer any question or choose to withdraw from participation at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which they are otherwise entitled.

WHAT DO YOU DO? Sign this consent form and return to the researcher. The interview should take no more than 50 minutes to complete.

BENEFITS: Your participation in this research project will enrich the information base. A clearer understanding of how leadership characteristics may assist in the creation of an overall successful organization will expand the educational knowledge base. The findings could serve to increase the degree of educational excellence achieved by school districts.

RISKS: This project does not involve any risks greater than those encountered in everyday life.

CONFIDENTIALITY: Your confidentiality will be maintained in that a participant's name will not appear on the survey, interview, or in the published study itself. A code number may be assigned so that responses may be grouped for statistical analysis. The data will only be reported in aggregate form.

INJURY: It is not the policy of the University of Missouri to compensate human subjects in the event the research results in injury. The University of Missouri does have medical, professional and general liability self-insurance coverage for any injury caused by the negligence of its faculty and staff. Within the limitations of the laws of the State of Missouri, the University of Missouri will also provide facilities and medical attention to subjects who suffer injuries while participating in the research projects of the University of Missouri. In the event you suffered injury as the result of participating in this research project, you are to immediately contact the Campus Institutional Review Board Compliance Officer at (573) 882-9585 and the Risk Management Officer at (573) 882-3735 to review the matter and provide you further information. This statement is not to be construed as an admission of liability.

Thank you for your assistance in providing current information regarding the characteristics of effective leadership. Your efforts are greatly appreciated. If you have any questions regarding the study, please contact me at home (417) 890-7382, work (417) 523-4302, or gjb5ff@mizzou.edu. You may also contact my Faculty Advisor, Dr. Barbara N. Martin at: Dr. Barbara Martin, 4105 Lovinger Hall, Central Missouri State University, (660) 543- 8823. If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in research, please feel free to contact the Campus Institutional Review Board at (573) 882-9585. Thank you in advance for your assistance with this project.

Sincerely,

Gwen J. Burns

Doctoral Candidate, University of Missouri-Columbia

Appendix D

Informed Consent Form Principal Interview

Dear Participant:

Thank you for considering participation in my study on leadership practices in public schools. This study is part of my dissertation research for a doctoral degree in educational leadership and policy analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia. The information gathered should be useful in the field of professional development of school leaders. Your participation has been approved by your Superintendent.

For the study, schools were purposively selected from four quadrants of Missouri. From the selected schools, all principals and teachers from each school will be included in the survey instrument. Five percent of the survey participants will be chosen to be involved in the interview process. Your participation in the interview will vary in length, but should take approximately half an hour to one hour.

Before you make a final decision about your participation, I need to explain how your rights as participants are protected:

3. Participation in the study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from participation at any time you wish without penalty, including in the middle of completing the interview or after it is completed. Your consent to participate or refusal to participate will not affect your employment in any way. You may also decline to answer any questions that you feel uncomfortable answering. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns about your participation. You can call me at (417)-234-0023 during the day and (417)-890-7382 in the evening. In addition, you are also welcome to contact the dissertation advisor for this research study, Dr. Barbara Martin, who can be reached at (816)-373-6427.

The University of Missouri does not compensate human subjects if discomfort eventually results from the research. Nonetheless, the university holds medical, professional, and general liability insurance coverage, and provides its own medical attention and facilities if participants suffer as a direct result of negligence or fault from faculty or staff associated with the research. In such unlikely event, the Risk Management Officer should be contacted immediately at (573) 882-3735 to obtain a review of the matter and receive specific information. Related ethical guidelines about Protection of Human Subjects set forth in the Code of Federal Regulations "45 CFR 46" will be upheld. This statement is not to be construed as an admission of liability.

4. Your identity and your building's identity will be protected in reporting of results. I will not list any names of participants, or their corresponding institutions, in my dissertation or any future publications of this study.

• Confidentiality. Participants' answers will remain confidential, anonymous, and separate from any identifying information. Only the researcher and the dissertation supervisor will have access to identifiable data. Collected data will be kept locked and destroyed three years after completion of this study. Participants' identity and district or school affiliation will not be published. Data will be aggregated for statistical analysis and summarized for reporting, protecting participants' confidentiality at all times.

This research has been preauthorized by the Institutional Review Board-IRB of the University of Missouri-Columbia. If you have further questions regarding research participants' rights, please contact the University of Missouri-Columbia Campus Institutional Review Board at (573) 882-9585, or visit <http://www.research.missouri.edu/cirb/index.htm> or <http://ohrp.osophs.dhhs.gov/humansubjects/guidance/45cfr46.htm> For inquiries about the interview or your participation, please contact the researcher Gwen J. Burns at (417) 234-0023, or at (417) 890-7382, or by email at gburns@spsmail.org You may also contact the dissertation supervisor Dr. Barbara Martin at (816)-373-6427.

If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in research, please feel free to contact the University of Missouri-Columbia campus Institutional Review Board at 573-882-9585. If at this point you are still interested in participating, please fill out the consent form below. Keep a copy of this letter for future reference. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Gwen J. Burns

By completing the interview you understand that the following safeguards are in place to protect you:

1. Your responses will be used for dissertation research and potential future publications.
2. Your participation is voluntary, and may be withdrawn at any point in the study prior to submission of interview results.
3. Your identity will be protected in all reports of the research.
4. Your consent or refusal to participate in this study will not affect your employment in any way.

By completion of the interview it is implied that you agree to participate in this study and waive the requirement for a written consent.

Please keep this consent letter for your records.

Appendix E

Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices PPLP

Dear Respondent:

This survey is being conducted to determine principal perceptions of the leadership practices used on a daily basis. Please know that all responses are kept strictly confidential and are completely anonymous. It should take approximately 15 minutes to respond to this survey. Please answer the questions based on your current leadership practices.

By completing the attached survey entitled the Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices (PPLP) you agree to participate in the study of leadership characteristics being conducted by Gwen Burns. By completing the PPLP you understand that the following safeguards are in place to protect you:

1. Your participation is voluntary, and may be withdrawn at any point in the study prior to submission of the survey.
2. Your identity will be protected in all reports of the research.
3. Your consent or refusal to participate in this study will not affect your employment in any way.
4. Your responses will be used for dissertation research and potential future publications.

By completion of this attached survey it is implied that you agree to participate in this study and waive the requirement for a written consent.

Please keep this consent letter for your records. Please do not place any name, number, or other identifying markings on your survey in order to protect your confidentiality.

Thank you for your help.

Respectfully,

Gwen Burns

Doctorate Candidate

Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices

PPLP

Instructions:

Please rate your leadership characteristics by selecting the response for each item which best describes your leadership behaviors. Mark only one response per item.

Directions: For items 1 – 37 please answer the following questions by placing an “X” in the box that best matches your level of agreement with the statement.

	Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	Demonstrate a belief that faculty and staff members are responsible and capable					
2	Create a climate of trust					
3	Make a special effort to learn names					
4	Use sarcasm, name-calling and negative statements					
5	Often cause others to feel stressed					
6	Facilitate policies, and procedures which benefit staff, students, and teachers					
7	Demonstrate optimism					
8	Expect high levels of performance from co-workers					
9	Resistant to change					
10	Make an intentional effort to provide necessary instructional materials					
11	Create a climate for improvement through collaboration and shared decision-making					
12	Remain informed about important issues					
13	Encourage cooperation rather than competition					
14	Assure that all necessary communications reach those concerned					

	Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
15	Treat faculty and staff as though they are irresponsible					
16	Express appreciation for faculty and staff's presence in school					
17	Provide opportunities for professional growth through meaningful in-service					
18	Offer constructive feedback for improvement in a respectful manner					
19	Care about co-workers					
20	Take time to talk with faculty and staff about their out-of-school activities					
21	Listen to co-workers					
22	Communicate expectations for high academic performance from students					
23	Encourage staff members to tap their unrealized potential					
24	View mistakes as learning experiences					
25	Show insensitivity to the feelings of faculty and staff					
26	Model values, attitudes, and beliefs that encourage others to improve their skills/abilities					
27	Believe that people are more important than things or results					
28	Demonstrate a lack of enthusiasm about your job as a principal					
29	Fail to follow through					
30	View the principalship as a position of service to others					
31	Make an intentional effort to treat others with trust and respect					
32	Delegate authority and responsibility when appropriate					
33	Impolite to others					

	Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
34	Have a sense of mission which you share with others					
35	Delegate responsibilities to provide learning opportunities					
36	Express appreciation for a job well done					
37	Treat each co-worker as a unique individual					

For items 38 – 41: Please answer the following questions by placing an “X” in the box that best matches your level of agreement with the statement.

	Item	Not Effective	Slightly Effective	Moderately Effective	Effective	Very Effective
38	How do you classify the overall work effectiveness of your school?					
39	How do you rate your school’s effectiveness compared to other schools you have worked in?					
40	How do you rate your effectiveness in meeting the job-related needs of your faculty and staff?					
41	How effective have you been in positively transforming your school?					

Please circle one:

42. I am a:

1. Male 2. Female

For items 43 – 44: Please use the space provided for your answers. Additional comments may be included on the next page.

43. Please express your general observations about the leadership behaviors you most commonly utilize in your current position as principal.

44. Please express any specific comments about the effectiveness you believe you have experienced in your current leadership position.

Additional Comments: _____

Appendix F

Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices

TPLP

Dear Respondent:

This survey is being conducted to determine teacher perceptions of the leadership practices of principals. Please know that all responses are kept strictly confidential and are completely anonymous. It should take approximately 15 minutes to respond to this survey. Please answer the questions with your current principal in mind.

By completing the attached survey entitled the Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices (TPLP) you agree to participate in the study of leadership characteristics being conducted by Gwen Burns. By completing the TPLP you understand that the following safeguards are in place to protect you:

1. Your participation is voluntary, and may be withdrawn at any point in the study prior to submission of the survey.
2. Your identity will be protected in all reports of the research.
3. Your consent or refusal to participate in this study will not affect your employment in any way.
4. Your responses will be used for dissertation research and potential future publications.

By completion of this attached survey it is implied that you agree to participate in this study and waive the requirement for a written consent.

Please keep this consent letter for your records. Please do not place any name, number, or other identifying markings on your survey in order to protect your confidentiality.

Thank you for your help.

Respectfully,

Gwen Burns
Doctorate Candidate

Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices

TPLP

Instructions:

Please rate your principal by selecting the response for each item which best describes your own perceptions of his or her leadership behaviors. Mark only one response per item.

Directions: For items 1 – 37 please answer the following questions by placing an “X” in the box that best matches your level of agreement with the statement.

	Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	Demonstrates a belief that faculty and staff members are responsible and capable					
2	Creates a climate of trust					
3	Makes a special effort to learn names					
4	Uses sarcasm, name-calling and negative statements					
5	Often causes others to feel stressed					
6	Facilitates policies, and procedures which benefit staff, students, and teachers					
7	Demonstrates optimism					
8	Expects high levels of performance from co-workers					
9	Is resistant to change					
10	Makes an intentional effort to provide necessary instructional materials					
11	Creates a climate for improvement through collaboration and shared decision-making					
12	Remains informed about important issues					
13	Encourages cooperation rather than competition					

	Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
14	Assures that all necessary communications reach those concerned					
15	Treats faculty and staff as though they are irresponsible					
16	Expresses appreciation for faculty and staff's presence in school					
17	Provides opportunities for professional growth through meaningful in-service					
18	Offers constructive feedback for improvement in a respectful manner					
19	Cares about co-workers					
20	Takes time to talk with faculty and staff about their out-of-school activities					
21	Listens to co-workers					
22	Communicates expectations for high academic performance from students					
23	Encourages staff members to tap their unrealized potential					
24	Views mistakes as learning experiences					
25	Shows insensitivity to the feelings of faculty and staff					
26	Models values, attitudes, and beliefs that encourage others to improve their skills/abilities					
27	Believes that people are more important than things or results					
28	Demonstrates a lack of enthusiasm about his or her job as a principal					
29	Fails to follow through					
30	Appears to view the principalship as a position of service to others					
31	Makes an intentional effort to treat others with trust and respect					

	Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
32	Delegates authority and responsibility when appropriate					
33	Is impolite to others					
34	Has a sense of mission which he or she shares with others					
35	Delegates responsibilities to provide learning opportunities					
36	Expresses appreciation for a job well done					
37	Treats each co-worker as a unique individual					

For items 38 – 41: Please answer the following questions by placing an “X” in the box that best matches your level of agreement with the statement.

	Item	Not Effective	Slightly Effective	Moderately Effective	Effective	Very Effective
38	How do you classify the overall work effectiveness of your school?					
39	How do you rate your school’s effectiveness compared to other schools you have worked in?					
40	How do you rate your principal’s effectiveness in meeting the job-related needs of the faculty and staff?					
41	How effective has your principal been in positively transforming your school?					

Please circle one:

42. I am a:

1. Male 2. Female

Items 43 and 44 appear on the next page.

For items 43 – 44: Please use the space provided for your answers. Additional comments may be included on the bottom of the page.

43. Please express your general observations about the leadership behaviors of your current principal.

44. Please express any specific comments about the effectiveness of your current principal.

Additional Comments: _____

Appendix G

Principal's Interview Protocol

1. As an administrator how do you believe you create a sense of optimism in all interested stakeholders?
2. How important do you believe the aspect of respect is in the arena of leadership?
How do you demonstrate respect for your faculty and staff?
3. From an administrator's perspective, how do you attempt to build trust among those who follow your leadership?
4. How important do you believe it is to be "intentional" in your leadership behaviors? How do you demonstrate the characteristic of intentionality to those you serve?
5. Considering invitational leadership's five P's, how do you believe you address the issue of "people" within your organization?
6. In what ways do you attend to the "places" of your organization?
7. How do you focus on "policies" as a part of trying to create a successful organization?
8. How do you deal with the aspect of "programs" within your organization?
9. In what ways do you address "processes" within your organization?
10. Of the four assumptions – Optimism, Respect, Trust, and Intention, which do you feel as an administrator is the most important component? Why do you feel this way?

11. Of the five P's, people, places, policies, programs, and processes, which do you believe as an administrator is most important to address? Why do you feel this way?

Appendix H

Teacher's Interview Protocol

1. In what ways do you feel your administrator creates a sense of optimism in all interested stakeholders?
2. How important do you believe the aspect of respect is for leaders to show those who work under their leadership? How does your administrator demonstrate respect for your faculty and staff?
3. How does your administrator attempt to build trust for and among those who follow their leadership?
4. How important do you believe it is for leaders to be “intentional” in their leadership behaviors? How does your administrator demonstrate the characteristic of intentionality to those they serve?
5. Considering invitational leadership's five P's, how do you believe your administrator addresses the issue of “people” within their organization?
6. In what ways does your administrator attend to the “places” of your organization?
7. How does your administrator focus on “policies” as a part of trying to create a successful organization?
8. How does your administrator deal with the aspect of “programs” within your organization?
9. In what ways does your administrator address “processes” within your organization?
10. Of the four assumptions – Optimism, Respect, Trust, and Intention, which do you, as a teacher, believe is the most important component?

11. Of the five P's, people, places, policies, programs, and processes, which do you, as a teacher, believe is the most important to address?

Appendix I

Permission from Kate Asbill to Modify Survey

July 25, 2006

Mrs. Gwen Burns
1226 E. Highpoint St.
Springfield, MO 65804

Dear Mrs. Burns:

I am pleased that you want to use The Leadership Survey that I developed for my dissertation on Invitational Leadership. I give you permission to use that instrument and to make the modifications that we discussed as needed for the purposes of your study.

Please contact me at 505-887-1844 if I can be of further assistance to you. I am looking forward to seeing the results of your research and hope that you will share that information with me when your study is complete.

Sincerely,

Dr. Kate Asbill

Dr. Kate Asbill
POB 785
Carlsbad, NM 88221
505-887-1844

Appendix J

Sample representation of comments written in response to question 43 on Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey

Question 43 read as follows: Please express your general observations about the leadership behaviors of your current principal.

Effective Schools:

- “She is very calm and appears to assess everything before reacting.”
- “Good leader, very organized.”
- “Sees the larger picture. Is respectful. Requires top-quality work.”
- “Good, positive leadership, however, sometimes comes across as having ‘favorites’ and others don’t get a chance to shine.”
- “I feel our principal does a very effective job as her role in the principalship. I really feel she has an open door policy (during school hours).”
- “Encouraging, enthusiastic – makes me look forward to coming to school despite student challenges.”
- “Excellent – thinks outside the box, a problem solver.”
- “Great leader!”
- “She is always willing to work with the staff. She attends our reading meetings and listens to what we have to say.”
- “Our current principal is a very capable leader. She has good communication and organizational skills. She leads with respect for the individual so that all feel they are valued and can be successful.”

- “She is organized and decisive. She cares for both students and staff. She occasionally makes decisions based on input from a select few rather than the majority.”
- “Good leadership characteristics in some areas but mostly with grade level teachers. Good leadership in new ideas for the building, but implementing too many new ideas, too often. Lacks in leadership with teachers in special classes.”
- “The principal is responsive to teacher input and expresses a positive attitude. There are favored teachers within the district, their input is final over other’ opinions.”
- “Does not set good example for teachers and students in work ethic or bipartisan behavior.”
- “My principal has an agenda that does not meet the needs of the school.”
- “The current principal is somewhat unavailable during the school day. Very rarely can you pop in to discuss a matter. The office is either empty or the principal is on the phone.”
- “Lacks in areas of discipline afraid to step on toes of parents/students.”
- “A team player, high energy and always interested in what takes place in the classrooms. Always has best interest of students as top priority.”
- “Our principal is very inspirational, enthusiastic and shows she loves her job. Her enthusiasm is contagious. She is one of the best principals I have ever worked for.”
- “The principal is very optimistic and devoted to improving the school for our students.”

- “Our principal is an excellent leader. She is a motivator and cares about others.”
- “She is the most positive individual I have ever met.”
- “Not always realistic in problem solving. She needs to hold the students more accountable for their actions.”
- “My principal does an excellent job of modeling what a great administrator looks like. She is definitely a positive leader.”
- “Our principal models behavior each day that makes me want to do a better job. I know that the principal expects no more of me than she is willing to do herself.”
- “She is an amazing leader and is always making each teacher feel appreciated.”
- “Always upbeat, expects the absolute best from us and herself.”
- “Language wise he uses inappropriate language, but it’s never directed in a negative way at someone. It’s common language to the people in our area.”
- “More concerned about appearances of facilities than child-friendly environment.”

Less Effective Schools:

- “It is January 7th and my principal has not visited my room once. I feel he does not stick to school policies when dealing with discipline issues. He is too soft.”
- “Something is lacking to ultimately achieve change, positive change in our school.”
- “My principal needs to allow his staff more control over their areas of expertise.”
- “Well done over all, but a need to eliminate the 4, 5, 6, and so on second chances in discipline.”

- “Demonstrates professionalism. Respect for others.”
- “Ineffective at solving problems amongst staff members.”
- “Our principal doesn’t want to ‘rock the boat’, even if it’s the right decision that makes someone unhappy.”
- “Needs to be open to change, be more positive in that area.”
- “Makes blanket statements when there is a problem instead of going to individual teachers.”
- “In my opinion he does not delegate so most of the time he is unavailable to help others.”
- “While my principal is interested in ‘honors’ of the school, sometimes loses touch with the reality of getting there.”
- “As a first year principal in our building, he is learning each and every day. He cares about everything, the students, the teachers, and the community.”
- “He listens attentively to and encourages staff. He is optimistic and always in an upbeat mood. He is always ‘available’ with an open door.”

Sample representation of comments written in response to question 44 on
Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey

Question 44 read as follows: Please express any specific comments about the effectiveness of your current principal.

Effective Schools:

- “She’s transformed a negative environment to a positive.”
- “She is a very effective principal. She does what is needed to get the job done.”
- “She has verbalized, ‘What can I do to help you teach?’ I’ve never had that kind of support before!”
- “Excellent leadership, promotes a sense of optimism throughout the building.”
- “She isn’t readily available to staff. She leaves the office at 3:30 and is often busy during teacher breaks.”
- “Whether arranging for summer school field trips, finding funds available for a new reading series, or working in the Outdoor Classroom our principal has earned the respect of her school district for her positive ‘can do’ approach.”
- “The current principal is more active with updating textbooks.”
- “She has been very effective in several areas of curriculum, starting new reading and math programs. Started new discipline program for our building that has been successful.”
- “She is a people person. Her concern and compassion for the school, staff and students is shown daily in the way she handles situations.”
- “She is effective and quick on handling student/teacher issues.”
- “Lively, energetic, and very organized. Good with providing materials for meetings and keeping meetings brief. Values time of staff to a point, but

sometimes geared towards own benefits. Good ideas for assisting classroom learning, but piles too much on her staff at one time.”

- “Sometimes I feel she is unavailable. The majority of the time she is packed up and has gone before 3:30 p.m. This is very inconvenient some days.”
- “My principal, with several of her friends, make decisions which best suits themselves and their beliefs.”
- “Leaves building/office before all students (tutoring or special activities) are out of the building. She begins programs very vaguely expecting the teachers to ‘figure it out’. She conveys an attitude of superiority and uses authority to ‘make it her way’.”
- “Too many meetings have been scheduled.”
- “She stands firmly behind the faculty.”
- “We are in a re-organizational period – lots of balls in the air.”
- “I feel she needs to trust the PLC committee to run professional development days verses her telling them what will be done.”
- “Needs to stop giving students so many chances. We need more consequences or students are going to end up running this school.”
- “The staff is now more cohesive.”
- “Steadily decreased in effectiveness over the years.”

Less Effective Schools:

- “He encourages the use of technology, is open-minded about using a wide variety of instructional strategies, and allows staff to use their professional judgment in daily decision making.”
- “I think our students need a more strict structure that they are not getting.”
- “I feel that he needs to be more consistent and follow the handbook when it comes to discipline.”
- “Has final say – not sure it’s always his thoughts or ideas.”
- “Not positive of his follow through.”
- “Allows students to take advantage of the policies which sends an overall bad impression.”
- “I am sure he would be very effective if we could actually interact or have him help us with situations that may arise.”
- “Needs to listen to teachers as an expert in their field.”
- “He listens to what others have to say.”
- “Has mellowed from authoritative rule maker to more team builder and encourager.”

Sample representation comments written in response to Additional Comments section of
Teacher Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey

Effective Schools:

- “I’ve worked for 4 different principals and this one is the best so far. Others were disrespectful and rude to the point that teachers were wanting to walk out on their jobs! This principal requires twice the work and people are thanking her for it – because she herself works hard and she handles everything with respect.”
- “Although I am older than my principal, I’ve never been made to feel an age difference. In regards to education and our roles at school, I’ve always felt that we were equal partners in wanting the best for our students.”
- “She works to ‘catch’ her teachers doing a great job and she commends them.”
- “She is great at planning and delegating. She is friendly and uses local resources when possible.”
- “Very concerned about the welfare of the students and working toward their good. Maybe needs to continue with this goal in mind, but keep the teacher’s welfare in mind also.”
- “After school availability is also poor, as the principal leaves 20 minutes after school ends on a daily basis.”
- “She makes me want to come in and do the best that I can. I feel that she is the best principal I have ever worked for. My job is much easier knowing that I have a principal who is so positive.”
- “I count myself very fortunate to have worked with _____ - she is the principal all teachers deserve, as well as students deserve to have.”

Less Effective Schools:

- “He is supportive in matters of student discipline.”

Appendix K

Sample representation of comments written in response to question 43 on Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey

Question 43 read as follows: Please express your general observations about the leadership behaviors you most commonly utilize in your current position as principal.

Effective Schools:

- “Through weekly faculty meetings many issues can be resolved and/or discussed before they distract from the learning environment. Teachers are encouraged to work collaboratively on a weekly basis as an hour of planning time is built into the building schedule for grade level and resource teachers to meet. I attend those meetings as well.”
- “My biggest focus other than the district’s vision of MAP is to let the teachers know I support and appreciate them 100%.”
- “Decision-making, delegation of responsibilities, communication skills.”
- “Our school has received the Distinction in Performance Award from DESE all five years of my tenure.”
- “Treat all staff with respect. Collaborate. Staff unity during year (social). Time for staff to talk to one another uninterrupted.”
- “Communication is paramount.”
- “A combination approach, servant leadership, transformational leadership, participative leadership, and situational leadership.”
- “I view myself as an equipper. Encourage teachers/staff to press onward and upward to reach goals of achievement.”

Less Effective Schools:

- “My job is to provide a safe, respectful learning environment which promotes learning and independent thought.”
- “Leadership behaviors must be as flexible as the job. Every situation and individual requires differing strategies.”
- “The leadership behaviors that I utilize as a principal are listening, cooperation, flexibility (sic), and communication.”
- “Communication and high expectations.”
- “Transferring leadership through a gradual release belief - have built a PLC building, lead by example.”
- “Collaborative/collegial atmosphere – trustful, understanding, caring”

Sample representation of comments written in response to question 44 on
Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey

Question 44 read as follows: Please express any specific comments about the effectiveness you believe you have experienced in your current role as principal.

Effective Schools:

- “I think principals must respect the time teachers have to accomplish tasks as well as the added responsibilities of completing requisitions, referral paperwork, etc. I believe any paperwork should have a purpose! Unless it is going to be utilized it should not be a priority!”
- “The teachers trust me and are not afraid to express their ideas and feelings.”
- “Made reading a priority. Made resources available to staff. Made time available for staff to meet.”
- “I believe that communication builds trust. This significantly improves morale.”
- “I would be more effective with a full-time assistant principal. We have an amazing staff which easily allows for participatory practices in decision-making. Collaboration time greatly enhances my ability to lead staff in ‘knowledge creation’ and problem-solving, etc.”

Less Effective Schools:

- “We have established a working and learning environment which is conducive to students and teachers maximizing their potential.”
- “My staff and parents have been very positive about my “pro-kid” philosophy to education.”

- “I have had the opportunity to work with, and for, the same individuals for the last five years. I have had very positive comments such as, ‘your (sic) doing a great job’, made on many occasions.”
- “Communication/Partnerships – every staff member meets weekly to collaborate (with grade level and special teachers and paras). Grade levels have daily common plan times.”
- “Worked with staff to build our education for students. Developed building into a PLC, focus on literacy, brought in eMINTS, facilitated development of respect for all, safe environment for students, use of data.”
- “Some staff members are resistant to change, causing a reduction in effectiveness. I am desperately trying to work with the comfort zone of the staff.”
- “Restructured Comm. Arts program to be effective and consistent. Discipline is fair/consistent.”

Sample representation of comments written in response to Additional Comments section
on Principal Perceptions of Leadership Practices Survey

Additional comments were added as follows:

Effective Schools:

- “Our special education department has had a difficult time adjusting to teaching classes rather than just providing support for students as they had in the past.”
- “I love my job and the people I work with!”
- “The 13 years I spent coaching prepared me far more the principalship than any college course(s) I have taken.”

Less Effective Schools:

- No comments received

Appendix L

Definition of Invitational Leadership Terms for Interview Purposes

Dear Interview participant,

In order to assist in the interview process, please find the following Leadership terms and definitions. It is my hopes that these definitions will assist in the interview process as certain specific terms will be used throughout the interview.

1. *Optimism* – the belief that people have untapped potential for growth and development (Day et. al, 2001, p. 34).
2. *Respect* – the recognition that each person is an individual of worth (Day et. al, 2001, p.34). The belief that everyone is able, valuable, and responsible and is to be treated accordingly.
3. *Trust* –the need to trust others to behave in concert and in turn, as leaders, to behave with integrity (Day et. al, 2001, p. 34).
4. *Intention* – a decision to purposely achieve and carry out a set goal, the need to be actively supportive, caring, and encouraging (Day et. al, 2001, p. 34). Stillion and Siegel, (2005) defined *intention* as, “knowing what we intend to bring about as well as how we intend it to happen gives clarity and direction to our work” (¶ 15).

Definition of the five “P’s”:

1. *People* – Purkey (1992) affirmed that “nothing is more important in life than people. It is the people who create a respectful, optimistic, trusting and intentional society” (p. 7).
2. *Places* – refers to the physical environment of an organization. It has been suggested that places are the easiest of the five areas to change due to their visibility.

3. *Policies* – “Policies refer to the procedures, codes, rules, written or unwritten, used to regulate the ongoing functions of individuals and organizations” (Purkey, 1992, p. 7).
4. *Programs* – Programs play an important role in invitational leadership “because programs often focus on narrow objectives that neglect the wider scope of human needs” (Purkey, 1992, p. 7). Invitational leaders find it important to monitor programs to insure that they fulfill the goals which they were designed for (Purkey, 1992, p. 7).
5. *Processes* – The final P addresses the “ways in which the other four P’s function (Purkey, 1992, p. 7). Processes can be defined as the way that people, places, policies, and programs are evident in a school.

Appendix M
Leadership Survey
Subscales

Subscale	Item Numbers
Trust	1, 2, 11, 13, 15, 26, 32, 35
Respect	4, 5, 14, 18, 20, 21, 25, 27, 33, 36, 37
Optimism	7, 8, 9, 16, 19, 22, 23, 24, 28
Intentionality	3, 6, 10, 12, 17, 29, 30, 31, 34
Effectiveness	38, 39, 40, 41

INVITATIONAL LEADERSHIP



Appendix O



Campus Institutional Review Board

University of Missouri-Columbia

483 McReynolds Hall
Columbia, MO 65211-1150
PHONE: (573) 882-9585
FAX: (573) 884-0663

Project Number: **1079777**
Project Title: Invitational Leadership in Public Schools
Approval Date: 12-21-2006
Expiration Date: 12-21-2007
Investigator(s): Martin, Barbara Nell
burns, gwen jeannine
Level Granted: Expedited

**CAMPUS INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL FORM
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA**

This is to certify that your research proposal involving human subject participants has been reviewed by the Campus IRB. This approval is based upon the assurance that you will protect the rights and welfare of the research participants, employ approved methods of securing informed consent from these individuals, and not involve undue risk to the human subjects in light of potential benefits that can be derived from participation.

Approval of this research is contingent upon your agreement to:

- (1) Adhere to all UMC Policies and Procedures Relating to Human Subjects, as written in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46).
- (2) Maintain copies of all pertinent information related to the study, included but not limited to, video and audio tapes, instruments, copies of written informed consent agreements, and any other supportive documents for a period of **three (3) years** from the date of completion of your research.
- (3) Report potentially serious events to the Campus IRB (573-882-9585) by the most expeditious means and complete the eIRB "Campus Adverse Event Report". This may be accessed through the following website: <http://irb.missouri.edu/eirb/>.
- (4) IRB approval is contingent upon the investigator implementing the research activities

as proposed. Campus IRB policies require an investigator to report any deviations from an approved project directly to the Campus IRB by the most expeditious means. All human subject research deviations must have prior IRB approval, except to protect the welfare and safety of human subject participants. If an investigator must deviate from the previously approved research activities, the principal investigator or team members must:

- a. Immediately contact the Campus IRB at 882-9585.
- b. Assure that the research project has provisions in place for the adequate protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects, and are in compliance with federal laws, University of Missouri-Columbia's FWA, and Campus IRB policies/procedures.
- c. Complete the "Campus IRB Deviation Report". This may be accessed through the following website: <http://irb.missouri.edu/eirb/>.

(5) Submit an Amendment form to the Campus IRB for any proposed changes from the previously approved project. Changes may not be initiated without prior IRB review and approval except where necessary to eliminate apparent and immediate dangers to the subjects. The investigator must complete the Amendment form for any changes at <http://irb.missouri.edu/eirb/>.

(6) Federal regulations and Campus IRB policies require continuing review of research projects involving human subjects. Campus IRB approval will expire one (1) year from the date of approval unless otherwise indicated. Before the one (1) year expiration date, you must submit Campus IRB Continuing Review Report to the Campus IRB. Any unexpected events are to be reported at that time. The Campus IRB reserves the right to inspect your records to ensure compliance with federal regulations at any point during your project period and three (3) years from the date of completion of your research.

VITA

Gwen J. Burns was born on June 7, 1954 in Wichita, Kansas, the daughter of Kenneth D. and Barbara J. Johnston. She attended public schools in Springfield, Missouri and graduated from Parkview High School in 1972. She received a B. S. in Elementary and Special Education from Missouri State University in 1977. She continued her studies at MSU where she received a M.S. Ed. in Administration (2000) and a Specialist degree in Administration from MSU (2003) as well. As part of the University of Missouri-Columbia statewide cohort program, she completed the Ed.D. in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis in 2007. She is happily married to Stephen R. Burns and has two magnificent sons, Brian Haynes and Justin Haynes, and one beautiful daughter, Meagan Burns. She is employed by Springfield R-XII School District, a position she has held since 1997. Gwen has taught all grade levels K-12, as well as special education classes and college classes. Gwen has also been active as a motivational public speaker since 1990.