

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

1-1-2011

Preparing Transformational School Leaders: An Investigation into Leadership Style

Julie Catherine Murgel
University of Denver

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Other Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Murgel, Julie Catherine, "Preparing Transformational School Leaders: An Investigation into Leadership Style" (2011). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 463.
<https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/463>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

Preparing Transformational School Leaders: An Investigation into Leadership Style

Abstract

Since traditional principal preparation programs were scrutinized for inadequately training 21st century principals, alternative principal programs were designed to prepare principals to improve the US educational system and student achievement. One particular innovative program, the Daly Leadership Program, was collaboratively developed between the Pintler School District and the Intrepid University. The Daly Leadership Program was not only designed to balance leadership theory and practice, but also to produce *transformative leaders* capable of navigating a moral dimension and promoting second order change.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the leadership style of graduates from the Daly Leadership Program that were employed by the Pintler School District. First, it was determined if the program graduates identified themselves as transformative leaders or leaders who have the capacity to make second-order changes. Then it was determined if program graduates serving as school principals were perceived as transformative by the teachers on their staff. The leadership style of graduates was measured using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire created by Bass & Avolio to define leadership behaviors on a Full Range Leadership continuum from Laissez-Faire to Transactional to Transformational.

The results revealed that Daly graduates perceived themselves to be transformative leaders at a higher rate than the national norms. Teachers who worked with program principals perceived their principals as transformative as well. However, principals perceived themselves more transformative than their teachers perceived them to be in the areas of intellectual stimulation (encourages innovative thinking), individual consideration (coaches people), and contingent reward (rewards achievement). In fact, teachers perceived their principals lower than national norms in these three factors, but higher than national norms for inspirational motivation (inspires others) and idealized influence (builds trust and acts with integrity).

This study indicated that there was alignment between the goals of the program and the perceived leadership style of graduates. It also indicated that the context of formal leadership roles might impact the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding leadership style.

Document Type

Dissertation

Degree Name

Ph.D.

Department

Educational Administration and Policy Studies

First Advisor

Susan Korach, Ed.D.

Second Advisor

Kent Seidel

Third Advisor

Linda Brookhart

Keywords

Innovative, Leadership, Preparation, Principal, School, Transformational

Subject Categories

Education | Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research | Other Educational Administration and Supervision | Teacher Education and Professional Development

Publication Statement

Copyright is held by the author. User is responsible for all copyright compliance.

PREPARING TRANSFORMATIONAL SCHOOL LEADERS: AN INVESTIGATION
INTO LEADERSHIP STYLE

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Morgridge College of Education

University of Denver

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Julie C. Murgel

August 2011

Advisor: Susan Korach, Ed D

Author: Julie C. Murgel
Title: PREPARING TRANSFORMATIONAL SCHOOL LEADERS: AN INVESTIGATION INTO LEADERSHIP STYLE
Advisor: Susan Korach, Ed D
Degree Date: August 2011

Abstract

Since traditional principal preparation programs were scrutinized for inadequately training 21st century principals, alternative principal programs were designed to prepare principals to improve the US educational system and student achievement. One particular innovative program, the Daly Leadership Program, was collaboratively developed between the Pintler School District and the Intrepid University. The Daly Leadership Program was not only designed to balance leadership theory and practice, but also to produce transformative leaders capable of navigating a moral dimension and promoting second order change.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the leadership style of graduates from the Daly Leadership Program that were employed by the Pintler School District. First, it was determined if the program graduates identified themselves as *transformative leaders* or leaders who have the capacity to make second-order changes. Then it was determined if program graduates serving as school principals were perceived as transformative by the teachers on their staff. The leadership style of graduates was measured using the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire created by Bass & Avolio to define leadership behaviors on a Full Range Leadership continuum from Laissez-Faire to Transactional to Transformational.

The results revealed that Daly graduates perceived themselves to be transformative leaders at a higher rate than the national norms. Teachers who worked

with program principals perceived their principals as transformative as well. However, principals perceived themselves more transformative than their teachers perceived them to be in the areas of intellectual stimulation (encourages innovative thinking), individual consideration (coaches people), and contingent reward (rewards achievement). In fact, teachers perceived their principals lower than national norms in these three factors, but higher than national norms for inspirational motivation (inspires others) and idealized influence (builds trust and acts with integrity).

This study indicated that there was alignment between the goals of the program and the perceived leadership style of graduates. It also indicated that the context of formal leadership roles might impact the perceptions of principals and teachers regarding leadership style.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Vignette	1
Statement of Problem.....	6
Purpose of Study	10
Research Questions	11
Role of the Researcher	11
List of Terms	11
Chapter 2: Literature Review	14
Overview	14
School Leadership.....	14
Transformational Leadership Model.....	17
Impact of School Leadership	19
The History of Principal Preparation	21
Recent Principal Preparation Reform	25
Current Findings on Principal Preparation Programs	28
Preparation to Practice: Learning Transfer	33
Summary	34
Chapter 3: Methodology	36
Research Design.....	36
Instruments.....	37
Procedures	40
Setting, Population, Sample, and Participants	43
Setting.....	43
Population, sample, and participants.	44
Data Analysis Procedures	48
Statement of Bias	51
Methodology Limitations.....	52
Summary	55
Chapter 4: Results	56
Introduction.....	56
Findings Related to Research Question One	56
Finding Related to Research Question Two	60
Findings Related to Research Question Three.....	63
Summary of Findings.....	69
Chapter 5: Discussion and Recommendations for Further Research.....	72
Overview.....	72
Discussion	73
Suggestions for Future Research	78
References.....	80

Appendix A.....	92
Appendix B.....	94
Appendix C.....	95
Appendix D.....	97

List of Tables

Table 1	<i>Frequencies and Percentages for Demographics</i>	47
Table 2	<i>Means and Standard Deviations for Participants' Age</i>	47
Table 3	<i>Means and Standard Deviations for Graduates and Principals' Self-Rated scores</i>	57
Table 4	<i>Dependent Sample t-tests Comparing Leadership Styles for Graduates</i>	59
Table 5	<i>Means and Standard Deviations for Graduates and Principals' Perceived Program Influence on Their Leadership Style</i>	59
Table 6	<i>Independent Sample t-test for Means Scores by Graduates vs. Principals for Program Influence</i>	60
Table 7	<i>Means and Standard Deviations for Graduates, Principals' Self-Rated scores and the Principals' Teacher-Rated scores</i>	62
Table 8	<i>Dependent Sample t-tests Comparing Leadership Styles for Principals/Teacher-Rated Leaders</i>	63
Table 9	<i>Independent Sample t-Test for Transformational Leadership Scores by Associates vs. Principals</i>	64
Table 10	<i>Nine Independent Sample t Tests for MLQ Subscales by Principals vs. Associates</i>	66
Table 11	<i>Z-tests for U.S. Norms for Self Raters and Principals on MLQ Subscales</i>	68
Table 12	<i>Z-tests for U.S. Norms for Lower Level Associates and Teachers on MLQ Subscales</i>	69

Chapter 1: Introduction

Vignette

Sitting at a table in a convention center meeting room, waiting to start a leadership session are two principals. On paper, these two principals appear to have a lot in common. They work within the same urban school district, have similar student populations, implement school improvement plans, evaluate teachers, and monitor curriculum implementation, to name a few.

Breaking the silence, one principal asks, “Did you read the article in the paper this morning regarding the integrity of the credit recovery program at our neighborhood high school?”

Looking up from her agenda, the other principal replies, “No, but I am curious because I have been hearing some negative perceptions about the credit program from my assistant principal.” She pauses, takes a sip of coffee and then continues, “According to my assistant principal, students are able to get credit for a semester course by passing one on-line final exam.”

The first principal shudders “Yeah—according to the article, students look up answers on search engines while they take the final test on-line, then pass answers onto their friends.”

Sighing and shaking her head, the second principal probes, “What would you do if that was your school?”

Principal one quickly explains, “I would block the websites where students are getting answers and ensure that the computer labs are better monitored. What would you do?”

Principal two responds, “Yes, I would implement those steps too. However, I think the issue is much bigger than the credit recovery program.” She then takes another sip of coffee and says, “So, I would use this problem as an opportunity to bring all stakeholders together to address rigor in high schools and clearly define what a diploma represents in terms of content and performance.”

Based on these principals’ conversation, it becomes quickly evident that the two principals think and go about their work in different ways. Why is that? Is it simply because they are different leaders? Or, is there some other dynamic that has influenced their leadership style?

Dramatic improvement to the U.S. educational system is imperative. (Duncan, 2010; Education Trust, 2010; NCEE, 2006) Despite a plethora of improvements to the

U.S. public educational system over the past century including but not limited to: inclusion of females, increased rigor of standards, increased graduation rates, improved services for students with special needs, increased number of students taught, and increased number of students going to college; the U.S. public educational system has not kept pace with other industrialized nations. One critical report “Tough Choices or Tough Times: A Report of the New Commission of the Skills of the American Workforce” summarized, “Thirty years ago the United States could lay claim to 30% of the world’s population of college students....Today that proportion has fallen to 14% and continues to fall” (2006, p. 4).

On December 7, 2010, in reference to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development’s (OECD) release of the 2009 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) results, Arne Duncan, the Secretary of the United States Department of Education, remarked:

With the exception of some improvement in science from 2006 to 2009, U.S. performance on the PISA has been largely stagnant. The U.S. is not among the top performing OECD nations in any subject tested by PISA— though U.S. students express more self-confidence in their academic skills than students in virtually all OECD nations. This stunning finding may be explained because students here are being commended for work that would not be acceptable in high-performing education systems. The hard truth is that other high-performing nations have passed us by during the last two decades. (p. 1)

Moreover, in December 2010, Education Trust researchers analyzed the 2004 to 2009 military entrance exams for 350,000 high school graduates between the ages of 17 and 20. They found that “Among young people who are recent high school graduates, more than one in five do not meet the minimum standard necessary to enlist in the U.S. Army” (p. 1). In summary, the Education Trust President, Kati Haycock wrote, “Just as

they have not been prepared to enter college or find a good job in the civilian world, they have not been prepared to qualify for the military” (p.1).

These examples provide a snapshot of the urgency to improve the U.S. educational system. What kind of change will bring significant improvement? Complex change requiring new behaviors is needed. Change has varying degrees-*first order change* in contrast to *second order change* (Watzlawick, Weakland, & Fitch, 1974) or *adaptive change* rather than *technical change* (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). Second order change and adaptive change are the kind of complex change needed to improve the US educational system. According to Heifetz (2003) a technical challenge, or first order change, is where “every day, people have problems for which they do, in fact, have the necessary know-how and procedures” (p. 13); whereas, an adaptive challenge, or second order change, requires the people with the problem to learn, “new ways- change attitudes, values, and behaviors” (p. 13). For example, reducing class sizes is a reform strategy that may not require a shift in educators’ mindsets or values. It is a strategy that often matches educators’ current methods and mindsets, such that, the change is most often a technical challenge or first order change. On the other hand, using a second order change to address low proficiency reading levels for boys may influence educators to question, consider their existing beliefs and mindsets, or learn new ways to specifically teach boys. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2003) warned that, “using practices that might be appropriate for a first order change when a second order change is actually implied for stakeholders, will likely result in a negative impact on student achievement”

(p. 7). Thus, using a first order change when a second order change is needed to address the reading gap for boys may result in more problems rather than improvements.

United States' educational reform over the last 20 years has consisted of predominately first order change. These first order changes have had minimal positive impact on the U.S. educational system. To facilitate critical change, Fullan (2005) emphasized that leadership is the lever to promote deep change. He stressed that, "Change is an intricate, complex, and emotional process, such that, change arouses emotions and when emotions intensify, leadership is key" (p. 1). Heifetz and Linsky (2002) also promoted leadership behavior as a strong factor in response to change. They stated:

To lead is to live dangerously because when leadership counts, when you lead people through difficult change, you challenge what people hold dear-their daily habits, tools, loyalties, and ways of thinking-with nothing more to offer perhaps than a possibility. (p. 2)

Leaders who promote second order change might provide a viable remedy to the United States educational crisis and improve student achievement. Through a meta-analysis, Marzano, et al. (2005, 2003) showed that leadership does impact student achievement and that a significant correlation existed between effective school leadership and student achievement. Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) stressed "Leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school" (p. 7). Fullan (2005) maintained that "Leadership, not leaders, is to this decade what standards were to the 1990s if we want large-scale, sustainable reform" (p. xi).

Additionally, in an empirical study commissioned by the Wallace Foundation, “How Leadership Influences Student Learning”, Leithwood, et al. (2004) found that, “Without a powerful leader, troubled schools are unlikely to be turned around” (p. 7). The study determined that “Many other factors may contribute to such turnarounds, but leadership is the catalyst” (p. 7). This research by Leithwood, et al. led to the identification of three leadership practices to improve results: (1) setting direction, (2) developing people, and (3) redesigning the organization (2004). Their findings suggested that, “Rarely are [these] practices sufficient for leaders aiming to significantly improve student learning in their schools. But without them, not much would happen” (p. 10). As Bass and Avolio (2004) asserted:

A higher order of change calls for something distinctly different; it is represented in the perspective shifts often associated with transformational leadership. Transformational leadership can be thought of a higher-order exchange process; not a simple transaction, but rather a fundamental shift in orientation, with both long and short term implications for development and performance. The shift is generally toward the long-term implications and the impact on both process and outcomes. (p. 20)

The type of leadership linked to second order change that includes the three previous mentioned practices is transformational leadership. Northouse (2004) identified transformational leaders as ones who are:

Recognized as change agents who are good role models, who can create and articulate a clear vision for an organization, who empower followers to achieve at higher standards, who act in ways that make others want to trust them, and who give meaning to organizational life. (p. 198)

Leithwood, et al. (1999) emphasized that teachers’ commitment to change was indirectly and directly impacted by transformational leaders. Koh, Steers, and Terborg (1995) found that teachers and students held greater organizational commitment when they

worked for a transformational principal. Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) showed that transformational leadership positively impacted staff motivation, commitment, and empowerment. Also, Marks and Printy (2003) found that transformational leadership blended with instructional leadership positively influenced overall school performance. As Leithwood et al. claimed, “Virtually all of this evidence, however, attests to the suitability of transformational leadership practices in schools faced with significant challenges for change” (p. 9).

Statement of Problem

Senge, Cambron-McCabe, Lucas, Smith, Dutton, and Kleiner (2000) articulated concern over the capacity of university preparation programs to prepare leaders to meet the challenges of the current system:

We felt that schools were failing to meet the needs of society, yet most educational administrators were trained by universities to maintain the status quo. They were being handed a lot of skills and knowledge that had little meaning in helping them change their organizations. (p. 313)

Not only was the educational field under attack by an external audience, educators within the field of leadership preparation identified the inadequacy of the current system to prepare leaders who were capable of improving the US education system. The founding chair for the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, Joseph Murphy (2001), described principal preparation programs as “bankrupt” (Lashway, 2003, p. 1). Whereas, Michelle Young, the Executive Director of the University Council for Educational Administration, blamed the lack of effective principal preparation directly at the university system. She believed the university system was slow to change because the

faculty was disconnected from the field and instructors were generally complacent about adopting standards (Norton, 2002).

School preparation programs were not just scrutinized by both internal and external experts, but they were faced with a challenge to develop programs to train aspiring leaders for future jobs that were difficult to envision. Senge et al. (2000) concluded that, “We believed that a shift needed to occur from thinking about the training of administrators to considering the education of leaders” (p. 317). An influential reform report, *Educating School Leaders* (Levine, 2005) identified the changing landscape of leadership preparation:

Today, principals and superintendents have the job not only of managing our schools, but also of leading them through an era of profound social change that has required fundamental rethinking of what schools do and how they do it. This is an assignment few sitting school administrators have been prepared to undertake. (p. 5).

Levine’s study (2005) consisted of national surveys of deans, chairs, and directors of education schools; education school faculty; education school alumni; and school principals; as well as, case studies of 28 schools and departments of education. He concluded that, “Collectively, educational administration programs are the weakest of all the programs at the nation’s education schools” (p. 13). At traditional university preparation programs, Levine discovered that “A growing number of education schools were lowering admission standards, watering down programs, and offering quickie degrees” (p. 24). One particular case study established that the leadership program was composed of multiple satellite schools that were staffed by adjunct staff, mostly local administrators, who created syllabi that were never evaluated. According to the staff and

students of the programs expectations were low. In fact, the curriculum was described as irrelevant. Levine reported that, “If the class on the principalship were removed, it would be a real challenge to guess the purpose of the program” (p. 28). Levine further stated that:

There is an absence of research on what value these programs add, what aspects of the curriculum or educational experience make a difference, and what elements are unnecessary or minimally useful in enhancing children’s growth and educational attainment, K-12 teacher development and effectiveness, and overall K-12 functioning. (p. 37)

Following the research on university based leadership program, Levine assessed new alternative programs. “In contrast, the new competitors offer programs that are variable in length; are primarily experiential; occur largely in schools; are taught primarily by practitioners, supplemented by business school professors; and focus on management” (p. 52). Levine stressed that the new alternative programs were also inadequate to meet the leadership needs of today’s schools. He identified the alternative programs as weak on theory, deep in practice and the university programs weak on practice, deep on theory.

Along with Levine, many other educational researchers, (Daresh, 2002; English, 2000; Hora, 2007; Murphy, 2001), identified the tension between the amount of theory and practice explored in preparation. Cuban (1993) and Murphy (2001) described eras in principal preparation where the sole emphasis was on practice or theory, but not both. Hora (2007) criticized the field of educational leadership in both perpetuating and failing to mend what he called, “the schism between theory and practice.” Murphy (2001) argued that “no matter how effectively professors package and present the knowledge,

they (or their students) ultimately face the problem of creating a bridge between theory and practice” (as cited in Lashway, 2003, p.1). Whereas, Daresh (2002) noted that both theory and practical experience have limitations as well as benefits. Daresh advocated for “personal formation,” where the leader blends personal and professional knowledge to provide a moral compass to navigate practice. Hora also urged that the theory/practice binary be resolved by testing theory against practice and by including the practitioners as partners in theory development.

The need for second order change to enact significant school reform and the status of principal preparation established the need for innovation in leadership preparation. This need and concern regarding the quality of university based preparation resulted in the creation of the Daly Leadership Program. From inception in 2002, the Daly Leadership Program was intended to operate as a collaborative partnership, where the Intrepid University and Pintler School District connected theory and practice. To maintain confidentiality, pseudonyms are used for the names of the principal preparation program, school district, and university.

The Pintler School District and the Intrepid University teamed to design and implement an innovative principal preparation program. The leadership program was created to balance theory and practice and produce leaders who could navigate in a moral dimension and apply second order change. The Daly Leadership Program embarked on a mission to develop, “leaders who can promote second order change by focusing on the relationship between values/mental models and actions/results” (Korach, 2008, p. 4).

Both the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the principal preparation program were structured to provide an education for leaders to pilot profound change. The theoretical framework applied in the Daly Leadership Program was composed of theories of action science, systems, change and culture (Argyris & Schön, 1996; Deal & Peterson, 1999; Fullan 2001a, 2001b; Freire, 1972; Senge, 1990; and Wheatley, 2006). “The dynamics of espoused theory vs. theory-in-use were used to operationalize adaptive/second order change” (Korach, 2008, p.2). The signature conceptual framework of the Daly Leadership Program was comprised of three domains: conceptual, practical, and moral. The three domains were instructed through a pedagogy centered on shared-values, leadership best practices, (Browne-Ferrigno, Barnett, & Muth, 2002; Murphy & Shipman, 2002; see Appendix A), norms of collaboration (Garmston & Wellman, 1999, see Appendix B), and generative learning strategies.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the leadership style of graduates from a principal preparation program designed to promote transformative leadership. The Daly Leadership Program’s mission to produce transformative leaders or leaders who can navigate second-change provided a unique setting for this investigation into leadership style. Moreover, this study contributed to the body of educational research on school leadership style.

Research Questions

The research questions for the study were as follows:

1. How do graduates from the Daly Leadership Program perceive their own leadership style?
2. How do teachers who work with Daly program graduate principals identify their principal's leadership style?
3. What difference is there between the Daly program graduate principals perceived leadership style and the teacher perception of their principal's leadership style?

The instrument used to measure the graduates leadership style was the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The MLQ was created by Bass & Avolio (2004) to measure leadership behaviors that transform individuals and organization on a Full Range Leadership continuum: *Laissez-Faire, Transactional* to *Transformational*.

Role of the Researcher

The researcher participated in an innovative preparation program and works as a principal in a school that has been engaged in a turnaround process. This experience and the need for transformative leaders led to the desire to empirically test the hypothesis that graduates from the Daly Leadership Program would be perceived as possessing a transformative leadership style.

List of Terms

Action science is the process for organizational learning. (Argyris and Schön, 1978, p. 2)

Cognitive apprenticeship is “wherein one learns to think like a professional” (Shulman, 2005, p. 3).

Espoused theory is “the words we use to convey what we do or what we would like others to think we do” (Argyris and Schön, 1978, p.2).

Laissez Faire Leadership is defined by Bass and Avolio (2004) “as passive avoidant leadership, where a leader avoids responsibility and action” (p. 3).

Moral apprenticeship is where one learns to think and act in a responsible and ethical manner that integrates across all three domains” (Shulman, 2005, p.3).

Practical Apprenticeship is “where one learns to perform like a professional” (Shulman, 2005, p. 3).

System as defined by Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, and Ross (1994) “is a perceived whole whose elements hang together because they continually affect each other over time and operate toward a common purpose” (p. 90).

Theory-in-use is the theory that actually governs your actions. (Argyris and Schön 1978, p. 6)

Third Space is “a new arena for activity where competing interests, perspectives, and opinions play out as different organizations come together” (Hora & Mora, 2010, p. 12).

Transactional leaders are as those who, “recognized what their associates want to get from their work, and try to see that they get it, if their performance so warrants; exchange rewards and promises of reward for appropriate levels of effort; and respond to

the needs and desires of associates as long as they are getting the job done” (p. 17, Bass & Avolio, 2004).

Transformational Leadership refers to “the process whereby an individual engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower” (Northouse, 2004, p. 131).

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Overview

This chapter begins by establishing the definition of school leadership, describes the transformational leadership model, and reviews research findings on the impact of school leaders. It concludes with the history of principal preparation and review of current findings on modern principal preparation programs. Ultimately, the connection between preparation and practice is illuminated.

School Leadership

Beginning in 1978, Burns stated “The genius of leadership lies in the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers’ values and motivations” (p. 19). Similarly, Leithwood et al. (2004) declared that, “At the core of most definitions of leadership are two functions generally considered indispensable to its meaning: setting directions and exercising influence” (p. 1).

While trying to clearly define leadership, Leithwood et al. (2004) cautioned leadership is a complex concept that when narrowly defined will not help clarify its meaning. Northouse (2004) also emphasized that, “Leadership from all of these areas provides a picture of a process that is far more sophisticated and complex than the often simplistic view presented in some of the popular books on leadership” (p. 1). As a result, Northouse defined leadership as, “a ‘process’ whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 3).

Over the decades, leadership models have been classified in multiple ways: servant leadership, moral leadership, constructivist leadership, instructional leadership, and transformative leadership to name a few. However Leithwood et al. (2004) contended that a half-dozen of these leadership models repeatedly appeared in educational literature, but two models, transformational and instructional, currently were at the center of educational research.

Instructional leadership as defined by Hallinger (2003), encompasses three major components: (1) defining the school's mission; (2) managing the instructional program; and (3) promoting a positive school learning climate" (p. 9). Of these three components, Hallinger (2003) reported that defining the school's mission was the most influential component. Hallinger (2000), Hallinger and Murphy (1985), and Heck, Larson, and Marcoulides (1990) provided empirical evidence supporting instructional leadership that included more than 90 studies. However, in 2010, Stein and Curtis stressed:

The idea of the principal as the instructional leader has had a powerful effect in shifting the focus of principals to ensuring high-quality teaching rather than managing schools. Yet the impact of this focus on teaching has been mixed, when judged by student learning results. (p. 92)

Furthermore, Leithwood and Riehl (2003) claimed that, "Instructional leadership has gradually become less the designation of a sharply defined set of leadership practices and more a slogan chiding administrators to focus their efforts on the core technology of their schools-teaching and learning" (p. 8). He declared that:

Whereas instructional leadership aims to narrow the focus of leaders to the core technology of their organizations, transformational leadership asks them to adopt a much broader, more systemic, view of their work. Paradoxically, most large-

scale educational reform efforts argue for systemic approaches to change (Elmore, 2005) while at the same time advocating instructional forms of leadership. (p. 9)

According to Hallinger (2003), “The emergence of these models indicated a broader dissatisfaction with the instructional leadership model, which many believed focused too much on the principal as the center of expertise, power, and authority” (p. 330). Hallinger (2003) declared:

Researchers emphasized leadership models that were ‘more consistent with evolving trends in educational reform such as empowerment, shared leadership, and organizational learning. This evolution of the educational leadership role has been labeled as reflecting ‘second order’ changes (Leithwood et al., 1994) as it is aimed primarily at changing the organizations normative structure’ (p. 330).

Where Hallinger, Leithwood and Riehl, and Stein and Curtis stressed the weakness of instructional leadership, Cascio (1995), Koh, Steers, and Terborg (1991), and Bass and Avolio (2004) confirmed the strength of transformational leadership. Cascio (1995) reiterated that, “more often today’s networked, interdependent, culturally diverse organization requires transformational leadership” (p. 930). Cascio asserted that the need for transformational leadership skills has never been greater. Bass and Avolio (2004) also concluded that developing only transactional leadership skills in this era will fall short of the leadership challenges facing most organizations.

Koh, Steers, and Terborg (1991) emphasized that teachers and students held greater organizational commitment when they worked for a transformational principal. Marks and Printy (2003) found that transformational leadership positively influenced school performance, when measured by student achievement and quality of teacher instruction. Yet, Marks and Printy contended that a blend of both leadership models was

the ideal. Silins, Mulford, and Zarins (2002), showed that transformational leadership had a positive impact on staff engagement. Based on empirical studies with school transformation leadership (e.g., Leithwood & Jantzi, 1990, 1999, 2000), Leithwood et al. (1999) maintained, “Transformational leadership practices were helpful in fostering organizational learning; in particular, vision building, individual support, intellectual stimulation, modeling, culture building and holding high performance expectations” (p. 37).

Transformational Leadership Model

Given the emphasis in literature of transformational leadership over instructional leadership for schools, this investigation into leadership style centered on the transformational model. In 1978, political sociologist, James MacGregor Burns identified two types of leadership: transactional and transformational. Transactional leadership represented everyday interactions/exchanges between manager and follower, whereas, transformational leadership “referred to the process whereby an individual engages with others and creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower” (Northouse, 2004, p. 170).

In 1985, Bass extended the theory of transformational leadership. He developed a model for transformational leadership practice. Bass described four scales in his model: (1) idealized influence, (2) inspirational motivation, (3) intellectual stimulation, and (4) individualized consideration. The idealized influence scale described “leaders as, strong role models for followers; followers identify with these leaders and want very much to emulate them....and place a great deal of trust in them” (Northouse, 2004, p. 174).

Inspirational motivation, according to Northouse (2004), is where “leaders who communicate high expectations to followers, inspiring them through motivation to become committed to and a part of the shared vision in the organization” (p. 175). Intellectual stimulation was defined such that it “includes leadership that stimulates followers to be creative and innovative and to challenge their own beliefs and values as well as those of the leaders and the organization” (p. 177). The last scale, individualized consideration, represents leaders “who provide a supportive climate in which they listen carefully to the individual needs of followers” (p. 177).

In 1985, Bennis and Nanus through extensive research on 90 leaders summarized four common strategies that they found transformational leaders used:

1. Transformational leaders as visionaries
2. Transformational leaders as social architects
3. Transformational leaders engender trust and confidence
4. Transformational leaders possess self-regard

Then, Northouse (2004) highlighted the following characteristics of transformational leaders: serve as strong role models, have a highly developed sense of moral values; a self-determined sense of identity; visionary, confident, articulate; willingness to listen; engender trust in followers, and act as change agents for the organization (p. 182).

A meta-analysis of 39 studies on transformational completed by Lowe, Kroeck, and Sivasubramaniam (1996), established that leaders who exhibited transformational traits, were perceived to be more effective leaders. In 2003, Cotton conducted an

extensive review of the literature in the field of transformational leadership, which indicated that transformational leadership positively related to student achievement and is more effective than the deal-making between principal and staff that characterizes the transactional approach alone (p. 61).

Impact of School Leadership

Underlying this investigation into leadership style is a critical assumption that school leadership matters. Although empirical research on the relationship between school leadership and school outcomes was established, the research was limited.

Leithwood, Begley and Cousins (1994) reinforced the limitation:

We must acknowledge significant limitations in the research-based knowledge about the nature of current school-leaders' impact. But, based on the number of studies alone, one can reasonably conclude that current school-leaders are capable of having a significant influence on the basic skills' achievement of students" (p.14).

Yet, a few key findings (Hallinger & Heck 1998; Hess, 1998; Leithwood, et al., 2004; and Marzano, et al. 2003) that suggest that the relationship does exist are highlighted here.

Starting with Hess in 1998, who found in a five year study in Chicago that, "the most distinguishing feature of improving as compared to stable or declining schools was that they were led continuously by strong principals who had a vision of improvement for their school" (p. 1). Then in 1998, Hallinger and Heck completed a 15 year national analysis, where the principal "exercises a measurable though indirect effect on school effectiveness and student achievement" (p.10). They concluded that a small but significant direct and indirect relationship between school leadership and student

achievement existed with 3% to 5% variation in student learning. In 2002, Schnur determined that “Many of the most impressive examples of school wide change and student achievement gains involve a talented principal who had brought together teachers, parents, and students to improve teaching and learning” (p. 2). Leithwood and Riehl (2003) found that, “Although leadership explains only about three to five percent of the variation in student learning across schools, this effect is actually nearly one-quarter of the total effect of all school factors” (p. 3)

Most notably, a 30 year meta-analysis conducted by Marzano, et al. (2005, 2003) found a positive correlation of 0.25 between effective school leadership and student achievement. Through the meta-analysis of 5,000 studies linking student achievement and leadership, 21 key leadership skills were identified (Marzano, et al., 2005, 2003). The 21 skills included: monitor/evaluate; culture, ideal/beliefs, knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; involvement in curriculum, instruction, and assessment; focus; order; affirmation; intellectual stimulation; communication; input; relationships; optimize; flexibility; resources; contingent rewards; situational awareness; outreach; visibility; discipline; and change agent. In other words, a 10 percentile point increase in student test scores resulted from the work of an average principal who improved her leadership abilities in all 21 skills by one standard deviation (Marzano et al., 2003). Moreover, Leithwood, Seashore-Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) stressed “Leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school” (p. 7).

The History of Principal Preparation

Beginning in 1879, a University of Michigan professor and a former superintendent, William H. Payne started the first university based principal course. Payne in 1886 (as cited in Berry & Beach, July 9) wrote, “Graduates of the university are called to supervise the more important public schools of the state. Why should they not have the opportunity to learn the theory of school supervision” (p. 336). Around the same time, future president Woodrow Wilson (1886), in his essay “The Study of Administration” (as cited in Berry & Beach, 2009, July 9) championed the need for administrative training programs. He explained that, “The object of administrative study is to rescue executive methods from the confusion and costliness of empirical experiment and set them upon foundations laid deep in stable principle” (p. 8). Even though Wilson’s essay called for administrative study, it was not until the first part of the 20th century that the principal role was recognized as a distinct profession and the need for principal preparation was broadly accepted. According to Murphy (1998) the earliest principal training programs focused on the technical core and business efficiency. Noteworthy, in 1905, the Teachers College at Columbia University conferred the first doctorates in educational administration. One recipient of the degree was Elwood Cubberley, who significantly advanced the field in 1916 through his publication of the book, *Public School Administration*. In this book, which became widely used for principal training across the country, Cubberley (as cite in Berry & Beach, 2009, July 9) wrote, “a new profession, and one which in time will play a very important part in the development of American life” (p. 130).

In fact it was not until the scientific era (1947 to 1985), as defined by Murphy (1998) that principal training content transformed from technical skills to theory based curriculum. Simultaneously, the faculty shifted from generalists, former principals and superintendents who had practical experience, to specialist who were researchers knowledgeable in theory. In 1976, as Iannacone (as cited in Berry & Beach, 2009, July 9) concluded:

The research produced during the twenty five year period [1925-1950] when educational administration was dominated by practitioner influence shaped by municipal reform was trivial, a-theoretical and useless as a scientific base to guide practice, training or future research however useful it may have been in fostering certain administrative-political agendas. (p. 19)

As the principal training in the 1950s shifted from practice to theory, professors started to use scientific methodology to create behavioral and scientific theories for administration, leadership, and organizational behavior. This change created preparation programs heavy on theory and light on practice. As Culbertson (as cited in Berry & Beach, 2009, July 9) explained, “During this century, growth in preparatory programs for administrators has been matched by the development of significant foundations for a science of administration” (1976, p. 329).

Educational researchers (Daresh, 2002; Hora, 2007, & Murphy 1998) continued to debate the balance between the theory and practice needed in principal preparation. In 2001, Murphy argued that “placing theory at the center of a preparation program is self defeating and leaves aspiring leaders grasping to connect theory to practice” (as cited in Lashway, 2003, p.1). Whereas, John Daresh (2002) noted that both theory and practical experience have limitations as well as benefits. Daresh advocated for “personal

formation,” where the leader blends personal and professional knowledge to provide a moral compass to navigate practice. In 2007, Hora criticized the field of educational leadership in both perpetuating and failing to mend what he called, “the schism between theory and practice.”

No doubt there have been on-going debates about the balance of theory and practice in principal preparation over the 20th century, but in this current era (1986-present), the high level of pressure on principals and teachers to improve student outcomes, has resulted in intense examination and reform in the field. For instance, the 2001 Public Agenda survey reported, 80% of superintendents and 69% of principals agreed with the experts that leadership programs were "out of touch with the realities of what it takes to run today's school districts" (as cited in Kaplan, Owings, & Nunnery, 2005, p.30). Archer (2003) further asserted, there were plenty of qualified candidates available to take on leadership positions, but few had the skills to impact student achievement. The Public Agenda confirmed that over 85% of both superintendents and principals believed that overhauling preparation programs would help improve leadership.

Acknowledging the need for reform within principal preparation, the NCEE published the report: *Leaders for America's Schools, a Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration* (1987). The report outlined eight recommendations:

1. Educational leadership should be defined.

2. A National Policy Board on Educational Administration should be established.
3. Administrator preparation programs should be modeled on those professional schools.
4. At least 300 universities and colleges should cease preparing educational administrators.
5. Programs for recruitment and placement of ethnic minorities and women should be initiated by universities, school boards, state and federal governments, and business and industry.
6. The public schools should become full partners in the preparation of school administrators.
7. Licensure programs should be substantially reformed.
8. Professional development activities should be an integral component of the careers of professors and practicing administrators.

Ever since the publication of the NCEE recommendations, significant reform efforts have occurred. In particular, in 1996 the standards were designed by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (CCSSO). The consortium was joined by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NBEA, 2001) the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP, 2001), and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). According to Hale and Moorman (2003), the ISLLC standards were used to guide principal preparation programs and certification in at least 35 states. The six Council of Chief State School Officers standards (CCSSO, 1996) described the actions of a school administrator who promote success of all students by:

1. Facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

2. Advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.
3. Insuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
4. Collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.
5. Acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
6. Understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

Not only were the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards implemented in state accreditation and licensure requirements, but they influenced changes across the educational administration preparation. As Murphy (2005) stated:

The objective of the ISLLC has been to yoke the standards to important leverage points for change. The goal has been to generate the critical support necessary to move school administration out of its 100-year orbit and then to reposition the profession around leadership for learning. (p. 180)

Recent Principal Preparation Reform

Over time, researchers like David Clark (1998) suggested concrete changes to preparation programs. Clark suggested four reform elements:

1. Set admission standards that recruit those capable of high academic standards and unyielding commitment to students needs.
2. Structure cohesive groups, called cohorts, of learners who address leadership issues as a group, rather than fragmented, part-time course work.
3. Offer high quality instruction and support for students.

4. Ensure that the program is not isolated from other departments and the community.

In a review of 450 leadership programs, Creighton and Jones (2001) found that the majority of principal certification program's admission criteria focused heavily on GRE scores and undergraduate grade point averages. Creighton and Jones also determined that only 6% of the programs completed an interview to determine leadership values and beliefs. As a result of the findings, recommendations to connect admissions criteria to leadership were instituted (Browne-Ferrigno, & Shoho, 2002). Different recruitment strategies proposed were: focused interview protocols, 360-degree evaluations, performance portfolios, writing samples, and assessment-center activities (Norton; Creighton & Jones).

Prior to Clark's recommendations, Hallinger (1997) suggested the use of a *problem-based learning* as an instructional strategy, in "The North Central Regional Education Laboratory" resource manual. Lashway (1999) defined problem-based learning as:

The core principle in problem-based learning is that the problem comes first. That is, rather than absorbing abstract knowledge and then applying it to a selected problem, students consider a realistic dilemma and identify the kind of knowledge required, making its relevance and significance clear. (p. 2)

Furthermore, Willis and Carol Furtwengler (1998) recommended that a performance assessment system with rubrics be used to transform the assessment within principal training, such that, aspiring leaders could demonstrate application of leadership skills rather than recite theory. The Furtwengler model aligned leadership expertise to expert levels to five kinds of leadership behaviors:

1. Identifying and responding to variations in contextual settings.
2. Engaging in a reflective sense-making process.
3. Using a systems approach to solve problems.
4. Viewing others as capable and worthy of respect.
5. Helping others to develop the skills to become experts.

Willis and Carol Furtwengler also developed performance rubrics that ranged from novice to expert levels and contained 10 job-related criteria associated with the five behavioral indicators.

These reform efforts continued to encounter criticism. Norton (1999) warned that standards can be a game of matching course titles and content with the standards. He suggested that the implementation of standards should not force standards into the current system, but rather bring about the redesign of school leadership curriculum, instruction, and assessment to the standards. English (2000) also argued that the standards were vague, lacked research validation, and did not help guide the work of principals. Additionally, Foster (2004), a critical theorist, warned that standards forced a business approach onto education. He claimed that the use of standards would endanger education as a democratic process. Nevertheless, Sanders and Simpsonson (2005) logged that by 2005, 46 states had adopted leadership standards as a requirement for administrative licensure and principal preparation program accreditation. As captured in a case study by Carr (2005), some principal preparation programs have not only met the administrative licensure standards but have exceeded them.

Towards the end of the century, in response to the urgency and demand for high quality principal training programs, school districts engaged in designing their own tailor-made alternative programs with universities (Keller, 2000). A few examples of alternative leadership programs across the country included, the New Leaders for New Schools, which contracted with nine large urban school districts, the KIPP charter school network preparation program, the New York City Leadership Academy's Aspiring Principals program, San Diego Unified School District, and Delta State University in Mississippi to name just a few.

Current Findings on Principal Preparation Programs

Despite the best of intentions for improved principal preparation, in 2004, based on review of 2000 research articles on principal preparation, Murphy and Vriesenga admitted that school administration is centered on weak empirical research findings. They found out of 2000 studies, 8% dealt with pre-service programs and only 3% were empirical studies focused on quantitative data.

In the meantime, researchers have continued to prepare perceptual reports and make recommendations. These perceptual reports have indicated a growing positive inclination towards reformed leadership programs. For example, Glass, Bjork, and Brunner (2002) reported that 74% of superintendents rated their preparation programs excellent or good, 22 % rated them as "fair," and fewer than 4% rated them "poor." A study from the University of Missouri and Texas A&M University found that graduates felt their preparation programs were successful in preparing them for their leadership roles (Hatley, Arrendondo, Donaldson, Short, and Updike, 1996; Hoyle & Oates, 2000).

Schmieder and Townley (1994) also reported that 33% of 450 principals and 208 superintendents in California found their program to be excellent. The remaining 67% were critical of the internship and the lack of time with their mentors. The perceptual reports also showed a positive correlation when a leadership program contains key components, such as: rigorous selection process, values driven instruction, standards based content, and internship opportunities (Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005). For instance, Leithwood and Jantzi (2005, 1999) found that effective principal preparation programs contained the following components:

1. Be purposeful, inclusive, and values driven.
2. Embrace the distinctive and inclusive context of the school.
3. Promote an active view of learning.
4. Be instructionally focused.
5. Reach throughout the school community.
6. Build capacity by developing the school as a learning community.
7. Be futures-oriented and strategically driven.
8. Draw on experiential and innovative methodologies.
9. Benefit from a support and policy context that is coherent, systematic, and implementation driven.
10. Receive support from a national college that leads the discourse on leadership for learning (p.53).

Stein and Curtis (2010) listed several similar features for principal preparation programs including: research-based content, curricular coherence, problem-based learning, field-based internships, or coaching, cohort groups, and close collaboration

between the preparatory programs and the district employed graduates (p. 101).

However, realizing these features were not sufficient, Stein and Curtis suggested the following additional elements: alignment to principal's competencies; responsiveness to district initiatives; rigorous simulations of real practice; flexibility and responsiveness in the recruitment of candidates; accommodation of various adult learning styles; and ongoing support after graduation (p. 101).

Studies also showed a need for additional training after the preparation program to support school leaders through their induction period (Malone, 2001). The continuum of leadership development and induction, called "second-level" certification was adopted by many states. For example, the Southern Regional Education Board (2006) required mentorship, a professional development plan, and a portfolio as evidence of a continued leadership development for principals in sixteen southern states.

McCarthy (2002) indicated that empirical research to date did not align with the perceptual findings. He asserted that empirical research had not found a correlation between leadership programs and principal effectiveness as measured by teacher perception. Then, in 2005, in a critical empirical study "Educating School Leaders" by Levine, the current president of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation and former president of the Teacher's College at Columbia University, found that 25 of 28 Education Schools were "little more than a grab-bag of survey courses" (p. 28). Levine called leadership programs "inadequate to appalling." He cautioned that principals "were appointed to and educated for jobs that do not exist any longer" (p. 12). He further declared:

Today, principals and superintendents have the job not only of managing our schools, but also of leading them through an era of profound social change that has required fundamental rethinking of what schools do and how they do it. This is an assignment few sitting school administrators have been prepared to undertake. (p. 5)

To complete his study, Levine used a nine point template based on: purpose, curricular coherence, curricular balance, faculty composition, admissions, degrees, research, finances, and assessment. Based on the nine criteria, he found that, “Collectively, educational administration programs are the weakest of all the programs at the nation’s education schools” (p. 13). Levine observed four detrimental elements:

1. An increase in the number of off-campus educational leadership programs that was lower quality than the programs offered at traditional colleges or universities.
2. Weaker research institutions were pushing for educational administrative doctoral degrees.
3. Program quality decreased in an effort to produce the most degrees the quickest and easiest.
4. Administrative programs becoming cash cows for universities.

In traditional university leadership programs, Levine found that “a growing number of education schools were lowering admission standards, watering down programs, and offering quickie degrees” (p. 24). One particular case study established that the leadership program was composed of multiple satellite schools that were staffed by adjunct staff, mostly local administrators, who created syllabi that were never evaluated. According to the staff and students of the programs the admission standards and expectations were low. In fact, the curriculum was described as irrelevant. Levine

reported that, “if the class on the principal ship were removed, it would be a real challenge to guess the purpose of the program” (p. 28). Levine further reported:

There is an absence of research on what value these programs add, what aspects of the curriculum or educational experience make a difference, and what elements are unnecessary or minimally useful in enhancing children’s growth and educational attainment, K-12 teacher development and effectiveness, and overall K-12 functioning. (p. 37)

Following the research on university based leadership program, Levine assessed new alternative programs. He found that, “In contrast, the new competitors offer programs that are variable in length; are primarily experiential; occur largely in schools; are taught primarily by practitioners, supplemented by business school professors; and focus on management” (p. 52). Levine stressed that the new alternative programs just like their university counterparts were incomplete. He described the alternative programs as deep on practice and short on theory.

Unfortunately, from Levine’s perspective he did not find an exemplary program in the U.S. He traveled to England where he observed the National College for School Leadership (NCSL). Levine asserted that the program was complete because the program balanced theory and practice, where research influenced the practice and the practice informed the research. He gave the following final recommendations:

1. School systems, municipalities, and states must find alternatives to salary scales that grant raises merely for accumulating credits and degrees.
2. Universities must champion high standards for education schools and their leadership programs by embracing financial practices that strengthen those programs.
3. Weak programs should be strengthened or closed.

4. The current grab bag of courses that constitutes preparation for a career in educational leadership must give way to a relevant and challenging curriculum designed to prepare effective school leaders.
5. A new degree, the Master's in Educational Administration, should be developed.
6. The doctor of education degree in school leadership should be eliminated.
7. The doctor of philosophy should be reserved for preparing researchers (p. 66).

Preparation to Practice: Learning Transfer

As recommended by Levine, to train a school leader, the success of a leader is contingent upon the leader's ability to transfer their learning from preparation to practice. The transfer from learning to practice applies not only in the field of education, but rather in a range of professions from medicine and law. Levine stressed, "Education schools should follow the example of other professional schools in making the education of the practitioner their primary activity" (2005, p. 9).

Few research studies have centered on how principal preparation programs impact leadership practices of participants. However in recent years, more studies have ensued. In 2002, Hessel and Holloway developed a framework for school leaders to link standards to practice. Then, in 2004 Leithwood and Levine developed a framework to evaluate the relationship between leadership preparation programs and practice. The framework contained six stages: preparation experiences, participant satisfaction, changes in participants' knowledge, skills, dispositions, and change in practices in schools, and changes in classroom conditions and improved student outcomes. Leithwood and Levine (2004) concluded that even though their research was short-term,

working with new principals allowed them to suggest implications for principal training on initial practice.

In addition, a Taskforce on Evaluating Educational Leadership Preparation, started to evaluate leadership preparation program and measure their long-term impact (Kottkamp & Orr, 2005). In England, Bush and Glover (2004, 2005) reported both on evidence and beliefs in leadership training and on the influence of the New Visions pilot program on head teacher induction, which emphasized process, a learning journey, rather than content. Nevertheless, both studies recommended further long-term studies on the relationship between principal preparation and leadership practice. Most recently in 2008, a comparative study known as the International Study of Principal Preparation (CCSSO), has evaluated the effectiveness of current principal preparation. Researchers involved in the ISPP project are tracking the experiences of school principals, specifically analyzing the relationship between what it is that principals do and the learning outcomes of principal programs. The researchers hope to answer the question: “To what extent to do principal preparation programs prepare candidates for the reality of life as a school principal” (p. 2)?

Summary

In conclusion, the history and research related to transformative leadership, the leadership impact on student achievement and the effectiveness of principal preparation programs supports an investigation into the leadership style of program graduates. The focus of the Daly Leadership Program on preparing transformative principals provided a unique opportunity to investigate the relationship between the goal of the program and

the perceived leadership style of program graduates. The following chapter, Chapter 3, describes the method used to explore if the graduates from Daly Leadership Program and teachers who work with Daly graduate principals perceived them as transformative leaders, leaders capable of piloting second-order change in the U.S. educational system.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Design

For this study the deductive process for quantitative research described by Johnson and Christensen (2004) was applied. First, the hypothesis was: graduates from the Daly Leadership Program will exhibit transformative leadership behaviors. This hypothesis was defined in two ways: graduates would perceive their own leadership style as transformative, and the teachers who work with principals who graduated from the Daly Program would perceive their principals as having a transformative leadership style. Data were collected with the Multi-Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). A detailed description of the MLQ is included in the next section under instruments. Data from the MLQ were analyzed using the computer software, SPSS 14.0 (Norušis, 2006). Both descriptive and inferential statistical procedures were conducted, which are explained in detail under the data analysis section below. First, mean scores and standard deviations were generated for the graduates and principals perceived leadership styles: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire. Then dependent sample *t*-tests were conducted to assess the difference between the leadership style mean scores, followed by a Cohen's *d* test to calculate the effect size of the difference. Since parametric tests (*t*-tests) assume that the data are normally distributed, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality was calculated prior to each *t*-test. The same process (means scores with standard deviations, two dependent sample *t*-tests, and a Cohen's *d*) was conducted on

teachers' perceptions of their principals. To determine if there was a discrepancy between principals' self perceptions and teachers' perceptions of principals, an independent sample *t*-test was performed. The discrepancy was further analyzed with independent sample *t*-tests on the MLQ nine leadership scales followed by Z-tests between the principal and teacher mean scores and U.S. norm samples. The final step was to accept or deny the hypothesis that the majority of graduates from the Daly Leadership Program will exhibit transformative leadership behaviors.

Instruments

The primary tool used for this study was the Multi-Factor Questionnaire (Mind Garden Inc.). The MLQ has evolved over the last 25 years and is a validated instrument by both the discriminatory and confirmatory factor analysis. Beginning in 1985, Bass developed the MLQ with 70 questions. In 1992, Bass and Avolio designed an abbreviated version of the MLQ, named the MLQ-6S. An improved version of the MLQ-6S was constructed in 2001. Then in 2004, the latest version called the MLQ-5X (Appendix C), which contains a short and long version, was constructed. The 5X-short has 45 items and the 5X-long has 63 items. The short form is generally used for organizational surveys or research projects, like this one, and the long form is used for training, development, and feedback purposes. Both the long and short versions consist of two feedback questionnaire forms: the self-rater and associate-rater form. The estimated amount of time to complete the MLQ-5X is 15-20 minutes.

Multiple studies have examined the validity of the MLQ to measure transformational leadership. According to Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam

(2003) dozens of studies and four meta-analyses have provided substantial support for the predictive validity of the tool. Confirmatory factor analyses on the 45 items of the MLQ was conducted and according to Avolio et al., the MLQ (Form 5X) scales have, on average, exhibited high internal consistency and factor loadings.

However, Antonakis, et al. found 14 studies that stressed that the MLQ was not without fault. Antonakis, et al. hypothesized that leadership evaluations are impacted by the context in which the leadership behavior was observed and evaluated. Furthermore, many studies indicated that the factor structure of the MLQ was unstable and the discriminate validity with the leadership continuum was weak. In 1999, Yukl theorized that discriminate validity problems existed between transformational and transactional contingent reward factor. Then in 2001, Tejeda, Scandura, and Pillai, recommended a reduction of items on the MLQ. Regardless Atonakis, et al. concluded:

The current version of the MLQ (Form 5X) is a valid and reliable instrument that can adequately measure the nine components comprising the full-range theory of leadership. Although the MLQ (Form 5X) and indeed, any leadership survey instrument, will never account for all possible leadership dimensions, it represents a foundation from which to conduct further research and to expand understanding of the new models of leadership. (p. 286)

The MLQ (Form 5X) is composed of two competencies: leadership style and effectiveness (Bass and Avolio, 2004). The leadership behaviors for transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire scales are measured on the full leadership continuum. The continuum contains nine scales:

- Idealized Attributes (builds trust)
- Idealized Behaviors (acts with integrity)

- Inspirational Motivation (inspires others)
- Intellectual Stimulation (encourages innovative thinking)
- Individual Consideration (coaches people)
- Contingent Reward (rewards achievement)
- Management-by-Exception: Active (monitors mistakes)
- Management-by-Exception: Passive (fights fires)
- Laissez-Faire (avoids involvement)

Transformational leadership is composed of five scales: idealized attribute, idealized behaviors, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individual consideration. Transactional is composed of two scales: contingent reward and management by exception (active); and laissez-faire with two scales: management by exception (passive) and laissez-faire. The nine scales are measured by four survey items making a total of 36 items. The transformational scales are formed from twenty 4-item Likert scale questions, while transactional and laissez-faire style scores are constructed from eight 4-item Likert scale questions. These scales are outlined in Appendix D and correlated to individual items on the score sheet in Appendix C.

Secondly, in addition to the nine leadership scales, the MLQ also assesses raters' perceptions of their success of their leadership style in three outcomes: effectiveness, satisfaction, and extra effort. Each of these outcomes is measured on nine separate questionnaire items, which are identified in the score sheet in Appendix C. The MLQ measures the effectiveness of the leader by how well they motivate and get followers to put forth extra effort, how effective the leader is at different levels of the organization,

how satisfied others are working with the leader. Since this study was an investigation into leadership style and not a study of leadership success or effectiveness, only the nine leadership scales were analyzed. Using only the data on the nine leadership scales to determine the perceived leadership style did not invalidate the questionnaire or compromise the nine scale results.

A demographic survey (Appendix E) was also attached to the MLQ survey. The demographic survey collected general information like age and gender of the graduates, which enabled the researcher to define the characteristics of the study sample. The demographic survey also contained the question: How much actual influence did participation in the Daly Leadership Program have over yourself perception as a leader? The purpose of the question was to determine from the graduate perspective, if participation in the Daly Leadership Program impacted graduates leadership style. Specifically, the question was asked to address the study limitations on the Daly program recruitment process, diminishing that the Daly graduates came into the program transformative.

Procedures

Since the researcher wanted to determine the perceived leadership style of Daly graduates, an email invitation was sent from Mind Garden Inc. to Daly graduates describing the research, inviting them to participate and requesting their consent by clicking on a link to receive the survey. Their consent took the graduates to the on-line MLQ-5X survey, where they answered 45 scale items of their leadership behaviors. Each leadership behavior was rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to

4 (frequently, if not always). In addition to the MLQ questionnaire, was a demographic survey for age, gender, number of years of experience, cohort year, and their perception of the impact of the program on their leadership behaviors. To keep the data confidential, Mind Garden Inc. coded all surveys and sent the data to researcher with identifiers removed.

Because the researcher also wanted to determine the perceptions of others who were familiar with the Daly Program graduates leadership behaviors, she selected to have teachers rate principals. Bass and Avolio (2004) stated, “We do generally recommend that all persons working above, below, and directly at the same organizational level as the leader rate the leader” (p. 13). Yet, they found that the MLQ results have been consistently the same and equally effective when supervisors, colleagues, peers, or direct reports rate leaders. Bass and Avolio maintained, “Specifically, the psychometric properties of the MLQ are comparable for direct reports and for colleagues or peers rating leaders” (p.13). Additionally, the MLQ handbook outlined that if a leader is remote from their associates, it is likely that the associates will evaluate the leader’s behaviors less frequently. In view of the fact that principals were remote from superintendents and peer principals, the principals might have been observed less frequently by above and same level associates than below associates or teachers. Knowing that ratings across types of raters are comparable and that principals engage more frequently and in multiple ways with teachers than peer principals and superintendents, the researcher opted to only have teachers rate their principals.

Still, the way in which teachers were selected and contacted was important. As delineated in the MLQ handbook, “Seltzer and Bass (1990) found that despite the anonymity of the data processing, if the raters were selected and contacted by the leader rather than by an independent authority, the ratings appeared to be inflated” (2004, p. 13). Hence, the researcher used the following process to select and contact teachers. First the researcher requested Daly program principals to grant permission for their teachers to participate in the study. The principals were sent an email from the researcher, along with a Pintler District research consent form. By faxing or emailing the district consent form back to the researcher, the principals agreed to allow their teachers to participate in the study. Then, the researcher randomly selected 20 teachers per principal. A district official provided the researcher a list of teachers who worked for each of the principals. Using the provided list, the researcher assigned each teacher a number then 20 numbers were randomly generated.

Next, an email invitation was sent by Mind Garden Inc. to the 20 randomly chosen teachers per principal, inviting them to participate and requesting their consent by clicking on a link. Their consent took them to the on-line MLQ-5X associate rater form, where they answered 45 scale items about their principal’s leadership behaviors. Each leadership behavior was rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always).

Given that the variability in the MLQ rating increases as the numbers of leader raters increases, the researcher attempted to collect more than the recommended minimum of three lower level associates. As identified in the MLQ handbook, “except

for a minimum of three raters, no specific optimal size for the rater group can be suggested for evaluating a single leader” (Bass & Avolio, 2004, p. 17).

Setting, Population, Sample, and Participants

Setting. An innovative principal preparation program, The Daly Leadership Program, was the setting of this investigation into leadership style. The Daly Leadership Program was designed as a collaborative partnership where faculty and participants connect the practice of leadership occurring in the Pintler School District with the theory of leadership studied at the Intrepid University. Hora (2007), Levine (2005), and Stein and Curtis (2010, and Korach (2010) described the collaborative partnership:

Collaborative partnership requires neutral ground where each entity can authentically share the problems and issues of the practice and work together to design authentic learning experiences for participants that are rooted in an existing context and situated in an environment that fosters critical inquiry and multiple perspectives. (p. 5)

The collaborative partnership between the Pintler School District and the Intrepid University, provides the *third space* to cultivate the professional leadership model (Shulman, 2005) consisting of the conceptual, practical, and moral apprenticeships. Hora and Millar (2010) described the third space as, “a new arena for activity where competing interests, perspectives, and opinions play out as different organizations come together” (p. 12).

The Daly Leadership Program was crafted to be purposeful and values driven. The overarching mission of the program is, “To prepare adaptive leaders capable of facilitating second order change” (Korach, 2008, p. 1). The set of shared-values that capture the essential qualities for the adaptive, transformative leaders are: action

orientation; high expectations for self and others; equity; diversity; community; inspired leadership; citizenship; explicit and honest communication; and head, hand, and heart (Korach, 2005). A detailed list of the values is included in Appendix A.

The Daly Program selection process contains two components: an application and interview. The application includes a leadership essay, letters of recommendation, and transcript submission. The interview is structured with an on the spot writing sample and problem based questions from a panel of invested leaders. Both the application and interview process were designed to select leaders who embodied the nine leadership values (listed above) and key traits. The key traits were: self-directed learners, learners who had the ability to respond positively to constructive criticism, active learners who desired more than grades/licenses/degrees, learners who had the ability to deal with ambiguity, and essentially risk takers.

Once selected into the Daly Leadership Program, participants complete a year-long program in a cohort model. The program consists of weekly classes, an internship with a practicing principal in a school setting, and standards based projects that require participants to apply leadership practices to real situations.

Population, sample, and participants. As of the 2010, 139 graduates had completed the Daly Leadership Program. Of the 139 graduates, 106 (76%) remained employed in the Pintler School District, 24 as principals and 82 as either assistant principals, district level leaders, or teachers. Since the researcher wanted to determine the perceived leadership style of Daly graduates and only had access to the graduates still employed in the Pintler School District, she invited 106 Daly Program graduates to

participate in the study. The Daly graduates still employed by the Pintler School District consisted of 69% white, 14% black, 17% Hispanic; 60% female; and ages ranging from 26 to 65.

Because the researcher also wanted to determine the perceptions of teachers who work for the principals who were Daly Program graduates, she requested Daly program graduates who were active principals (21) to grant permission for their teachers to participate in the study. Only 21 out of the 24 total principals were invited, because three principals did not meet the requirements to appropriately participate in the study as active principal graduates. Fourteen (67%) of the 21 principals agreed to have their teachers participate in the study, which caused the researcher to question why a high percentage of principals did not consent. For example, she wondered if the level of trust among the principal and teachers impacted the principal's decision to not participate. Nonetheless, it is important to note because the data could be skewed based on the low participation rate.

For analysis, the researcher divided the self-rater respondents into two groups: Daly Program graduates and Daly Program principals. Group one consisted of 91 graduates, the difference of all the graduates (105) minus the principals (14) who agreed to have their teachers complete a survey. These 91 program graduates included the seven active principals who had teachers working for them, but did not grant permission for teacher surveys and the two inactive principals who did not yet have teachers working for them. The 91 graduates were invited to complete a self-rater MLQ questionnaire. The response rate of this first group was 40 respondents or 44%. Because 39 out of the 40 respondents were assistant principals, district leaders, or teachers and not

principals, they were referred to as graduates throughout the study. The second group consisted of 14 principals, who agreed to be rated by their teachers. All 14 (100%) principals completed the self-rater survey. This represented a response rate of 58% of the total Daly graduates who are principals.

Twenty teachers per participating principal (20 teachers x 14 principals= 280 teachers) were contacted to complete an associated rater form. Of the 280 teachers, 123 completed surveys for their principals. This is a response rate of 44% of the teachers invited to participate. The number of teacher ratings per principal ranged from 5 to 15. Again, a significant amount of teachers (56%) did not participate in the study, calling questions to why teachers did or did not participate. Potentially, positional authority, lack of knowledge of the leader's behaviors, or school culture could be some of the reasons teachers opted to respond or not respond.

The majority of the 40 graduates who participated in the study were female (23, 57.5%) and white (29, 72.5%). The majority of the 14 principals who were rated by their teachers were also female (10, 71.4%) and white (8, 57.1%). The demographics of the Daly population of those still employed by the Pintler School District were 69% white and 60% female. The gender of survey respondents was representative with 58% of graduates and 71% of principals being female. The ethnicity of respondents was not as representative with 73% of graduates and 57% of principals being white. Again given the age range of 26 to 65 in the Daly population and the age range of Daly graduates from 29 to 63 and principals ranging from 35 to 55, the sample is a strong representation of the Daly population. This indicates that, using parametric statistical procedures, inferences

or judgments about the Daly population based on data collected from this representative sample can be made. Frequencies and percentages for the 40 graduates and the 14 principals are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages for Demographics

	Graduates		Principals (Teacher Rated)	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
Gender				
Male	17	42.5	4	28.6
Female	23	57.5	10	71.4
Ethnicity				
White	29	74.4	8	57.1
African American	4	10.3	2	14.3
Hispanic	-	-	4	28.6
Pacific Islander	-	-	-	-
American Indian	6	15.4	-	-

Of the 40 graduates, the youngest was 29 and the oldest was 63. The average age of the graduates was 43.18 years old ($SD = 9.23$). Of the principals, the youngest was 35 and the oldest was only 55. The average age of the 14 principals was 44.00 years old ($SD = 7.18$). The standard deviations dictated that spread of ages was greater among the graduates than the principals. Means and standard deviations for participants' age are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Participants' Age

Rater	M	SD	N
Graduate Leader	43.18	9.23	40
Principal	44.00	7.18	14

Data Analysis Procedures

After the data were collected, both descriptive and inferential statistics were performed on SPSS version 14.0, 2006 (Norušis). Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency, and percent as appropriate) of graduates were obtained to summarize characteristics of the graduates and principals in aggregate and by demographic categorization. Descriptive statistics, means and standard deviations, were also generated to determine the leadership style perceived by graduates, principals, and teachers.

In order to score a leadership style, the leadership behaviors (36 items) in the nine scales are averaged. Take for instance, the transformational leadership scale, inspirational motivation (IM). Inspirational motivation means that the leader raises expectations and beliefs concerning the mission and vision. The MLQ contains four inter-related items that measure inspirational motivation: talks optimistically about the future (#9); talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished (#13); articulates a compelling vision of the future (#26); and expresses confidence that goals will be achieved (#36). All questions are measured on a Likert Scale of 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always). For example, Mr. Principal was rated fairly often on question #9, fairly often on question #13, sometimes on question #26, and fairly often on question #36. A total of 11 (3 + 3 + 2 + 3=11) divided by 4 (the number of IM items) equaled a mean sub-score of 2.75 for Mr. Principal's inspirational motivation score. Mr. Principal was ranked on the other four transformational sub-factors as: Idealized Attributes (3.75), Idealized Behaviors (3.25), Intellectual Stimulation (3.25), and Individualized

Consideration (3.25), so the overall mean score for Mr. Principal's transformational leadership equaled 3.25. Since the transactional mean score was 2.75 and laissez-faire mean score was 0.75, Mr. Principal's leadership style was determined as transformational because it had the highest mean score at 3.25.

After obtaining the mean scores for each leadership style, two parametric dependent sample *t*-tests on leadership styles (laissez fair vs. transformational) and (transactional vs. transformational) were completed on the graduates, principals, and teachers' perceptions. The *t*-tests were performed to determine if the transformational mean scores were statistically different from the transactional and laissez-faire mean scores. Typically, a dependent sample t-test is a matched pair of a pretest to a posttest after a time frame. However, variables are not only paired for time, they also are paired for related topics on the same scale (Morgan, Leech, Gloekner, & Barret, 2007). For example, it is acceptable to conduct a dependent sample t-test to pair a mother's and father's education on the same scale and assess if the mother's education is different from the father's education (Morgan, Leech, Gloekner, & Barret, 2007). In the case of this research study, leadership styles were related and paired together by participant on the same scale. Thus, a t-test was conducted to see if there was a difference between the leadership styles. Then, a Cohen's *d* was calculated to measure the effect size of the difference.

The original research proposal only contained two research questions. After initial data analysis, a third question was inserted to assess differences between transformational scores between principals' perceptions and teachers' perceptions of their

principals existed. Because, no additional data collection was necessary, no addendums were added to the research application. The Independent *t*-tests were used to determine if there was a discrepancy between principal's perceptions and teacher's perceptions, as well as the discrepancy between the principals and teachers specific ratings for the nine scales. Additionally, because each principal had multiple teachers that evaluated them, the independent *t*-test used aggregate scoring. All of the principals were grouped together in one group and all of the teachers were all grouped into a second group. In order to pair them together, each set of teachers per principal would have had to be reduced to one score (instead of the total number of teachers rating them) in order to do a dependent sample *t*-test. Thus, they were left only as two separate groups, teachers and principals, with no method of pairing them together. The lack of pairing, may have caused type I errors in the data. For example, if Principal A had five teacher raters, who perceived their principal to be weak in intellectual stimulation and Principal B had 15 teacher raters, who perceived their principal to be strong in intellectual stimulation. Because Principal A had 10 more raters than Principal B, the data would show that both Principal A and Principal B are strong in intellectual stimulation, when in fact Principal B is not strong in intellectual stimulation.

Lastly, Z-tests on the nine leadership scales between principals' perceptions and the U.S. sample norms and teachers' perceptions of the principals and U.S. sample norms were conducted. The researcher obtained the U.S. norm data set from MLQ handbook. The normative data set were from findings testing the MLQ factor structure with the U.S. national normative data base. The U.S. normative data set is maintained by Mind Garden

Inc. and contains the sample size, mean score, and standard deviations separated into the rater categories: self, above, below, same, and other. The purpose for acquiring the normative data set was to compare the means scores from the principals and teachers with the national norms. The comparison was completed to soften the study limitation regarding the lack of a comparison group; such that, Daly principals were different in leadership style compared to other leaders outside the Daly Leadership Program.

Statement of Bias

Since the researcher completed an innovative principal preparation program and worked in Pintler School District, potential for bias was addressed through the study research design, measurement, sampling, and procedure. The researcher opted to use a quantitative rather than qualitative design to limit the impact from bias. The researcher also selected to use a pre-designed valid, reliable survey. The valid survey ensured that the researcher did not write leading questions geared towards the Daly leadership program goals. After given a list of teachers per principal from a Pintler School District official, the researcher used random number generation process to select 20 teachers per principal to invite to participate in the study. In terms of procedure, an unbiased third party, Mind Garden Inc. was selected and used to ensure data quality. Mind Garden Inc. electronically sent the surveys and collected the data. Once the data were collected, Mind Garden Inc. sent the raw data to the researcher with identifiers removed. The raw data allowed the researcher to remove any personal connection to individual graduates results.

Methodology Limitations

There were some limitations in the methodology that were critical to the overall study. In fact, Evers and Lakomski (2000) argued that empirical evidence collected through quantitative methodology of transformational leadership is impossible to get and inaccurate. They claimed questionnaires are ineffective, because of the subjectivity of people's interpretations of survey questions. They added:

If there is no principled way of telling one leader's behavior from another, then any claim to have empirically identified transformational leadership effects are not justified. In the absence of justification, however, claims to leadership are nothing more than personal belief or opinion, which does not carry any empirical status, no matter how many empirical studies are conducted. (p. 79)

Hunt (1999) also emphasized that survey measures of leadership have inherent limitations. A survey can only gather what a leader is doing but cannot determine why.

The use of only the MLQ to define leadership style was limiting. According to Avolio (1999), the full range leadership continuum as measured by the MLQ did not include all possible leadership behaviors or skills. For example, Antonakis and House (2002) argued that the continuum did not address strategic leadership. Also in 1999, Yukl suggested adding four more scales to the continuum. As House and Aditya (1997) asserted that surveys like the MLQ cannot adequately assess leadership behavior and potential, because research has oversimplified leadership behavior and measurement of leadership behaviors. Certainly, no leadership survey will account for all possible leadership behaviors. Thus it is important to recognize that the MLQ only represented leadership behavior defined on the full leadership continuum.

A major limitation of the study design was the inability to establish the influence of the Daly Leadership Program on the Daly graduates leadership style. This limitation was a result of narrow research design that did not adequately meet several key causal inference requirements: comparisons with non-Daly principals, information about recruiting vs. preparing. There was no comparison of Daly principals leadership styles compared to principals from other preparation programs within the same school district. That said, a comparison of the Daly principals self perceptions to the national norms did provide limited comparative data, but only enough to make limited casual inferences of the impact of the Daly program participation to Daly graduates leadership style.

Without having data on participants leadership style before entering the Daly Leadership Program to compare with graduates leadership style after the program, the influence of the program was impossible to measure. In fact, using the MLQ in a pre and post fashion would be inappropriate for this setting and population, because the questions are written for leaders who hold a leadership position and are executing their leadership style. Yet, it is not uncommon to use the MLQ in a pre and post manner for active leaders before and after an intervention, like additional training.

Leaders may have been transformative when they were recruited into the Daly Leadership Program. While designing the research method, the researcher attempted to address this limitation through the demographic question about the impact of the Daly program on leadership style. However, after data analysis the researchers determined that the one perceptual question was not enough evidence to make casual inferences. Hence, the researcher could only somewhat claim that participation in the program did influence

leadership styles of graduates. She could not infer statistically with confidence that the Daly Leadership Program impacted the graduates' leadership style.

Furthermore, by not collecting data on principals from all levels of the organization, the data were restricted to teacher perceptions. Perception data from all levels: above, same, below, and other would have strengthened the perception data on the 14 principals. No matter what, the ratings of leadership are based on the context in which the leader leads. As Zaccaro and Klimoski (2001, p. 12) mentioned confusion in measurement of leadership styles may be a result from the lack of understanding and focus on contextual factors. Since the researcher failed to adjust the research design to take into consideration how the district context impacted the Daly principal's leadership behavior, inferences could not be made that the district context impacted the leadership style of graduates or principals.

Regarding leadership style and context, the researcher was not able to compare the leadership style of graduates based on their position within the school district. The graduate group contained 91 leaders from different levels of the organization, including assistant principals, district level leaders, teachers, and principals who did not consent to have their teachers surveyed. The researcher had a list of participants that indicated if an individual did or did not complete the survey, but the participant list was not connected to the data excel sheets. All identifiers were removed from the data by Mind Garden Inc. to maintain confidentiality. Therefore, the researcher could not determine if there was a relationship between graduates' perceived leadership styles and their position. It would have been interesting to see if the teacher leaders, assistant principals, or district level

leaders perceived their leadership style different than principals. As Hogg (2001) explained, leaders actively adjust their leadership behaviors in order to meet expectations within their different contexts. In other words, it would have been interesting to see if principals within the Pintler School District had a different perception of their leadership style, because they might adjust their leadership styles to suit the district culture, school context, and/or job requirements. This information would have provided some insight into the impact of a leader's context on leadership style.

Furthermore, graduates who hold other leadership positions in the Pintler School District other than a principalship may have responded to the gap between espoused-theory of leadership versus their leadership theory-in-use. Meaning graduates' perception of the leadership style they would ideally use in the principalship might be different from the actual leadership style used by graduates once they became principals.

Summary

The quantitative methodology that was used for this study focused on transformative leadership perception of graduates from the Daly Leadership Program and teachers' perceptions of principals, who are graduates of the program. Specifically the study focused on transformative leadership continuum. The transformative leadership behaviors were gathered through the MLQ and analyzed with both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. In the following chapter, a synthesis of results, that includes accurate findings, and clearly stated support for the hypotheses, is presented.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the quantitative study to measure the perceived leadership style of program graduates from the Daly Leadership Program, a transformative principal preparation program. First investigated was how graduates perceived their own leadership style. Then, the leadership style of program graduates who had become school principals were rated by teachers who worked with those principals. The graduates' leadership style was measured using the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X), which was created by Bass & Avolio to measure leadership behaviors that transform individuals and organization on a Full Range Leadership continuum from laissez-faire, transactional, to transformational. It was hypothesized that the majority of graduates from the Daly Leadership Program would perceive their leadership style and be perceived by others as transformative. As presented below, SPSS version 14.0 (2006, Norušis 2006) was used to conduct both inferential and descriptive statistics to examine the three research questions.

Findings Related to Research Question One

Research question one was: How do graduates from the Daly Leadership Program perceive their own leadership style? In order to examine this question, descriptive statistics summarized leadership style in aggregate for both the graduates and the principal results. After calculating the descriptive statistics (means and standard

deviations), two dependent sample *t*-test on leadership styles were done to assess the difference between graduates perceived leadership scales. Given that the transformational scores were the highest, *t*-tests were done to see if there was a significant difference between laissez faire vs. transformational and transactional vs. transformational mean scores.

The following table presents the descriptive statistics of the results from program graduates and principals. Out of the three leadership styles, the program graduates and principals self-rated transformational scores were the highest. For the graduates, the standard deviation for transformational was the lowest, showing that the scores for the transformational style varied the least while the transactional scores varied the greatest. The standard deviation for principals was the lowest in laissez-faire and highest in transactional, showing that the laissez-faire scores varied the least, while the transactional scores varied the most. When compared side by side, the graduates' and the principals' leadership mean scores are similar. Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations for the leadership styles for the graduates and the principals.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Graduates and Principals' Self-Rated scores

	Graduates			Principals		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Transformational	3.34	0.30	40	3.29	0.46	14
Transactional	2.24	0.72	40	2.28	0.60	13
Laissez-Faire	0.58	0.40	39	0.52	0.37	14

To further examine research question one, two dependent sample *t*-tests were conducted on the leadership styles (laissez faire vs. transformational and transactional vs. transformational) for the graduates. Prior to analysis, three Kolmogorov Smirnov tests were conducted to assess normality. The tests were not significant, verifying the assumption of normality. The result of the first *t*-test that compared laissez-faire and transformational leadership styles for graduates was significant, $t(38) = -30.57, p < .001$. This showed that, for the graduates, the laissez-faire scores were significantly lower than the transformational scores. The result of the second *t*-test that compared transactional and transformational leadership styles for graduates was also significant, $t(39) = -9.69, p < .001$. This determined that, for the graduates, the transactional scores were significantly lower than the transformational scores. Cohen's *d* was also calculated to measure the difference between the tests. The effect size of the difference in laissez-faire and transformational styles was 4.93, which suggests a much larger than typical difference (Morgan, Leech, Gloekner, & Barret, 2007). The effect size of the difference in transactional and transformational leadership styles was 1.53, which also suggests a much larger than typical difference (Morgan, Leech, Gloekner, & Barret, 2007). Because the transformational scores were significantly higher than the laissez-faire and transactional scores, the null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. Results of the dependent sample *t*-tests are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Dependent Sample t-Tests Comparing Leadership Styles for Graduates

Style	<i>t</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>M_D</i>	<i>SD_D</i>	<i>d</i>
Laissez-Faire – Transformational	-30.57	38	.001	-2.76	0.56	4.93
Transactional – Transformational	-9.69	39	.001	-1.10	0.72	1.53

Note. Transformational > Laissez-Faire and Transactional

The demographic survey also contained a question about the influence the Daly Leadership program on the graduates perceived leadership style. The question read: How much actual influence did participation in the Daly Leadership Program have over yourself perception as a leader? The purpose of the question was to determine graduates perception of the influence of Daly program on their perceived leadership style. The question was measured on a Likert scale of 0 to 4 (0= No influence, 1= a little influence, 2=some influence, 3=a moderate amount, 4=a great deal of influence). The means scores for graduates and principals are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Graduates and Principals' Perceived Program Influence on Their Leadership Style

	Graduates			Principals		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Program Influence	3.63	0.59	40	3.93	0.27	14

The program graduates and principals both self-rated the program influence high with mean scores of 3.63 and 3.93. The principals mean score was higher than the graduates, showing that principals perceived the program influence on their leadership

style stronger than the graduates did. This led to further examination of the difference between the graduates and principals mean scores for the program influence. Prior to examination, two Kolmogorov Smirnov tests were conducted to assess normality. The tests were not significant, verifying the assumption of normality. Then a dependent sample *t*-test was conducted to measure the difference of principal and graduate leader's perception of the Daly program influence on their leadership style. The results of the *t*-test were significant, $t(48.11) = 2.60, p = .006$. This established that at a significant level, the principals rated the program influence on their leadership style higher than the graduates did. Results of the independent sample *t*-test are presented in Table 6.

Table 6

Independent Sample t-test for Means Scores by Graduates vs. Principals for Program Influence

	<i>T</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>P</i>	Graduate Leaders		Principals	
				<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Program Influence	2.60	48.11	.006	3.63	0.59	3.93	0.27

Finding Related to Research Question Two

Research question two inquired: How do teachers who work with Daly program graduate principals identify their principal's leadership style? To examine question two, descriptive statistics of the results from teachers' perceptions of program graduates who were principals were conducted. Out of the three leadership scales, the teachers identified the principals' transformational scale with the highest mean score. Based on teacher ratings, principals' transformational scores ranged from 0.00 to 4.00 with a mean score of 2.89 (SD = 0.99). Principals' transactional scores ranged from 0.00 to 3.65 and

had a mean score of 4.00 (SD = 0.97) and laissez-faire scores ranged from 0.00 to 3.50 and had a mean score of 0.79 (SD = 0.93). Table 7 presents the means and standard deviations for the leadership styles for principals rated by teachers' along-side the means and standard deviations of the graduates and principals self-ratings.

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for Graduates, Principals' Self-Rated scores and the Principals' Teacher-Rated scores

	Principals-Self Rated			Principals-Teacher Rated		
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
Transformational	3.29	0.46	14	2.89	0.99	112
Transactional	2.28	0.60	13	2.53	0.97	109
Laissez-Faire	0.52	0.37	14	0.79	0.93	112

Next, two dependent sample *t*-tests were conducted on the leadership styles (laissez faire vs. transformational and transactional vs. transformational) for the principals that were teacher-rated. The criteria for normality utilized in this study were skewed between -2.0 and 2.0 and kurtosis between -7.0 and 7.0 (Curran, West, & Finch, 1996; Kline, 2005). Skew for the three variables ranged from -1.74 to 1.22, which is within the limitations for normality. Kurtosis ranged from 0.35 to 3.27, which is also within the limitations for normality. Therefore the data is treated as normal.

The result of the first *t*-test that compared laissez-faire and transformational leadership styles was significant, $t(111) = -12.49, p < .001$. This showed that the laissez-faire scores were significantly lower than the transformational scores for the principals. The results of the second *t*-test that compared transactional and transformational leadership styles was significant, $t(108) = -4.89, p < .001$. This established that the transactional scores were significantly lower than the transformational scores for the principals. Cohen's *d* was also calculated for the difference between the tests. The effect

size of the difference in laissez-faire and transformational styles was 5.13, which suggests a much larger than typical difference (Morgan, Leech, Gloekner, & Barret, 2007). The effect size of the difference in transactional and transformational leadership styles was 1.90, which also suggests a much larger than typical difference (Morgan, Leech, Gloekner, & Barret, 2007). Because the transformational scores were significantly higher than the laissez-faire and transactional scores, the null hypothesis was rejected in favor of the alternative hypothesis. Results of the dependent sample *t*-tests are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Dependent Sample t-tests Comparing Leadership Styles for Principals/Teacher-Rated Leaders

Style	<i>T</i>	<i>Df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>M_D</i>	<i>SD_D</i>	<i>d</i>
Laissez-Faire – Transformational	-12.49	111	.001	-2.77	0.54	5.13
Transactional – Transformational	-4.89	108	.001	-0.99	0.52	1.90

Note. Transformational > Laissez-Faire and Transactional

Findings Related to Research Question Three

The third research question was to determine if there was a discrepancy between principal’s self-perceptions and teacher’s perception of the principals. The third question stated: What difference is there between the Daly program graduate principals perceived leadership style and the teacher perception of their principal’s leadership style?

In order to understand the discrepancy, additional independent sample *t*-tests on MLQ sub-scores between principals and teachers were completed, as well as independent sample Z-tests on MLQ sub-scores between principals, teachers, and U.S. sample norms.

First, an independent sample *t*-test was conducted to assess if the principal self-rated transformational scores were significantly different from the teacher rated transformational scores for the principals. Normality was assessed and verified by a non-significant Kolmogorov Smirnov test. The assumption for equality of variance was assessed with a Levene's test. The test was significant, and thus equality of variance was not assumed. The results of the *t*-test were significant, $t(30.37) = 2.65, p = .013$. This established that the principals rate themselves higher on transformational scale than the teachers did. Results of the independent sample *t*-test are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Independent Sample t-Test for Transformational Leadership Scores by Associates vs. Principals

	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>	Principals		Teachers	
					<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Transformational	2.65	30.37	.013	0.52	3.29	0.46	2.89	0.99

Because a difference between the self-perceptions of the principals and the teachers' perceptions of the principals was established, the researcher conducted further analysis to determine where the differences existed within the nine leadership scales. Nine independent sample *t*-tests were used to assess the differences in the principal's and teacher's responses for each leadership scale: idealized attributes, idealized behaviors,

inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, contingent reward, management by exception (active), management by exception (passive) and laissez-faire scores. Since each principal had multiple teachers that evaluated them, the independent t-test used aggregate scoring. All of the principals were grouped together in one group and all of the teachers were all grouped into a second group. In order to pair them together, each set of teachers per principal would have had to be reduced to one score (instead of the total number of teachers rating them) in order to do a dependent sample t-test. Thus, they were left only as two separate groups, teachers and principals, with no method of pairing them together. Prior to the nine *t*-tests, the assumption for equality of variance was assessed with Levene's tests. The results of Levene's tests were significant for intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, management by exception (passive), and laissez-faire and thus equality of variance was not assumed.

For the nine *t*-tests, the results were significant for intellectual stimulation, $t(32.30) = 2.77, p = .009$, individual consideration, $t(51.88) = 3.81, p < .001$, contingent reward, $t(31.33) = 2.26, p = .031$, management by exception (active), $t(71) = -2.24, p = .028$, and laissez-faire, $t(33.74) = -2.16, p = .038$. This showed that for subscales of intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and contingent reward, the principals rated themselves higher than their teachers rated them. Intellectual stimulation according to Northouse (2004) "includes leadership that stimulates followers to be creative and innovative and to challenge their own beliefs and values as well as those of the leaders and the organization" (p. 177). Individualized consideration represents leaders, "who provide a supportive climate in which they listen carefully to the individual needs of

followers” (p. 177). Contingent reward is when a leader sets goals and provides recognition when the goals are achieved.

For management by exception (active) and laissez-faire, the principals rated themselves lower than their teachers rated them. Management by exception (active) means that a leader sets standards for compliance, monitors for the compliancy, and when violations occur punishments are issued. Management by exception (active) is a transactional scale or managerial quality. This result indicates that teachers perceive their principals more active managers than they perceive themselves. The laissez-faire scale describes a leader as one who uses a hands-off approach. Since the principals rating were lower than teachers on the laissez-faire scale, this indicated that teachers perceived principals as more laissez-faire than they perceived themselves. All the results for the nine independent sample *t*-tests are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Nine Independent Sample t Tests for MLQ Subscales by Principals vs. Associates

	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>P</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>	Principals		Teachers	
					<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Idealized Influence (Attributes)	0.55	118	.581	0.19	3.10	0.63	2.94	1.03
Idealized Influence (Behaviors)	1.97	117	.051	0.65	3.56	0.57	3.06	0.93
Inspirational Motivation	0.77	130	.446	0.26	3.49	0.50	3.29	0.98
Intellectual Stimulation	2.77	32.30	.009	0.26	3.07	0.51	2.59	1.11
Individual Consideration	3.81	51.88	.001	0.68	3.22	0.41	2.61	1.20
Contingent Reward	2.26	31.33	.031	0.45	3.19	0.50	2.79	1.14
Management by Exception: A	2.24	71	.028	0.83	1.06	0.73	1.82	1.07

Management by Exception: P	1.95	44.06	.057	0.40	0.69	0.40	0.99	0.97
Laissez-Faire	2.16	33.74	.038	0.43	0.34	0.42	0.65	0.94

Additionally to diagnosis the differences between the principal and teacher mean scores, the researcher compared the U.S. national sample means for self with the principals' self-rated means and associate (lower level) ratings with teacher-rated means for principals. The U.S. national norm sample means were obtained from the MLQ handbook. The U.S. normative data set is maintained by Mind Garden Inc., which contains the sample size, mean score, and standard deviations separated into the rater categories: self, above, below, same, and other. The sample size for the U.S. norm sample for self raters was 3,375 and the U.S. sample size for associate-raters below the leader was 4, 376.

First, one-sample Z-tests were conducted to assess if there were differences in the principals scores on the MLQ compared to the U.S. norms for self-assessment. The results of the Z-tests showed that the principals rated themselves significantly higher on idealized influence (builds trust and acts with integrity) and inspirational motivation (inspires others), and significantly lower on management by exception: active (monitors mistakes) and passive (fights fires). Table 11 shows the means, standard deviations, and Z-test results for the nine Z-tests.

Table 11

Z-tests for U.S. Norms for Self Raters and Principals on MLQ Subscales

	Principals		US Norms-Self		<i>Z</i>	<i>P</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
Transformational						
Idealized Influence (Attributes)	3.10	0.63	2.95	0.53	1.06	.290
Idealized Influence (Behaviors)	3.56	0.57	2.99	0.59	3.61	.003
Inspirational Motivation	3.49	0.50	3.04	0.59	2.85	.004
Intellectual Stimulation	3.07	0.51	2.96	0.52	0.79	.439
Individual Consideration	3.22	0.41	3.16	0.52	0.43	.666
Transactional						
Contingent Reward	3.19	0.50	2.99	0.53	1.41	.158
Management by Exception: Active	1.06	0.73	1.58	0.79	-2.46	.014
Laissez-faire						
Management by Exception: Passive	0.69	0.40	1.07	0.62	-2.29	.022
Laissez-Faire	0.34	0.42	0.61	0.52	-1.94	.052

Nine one-sample Z-tests were conducted to assess if there were differences in the teacher scores on the MLQ compared to the US norms for lower level-assessment. The results of the Z-tests showed that the teachers rated their principals significantly higher on idealized influence (builds trust and acts with integrity) and inspirational motivation (inspires others), and significantly lower on intellectual stimulation (encourages innovative thinking) and individual consideration (coaches people). Table 12 shows the means, standard deviations, and z-test results for the nine scales.

Table 12

Z-tests for U.S. Norms for Lower Level Associates and Teachers on MLQ Subscales

	National Norms- Lower		Teachers		Z	P
	M	SD	M	SD		
Transformational						
Idealized Influence (Behaviors)	2.73	0.76	3.06	0.93	4.80	.001
Inspirational Motivation	2.97	0.79	3.29	0.98	4.47	.001
Intellectual Stimulation	2.76	0.75	2.59	1.11	-2.50	.012
Individual Consideration	2.78	0.88	2.61	1.20	-2.13	.033
Transactional						
Contingent Reward	2.84	0.78	2.79	1.14	-0.71	.479
Management by Exception: Active	1.67	0.92	1.82	1.07	1.70	.072
Laissez-faire						
Management by Exception: Passive	1.02	0.79	0.99	0.97	-0.42	.675
Laissez-Faire	0.66	0.72	0.65	0.94	-0.15	.878

Summary of Findings

Using the demographic survey, descriptive data were conducted and found that the majority of Daly graduates who participated in the study were white and female, with an average age of 43. Given the strong correlation between the sample descriptive data and the overall Daly population, the sample was found to be representative of the Daly population. The descriptive results to the first research question, how do graduates perceive their leadership style, indicated that both the 40 graduates and 14 principals perceived themselves to be transformative at a significant level. Additionally, both graduates and principals indicated that perceived participation in the Daly Leadership

Program influenced their leadership style. Since the sample was representative of the Daly population, it could be inferred that the majority of Daly graduates perceive themselves as transformative.

The second research question addressed how teachers defined the leadership style of their principal. Teachers perceived their principals to have the qualities of transformative leaders. However, as asked in research question three, there was a significant difference between the principals and teachers transformational mean scores. The findings showed principals perceived themselves higher than teachers did on transformational qualities in the areas of intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and contingent reward. These same three factors were the factors that teachers rated principals lower compared to the U.S. norm samples. Intellectual stimulation refers to a leader's ability to encourage followers to be creative, innovative and find new solutions to problems. Individualized consideration represents leaders who listen carefully to their followers and provide individual support for followers to develop and grow. Contingent reward is when a leader sets goals and provides recognition when the goals are achieved.

Nevertheless, in comparison to U.S. national norms, the teachers rated their principals higher in three out of five transformational scales: idealized influence (idealized attributes and idealized behaviors) and inspirational motivation. Inspirational motivation relates to a leaders ability to inspire others, while idealized influence relates to a leaders ability to build trust and act with integrity.

In the upcoming chapter these differences between teachers and principals perceptions are discussed in more detail, along with recommendations for future research on leadership style and principal preparation.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Recommendations for Further Research

Overview

This final chapter contains two sections. It begins with a discussion about the findings. Then, recommendations for future research are shared. The purpose of this investigation was to answer three research questions: (1) How do graduates from the Daly Leadership Program perceive their own leadership style, (2) How do teachers who work with Daly program graduate principals identify their principal's leadership style, and (3) What difference is there between the Daly program graduate principals perceived leadership style and the teacher perception of their principal's leadership style?

The tool administered to gather data was the Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) that measures transformational qualities on a leadership continuum. This was accomplished through on-line questionnaire to program graduates and on-line rater questionnaires completed by teachers who work for graduates that are acting principals. The MLQ categorized data based on a total of nine scales: Idealized Attributes (IA), Idealized Behaviors (IB), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), Individual Consideration (IC), Contingent Reward (CR), Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA), Management-by-Exception: Passive (MBEP), and Laissez-Faire (LF) (See Appendix D).

Discussion

Overall, the data from this research study indicated that the researcher hypothesis was confirmed. Daly Leadership program graduates perceived themselves as transformational leaders and teachers who work for principals who are Daly graduates also perceived their principals as transformative. Given the MLQ (2009) definition, then Daly Leadership Program graduates are:

Proactive- they seek to optimize individual, group and organizational development and innovation, not just achieve performance "at expectations." They convince their associates to strive for higher levels of potential as well as higher levels of moral and ethical standards. (p.100)

In addition to confirming the study hypothesis, the data revealed key differences between teacher perceptions of the principals and national norms.

According to the teachers' ratings as compared to national norms, principals were strongest in the area of idealized influence (attributes and behaviors) and inspirational motivation. Idealized influence indicates that leaders were admired, respected and trusted. A leader who used idealized influence would take risks or put other needs before their own. The leadership behavior of idealized influence was evident in the teacher survey comment, "She is willing to do difficult things, if it is what is best for the students." Teacher perception and comparison data also revealed that Daly principals lead in a values driven and ethical manner and have not only learned the program value of "hand, head, and heart", but practiced it.

The other leadership scale perceived by teachers as superior in their principals compared to national norms was inspirational motivation. Inspirational motivation

indicated that principals motivated their teachers by providing meaning and challenge.

According to the MLQ (2009, p. 100) inspirational motivation exists when:

- Individual and team spirit is aroused.
- Enthusiasm and optimism are displayed.
- Followers are encouraged to envision attractive future states.
- The future is talked about optimistically.
- Followers and leaders talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.
- Leaders articulate a compelling vision of the future.
- Leaders express confidence that goals will be achieved.

These above characteristics are aligned with the Daly Leadership Program value of inspired leadership, “School leaders should be committed to a vision of leadership that is collaborative, distributed, data-driven, effective, research-based, ethical, entrepreneurial, reflective, developmental and courageous”. For instance, inspired leadership behavior was captured in this teacher’s survey comment, “Principal A has a very clear vision and follows through with it. This has really helped the students and teachers to succeed.”

Program graduate responses to the demographic survey, “How much actual influence did participation in the Daly Leadership Program have over yourself perception as a leader?” revealed that graduates felt the Daly Leadership Program impacted their leadership style. The strong program connections and data from graduates indicated that the Daly Leadership Program might have influenced the transformational leadership scales of inspirational motivation and intellectual stimulation.

Another possible influence on leadership style is context. Hogg (2001) explained leaders actively adjust their leadership behaviors in order to meet expectations within their different contexts. In other words, is something within the context and culture of the school district systematically enhancing inspirational motivation and idealized influence leadership behaviors among the principals. Principals within the Pintler School District may be using inspirational motivation and idealized influence because they have adjusted their leadership styles to suit the district culture, school context, and/or job requirements.

The discrepancy between the principal and teacher perceptions of leadership informs both preparation and practice. The three scales that teachers rated Daly principals lower than the national norms and lower than the principals themselves were: intellectual stimulation, individual consideration, and contingent reward. Intellectual stimulation was defined and measured by the MLQ as, “Gets followers to question the tried and true ways of solving problems; encourages them to question the methods they use to improve upon them” (2009, p. 54). The data from the study suggested that principals think they empower their staff to make decisions and problem-solve while teachers do not. This is critical because as Heifetz and Linsky indicated second order challenges require new learning to solve problems. Also, Argyris and Schön’s stressed Model II processes, because it is through double-loop or deep learning that an organization improves and values and beliefs are shifted. Without new learning, second order changes will not occur, which is exactly what Leithwood, et al. (2004) stressed is needed for struggling schools.

The results related to the promotion of intellectual stimulation could be attributed to transfer of learning from program to practice or a problem of practice. Program graduates perceived that the Daly Leadership Program impacted their leadership style. The Daly Leadership program utilized Garmston and Wellman's (1999) seven norms of collaborative work. The seven norms, included in Appendix B, are: paraphrasing, pausing, probing, putting ideas on the table, paying attention to self and other, presuming positive intentions, and pursuing a balance between advocacy and inquiry. Together, the seven norms of collaboration are tools that can promote intellectual stimulation. The data suggest that the learning regarding the promotion of intellectual stimulation is not transferring from preparation to practice. Another factor to consider is how the context and culture of the Pintler School District promotes or inhibits intellectual stimulation. Further research is needed to understand why Daly principals are not exhibiting intellectual stimulation as leaders in the national norms.

Another gap identified between principals and teacher perceptions was individualized consideration. Do principals spend time teaching and coaching? Do principals treat teachers as individuals? Do principals help teachers to develop their strengths? Do principals consider each teachers individual needs, abilities, or aspirations? According to the teacher perceptual data, Daly principals do not do exhibit these behaviors as frequently as leaders from the national norm. Why do principals perceive they work individually with teachers more than teachers feel they do? The work within the Daly Leadership Program requires participants to complete projects with individual teachers, but this data suggests that these behaviors might not transfer to the

work of the principal. The formal role of the principal should also be examined to determine if there is a cultural or contextual element in the Pintler School District that is inhibiting principals to enact individual consideration. This difference might also be the result of a gap between the principal's espoused-theory of leadership versus their leadership theory-in-use. In other words, the principals' perception of the leadership style they use differs from the actual leadership style they put into action. This might be an issue for ongoing professional development for principals that encourages them "to get on the balcony" to gain perspective and analyze their leadership action from a distance (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002).

A discrepancy also existed between teacher ratings and national norms on the transactional dimension of contingent reward. Contingent reward is a transactional factor that is "the clarification of goals and objectives and providing of recognition once goals are achieved should result in individuals and groups achieving expected levels of performance" (MLQ, 2009, p. 100). An example of a contingent reward might be teachers setting student performance goals, if the goals are met then they receive some form of recognition. A transactional leader or manager who clarifies what associates need to do for a reward is important within the culture of the Pintler School District. With increased accountability for schools to make significant improvements, it is imperative for leaders to be able to support their teachers to reach their performance goals.

The perceptual data showed that the graduates from the Daly Leadership Program and principals in the Pintler School District need to continue to be more transformative in

intellectual consideration and individual consideration. It is imperative for principals to clearly understand why and how to develop learning organizations, where teachers feel encouraged to think, act creatively, and feel supported to grow and achieve. Huber and West (2002) asserted, “The school leader is most often cited as the key figure in the individual school’s development, either blocking or promoting changes, acting as the internal change agent, overseeing the processes of growth and renewal” (p. 1072). If a principal is charged with transitioning a system of managing people to an organizational learning system, they must be able to: re-examine critical assumptions to questions, seek differing perspectives when solving problems, get others to look at problems from many different angles, or suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments. Ultimately, if leaders who promote second order change provide a viable remedy to the United States educational crisis and improve student achievement, continued investigation into the relationship between the training of leaders and their practice as leaders is crucial.

Suggestions for Future Research

In order to determine the full impact of the Daly Leadership Program on participants leadership style, future research is recommended to compare Daly principals with principals in the Pintler School District that have been trained in other preparation program. Secondly, to eliminate the effects of recruiting or selection, it is recommended to measure the leadership styles of participants before and after completing the Daly Leadership Program. Another recommendation for future studies is in the area of organizational learning and leadership style. A future study could correlate the results

on principal leadership styles with a schools organizational learning. By collecting data on organizational culture, including factors such as innovativeness or willingness to take risks, it could be determined if a relationship exists between transformative principals and level of learning in their schools. It is also recommended that future studies explore whether principal transformational leadership behaviors are bounded by context factors like the school district characteristics or job requirements. While research on preparation and practice is needed, limited research has been conducted on the impact of leadership on student achievement. A final recommendation for future research is to determine if there is a correlation between principals from the Daly Leadership Program and student achievement results.

References

- Antonakis, J., Avolio, B., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003). Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 261-295.
- Antonakis, J., & House, R. J. (2002). *An analysis of the full-range leadership theory: the way forward*. In B. J. Avolio, & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road a-head* (pp. 3–34). Amsterdam: JAI Press.
- Archer, J. (2003). Debate heating up on how to lure top-notch principals. *Education Week*, 22(39), 1-12.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1996). *Organizational learning II: Theory, method, and practice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full leadership development: building the vital forces in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1995). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Technical report*. Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72, 441–462.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). *Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *MLQ multifactor leadership questionnaire*. (3rd Ed.). Redwood City, CA: Mindgarden.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berry, J., & Beach, R. (2009, July 9). *K-12 Leadership and the Educational Administration Curriculum: A Theory of Preparation*. Retrieved from the Connexions Web site: <http://cnx.org/content/m13772/1.2/>

- Browne-Ferrigno, T., Barnett, B., & Muth, R. (2002, November). *Performance outcomes and accreditation: A national research agenda*. Paper prepared for the Interactive Symposium on How Will We Know Whether Cohorts and Other Delivery Strategies Produce Effective School Leaders? Annual Conference of the University Council for Educational Administration Conference, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Shoho, A. (2002, November). An exploratory analysis of leadership preparation selection criteria. Paper prepared for the Interactive Symposium on How Will We Know Whether Cohorts and Other Delivery Strategies Produce Effective School Leaders? Annual Conference of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA.
- Bruner, J. (1996). *The Culture of Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bush, T. and Glover, G. (2004). *Leadership Development: Evidence and beliefs*. Nottingham, UK: National College for School Leadership.
- Bush, T. and Glover, G. (2005). Leadership development for early headship. *The New Visions Experience School Leadership and Management*, 25(3), 217-239.
- Carr, C.S. (2005). Evolution of a leadership preparation program in the 21st century. *NCPEA Education Leadership Review*, 6(1), 33-41.
- Cascio, W. (1995) Whither industrial and organizational psychology in a changing world of work? *American Psychologist*, 50, 928-939.
- Clark, D.L. (1998). Searching for authentic leadership in university graduate programs and with public school colleagues. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*, 4(4), 365-373.
- Cotton, K. (2003). *Principals and student achievement: What the research says*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (1996). *Interstate school leaders' licensure consortium: Standards for school leaders*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). (2008). *Educational leadership policy standards: Interstate school leaders' licensure consortium 2008*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Creighton, T.B., & Jones, G. D. (2001, August). *Selection or self-selection? How rigorous are our selection criteria for education administration preparation*

programs? Paper presented at the 2001 conference of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Houston, TX.

Creswell, J.W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cross, K.P. (1981). *Adults as Learners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Cuban, L. (1993). Forward. In Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K., & Murphy, J. (Eds). *Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership: Critical issues in educational leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Curran, P. J., West, S. G., & Finch, J. F. (1996). The robustness of test statistics to nonnormality and specification error in confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychological Methods, 1*, 16-29.

Daresh, J. (2002). *U.S. School Administrator Development: Issues and a Plan for Improvement*. In Proceedings of International Conference on School Leader Preparation, Licensure/Certification, Selection, Evaluation, and Professional Development, edited by Wen-liuh Lin. Taipei, Taiwan: National Taipei Teachers College.

Davis, S., Darling-Hammond, L., LaPointe, M., & Meyerson, D. (2005). *Review of research. School leadership study. Developing successful principals*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Stanford Educational Leadership Institute.

Day, C., Harris, A. & Hatfield, M. (2001). Challenging the orthodoxy of effective school leadership, *Leadership in Education 4* (1), 39-56.

Day, D., Harris, A., Hatfield, M., Tolley, H., & Beresford, J. (2000). *Leading schools in times of Change*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Deal, T.E., & Peterson, K.D. (1999). *Shaping school culture: The heart of leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Donohoe-Steinberger, E. (1995). Margaret Wheatley on Leadership for Change. *School Administrator, 52*(1), 16.

Duncan, A. (2010, December). Remarks at OECD's Release of the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2009 Results. Retrieved March 26, 2011, from the Department of Education website: <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/secretary-arne-duncans-remarks-oecd-release-program-international-student-assessment>

- Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B.J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(4), 735-744.
- Education Trust. (2010, December 20). Shut out of the military: More than one in five recent high school graduates is not academically qualified to enlist in the U.S. army. Retrieved March 26, 2011, from <http://www.edtrust.org/dc/press-room/press-release/shut-out-of-the-military-more-than-one-in-five-recent-high-school-graduate>
- Elmore, R. (2005). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- English, F. W. (2000). Psst! What does one call a set of non-empirical beliefs required to be accepted on faith and enforced by authority? *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 3(2), 159-168.
- Evers, C. W., & Lakomski, G. (1996). *Exploring educational administration: Coherentist applications and critical debates*. NY: Elsevier Science.
- Evers, C. W., & Lakomski, G. (2000). *Doing educational administration: A theory of administrative practice*. NY: Pergamon.
- Farkas, S., Johnson, J., Duffett, A., Foleno, T., & Foley, P. (2001). *Trying to stay ahead of the game: Superintendents and principals talk about school leadership*. Washington, DC: Public Agenda.
- Foster, W. (2004). The decline of the local: A challenge of educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(2), 176-191.
- Foster W. (2003, April). *National standards and local curriculum*. Paper proposal Prepared for the American Educational Research Association. Chicago.
- Franke, M., Carpenter, T., Levi, L., & Fennema, E. (2001). Capturing teachers' generative change: A follow-up study of professional development in mathematics. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 653-689.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Fullan, M. (2001a). *The new meaning of educational change*. (3rd ed). New York: Teacher's College Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001b). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership and sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Furtwengler, W., & Furtwengler, C. (1998). Performance assessment in the preparation of educational administrators: A journey. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8(1), 65-85.
- Garmston, R. & Wellman, B. (1999). *The adaptive school: A sourcebook for developing collaborative groups*. Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon Publishers.
- Glass, T., Bjork, L., & Brunner, C. (2000). The study of the American school superintendence. Arlington: VA: The American Association of School Administrators.
- Goldring, E. & Greenfield, W. (2002). Understanding the evolving concept of leadership in education: Roles, expectations, and dilemmas. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 1-19). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gronn, P. (1995). Greatness re-visited: The current obsession with transformational leadership. *Leading and Managing* 1(1), 14-27.
- Gutierrez, K. (2008). Developing socio-cultural literacy in the third space. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 43, 148-164.
- Hale, E., & Moorman, H. (2003). *Preparing school principals: A national perspective on policy and program innovations*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Hallinger, P. (1997). Problem-based learning: Resources for urban school leadership training. *North Central Regional Educational Laboratory*, 414, 363-484.
- Hallinger, P. (2000). *A review of two decades of research on the principalship using the principal instructional management rating scale*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Hallinger, P. (2003) Leading educational change: reflections on the practice of instructional and transformational leadership. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(3), 329-351.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R.H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 9, 157-191.

- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1999). Next generation methods for the study of leadership and school improvement. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds) (2nd Ed), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 141-162). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hallinger, P., Leithwood, K., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Cognitive perspectives on educational leadership: Critical issues in educational leadership*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217–247.
- Hatley, R. V., Arrendondo, D. E., Donaldson, J. F., Short, P., & Updike, L. W., (1996). *Evaluating the design, implementation, and impact of a non-traditional cohort ed.d program in educational administration and policy analysis*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Louisville, KY.
- Heck, R., Larson, T., & Marcoulides, G. (1990). Principal instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 94–125.
- Heifetz, R. A. (2003). Adaptive work. In T. Bently & J. Wilson (Eds.). *The adaptive state*. London: Demus.
- Heifetz, R.A., & Linsky, M. (2002). *Leadership on the line: Staying alive through the dangers of leading*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Hess, G. A. (1990). Strong leadership is no. 1. *Catalyst Chicago*, 10(1). Retrieved October 15, 2008, from <http://www.catalyst-chicago.org/arch/09-98/098whess.htm>
- Hessel, K., & Holloway, J. (January, 2002). *A framework for school leaders: Linking standards to practice*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Hogg, M.A. (2001). A social identify theory of leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(3), 184-200.
- Hora, M.T. (2007). *Analyzing cultural processes in higher education: STEM and education faculty collaboration in teacher education*. Paper presented at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago.
- Hora, M.T. & Millar, S.B. (2010). *A guide to building education partnerships: Navigating diverse cultural contexts to turn challenge into promise*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

- Hoyle, J., & Oates, A. (2000). The professional studies model (psm) and professional development for practicing administrators in the new millennium. In P. Jenlink (Ed.) *Marching into the new millennium. The eighth yearbook of the national council of professors of educational administration*. Lanham, MA: Scarecrow Press.
- Huber, S. & West, M. (2002). Developing school leaders: A critical review of current practices, approaches and issues and some directions for the future. In K. Leithwood., P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Second International Handbook of Educational*
- Hunt, J. G. (1999). Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: an historical essay. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 129–144. *Leadership and Administration Part 2*, (pp.1071-1099). Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2004). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. (2nd ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Kaplan, L.S., Owings, W.A., & Nunnery, J. (2005). Principal Quality: A Virginia study connecting interstate school leaders' licensure consortium standards with students' achievement. *NASSP Bulletin*, 89(643), 28-44.
- Keller, B. (2000). Building on experience. *Education Week*, 19(34), 36-40.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Koh, W.L., Steers, R.M., & Terborg, J.R. (1995). The effects of transformational leadership on teacher attitudes and student performance in Singapore. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 16, 319-333.
- Kotter, J.P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: The Free Press.
- Kottkamp, R., & Orr, M. T. (2003, March). Evaluating the effectiveness of educational leadership preparation and its impact on practice: A field initiated study. Unpublished manuscript.
- Korach, S. (2010, November). Professional preparation through a collaborative partnership: making the case for a third space. Unpublished manuscript.
- Korach, S. (2008). Preparing principals for adaptive challenges. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 12.

- Korach, S. (2005, November). *Pioneering leaders promoting change: The impact of an aspiring principal preparation program*. Paper prepared for the Annual Conference of the University Council for Educational Administration, Nashville, TN.
- Lashway, L. (1999). Preparing school leaders. Clearinghouse on Educational Policy and Management. College of Education: University of Oregon. *Research Roundup*, 15(3).
- Lashway, L. (2003). Transforming principal preparation. Clearinghouse on Educational Policy and Management. College of Education: University of Oregon. *Research Roundup*, 165.
- Leithwood, K. (2004). Educational leadership: Prepared for the laboratory of student success. *A Review of Research*: Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education. Retrieved September 14, 2007 at <http://www.temple.edu/lss/pdf/ReviewOfTheResearchLeithwood.pdf>
- Leithwood, K., Begley, P. T. & Cousins, J.B. (1994). *Developing expert leadership for future schools*. London: Falmer.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1990). Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 1(4), 249–280.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (1999). Transformational school leadership effects. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 10(4), 451–479.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2000). The effects of transformational leadership on organizational conditions and student engagement with school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112–129.
- Leithwood, K., & Jantzi, D. (2005). Transformational leadership. B. Davies (Ed.). *The essentials of school leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1999). *Changing leadership for changing times*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Leithwood, K. & Levin, B. (2004). *Approaches to the evaluation of leadership programs and leadership effects*. Department for Education and Skills, London.
- Leithwood, K., & Riehl, C. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Philadelphia, PA: Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University.

- Leithwood, K., Seashore-Louis, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation. Retrieved September 14, 2007, from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/WF/KnowledgeCenter/KnowledgeTopics/EducationLeadership/HowLeadershipInfluencesStudentLearning.htm>
- Leithwood, K., Tomlinson, D., & Genge, M. (1996). Transformational school leadership. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (pp. 785-840). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Levine, A.E. (2005). *Educating school leaders*. Washington: The Education Schools Project.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 385-425.
- Malone, R.J. (2001). *Principal mentoring*. (Report No. ERIC Digest 149). Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearing house on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED457535)
- Marks, H. M., & Printy, S.M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: An integration of transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370-397.
- Marks, H.M. & Printy, S.M. (2003). Principal leadership and school performance: Integrating transformational and instructional leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 370-397.
- Marzano, R.J. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R.J., Waters, J.T., & McNulty, B.A. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effects of leadership on student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- McCarthy, M. (2002). Educational leadership preparation programs: A glance at the past with an eye toward the future. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 1(3), 201-221.
- Morgan, G.A., Leech, N. L., Gloekner, G. W. & Barrett, K. C. (2007). *SPSS for introductory statistics: Use and interpretation* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

- Murphy, J. (1998). Preparation for the school principalship: The United States. *School Leadership & Management*, 18(3), 359-372.
- Murphy, J. (2000, February). Governing America's schools: The shifting playing field. *Teachers College Record*, 102(1), 57-84.
- Murphy, J. (2001, September). *Re-culturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints*. Paper commissioned for the first meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation, Racine, WI.
- Murphy, J., & Shipman, N. (2002). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) story: A brief narrative. In K. Hessel & J. Holloway (Eds.), *A framework for school leaders: Linking the ISLLC standards to practice*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services.
- Murphy, J. & Vriesenga, M. (2004). *Research on preparation programs in educational administration: An analysis*. Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration. National Association of Elementary School Principals. (2001). *Leading learning communities: Standards for what principals should know and be able to do*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2001). *Recognizing and encouraging exemplary leadership in America's schools: A proposal to establish a system of advanced certification for administrators*. Arlington, VA: Author.
- National Center on Education and Economy (2006). *Tough choices or tough times: A report of the new commission of the skills of the American workforce*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). *Leaders for America's schools: The report of the national commission on excellence in educational administration*. Tempe, AZ: Author. (ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 286265)
- Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership theory and practice*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Norton, J. (1999). *Teachers get help from guide on the side: Changing schools in long beach*. Atlanta, GA: Focused Reporting Project.
- Norton, J. (2002). *Preparing school leaders: It's time to face the facts*. Southern Regional Education Board. Atlanta, GA. Retrieved October 15, 2008, from http://www.sreb.org/main/Leadership/pubs/02V50_Leadership.pdf

- Norušis, M.J. (2006). *SPSS 14.0 Guide to data analysis*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Orr, M. T., Tichy, N.M., & DeVanna, M.A. (1986). *The transformation leader*. New York: John Wiley.
- Perkins, D. (2003). *King Arthur's round table: How collaborative conversations create smart organizations*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Sanders, N. M., & Simpsonson, J. (2005). State policy framework to develop highly qualified administrators. Washington, DC: CCSSO.
- Schmieder, J., & Townley, A. (1994). Key elements to principal training programs: Principal and superintendent perspectives. In J.Burdin & J. Hoyle (Eds.) *Leadership and diversity, The second annual yearbook of the national council of professors of educational administration*. (pp. 196-203). Lanham, MA: Scarecrow Publishing Corporation.
- Schnur, J. (2002). *An outstanding principal in every school: Using the new title II to promote effective leadership*. Washington, DC: National Council on Teacher Quality.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Senge, P., Cambron-McCabe, N., Lucas, T., Smith, B., Dutton, J., & Kleiner, A. (2000). *Schools that learn: A fifth discipline field book for educators, parents, and everyone who cares about education*. New York: Doubleday.
- Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C. and Ross, R. (1994) *The fifth discipline field book: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Shulman, L.S. (2005, February). *The signature pedagogies of the professions of law, medicine, engineering, and the clergy: Potential lessons for the education of teachers*. Paper presented at the Math Science Partnership (MSP) Workshop: Teacher Education for Effective Teaching and Learning, National Research Council's Center for Education, Irvine, CA. Retrieved October 10, 2010 from http://www.taylorprograms.com/images/Shulman_Signature_Pedagogies.pdf
- Silins, H.C., Mulford, W.R., & Zarins, S. (2002). Organizational learning and school change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(5), 613-642.
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2006). *Schools can't wait: Accelerating the redesign of university principal preparation programs*. Atlanta, GA: author.

- Stevens, J. (1999). *Intermediate statistics*. (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge Academic.
- Tejeda, M. J., Scandura, T. A., & Pillai, R. (2001). The MLQ revisited: psychometric properties and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 31–52.
- Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J., & Fisch, R. (1974). *Change: Principles of problem formation and problem resolution*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Wheatley, M.J. (2006). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world*. (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Berret-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Yukl, G. (1999). An evaluation of conceptual weaknesses in transformational and charismatic leadership theories. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10, 285–305.
- Zaccaro, S. J., & Klimoski, R. J. (2001). The nature of organizational leadership: An introduction. In S. J. Zaccaro & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *The nature of organizational leadership: Understanding the performance imperatives confronting today's leaders* (pp. 3–41). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Zeichner, K. 2010. Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education* 61 (12): 89-99.

Appendix A

Program Values

The Daly Leadership Program will focus not only on developing the skills and abilities necessary for success as a school leader, but also on developing a strong commitment to core values essential for ethical and responsible leadership in urban settings. The following value statements form a framework for the program and shape the curriculum and internship experiences of students.

1. **Action Orientation:** The framework for our course of study is built upon experiences that require participants to be action oriented leaders and researchers grounded in strategic instructional leadership.
2. **High Expectations for Self and Others:** School leaders should hold high expectations for their own performance, as well as for the performance of all others in the school community. School leaders should embrace accountability as a tool for continuous improvement.
3. **Equity:** All members of the school community are capable of learning and being successful in school. School leaders have a responsibility to establish learning conditions that meet the learning needs of all students.
4. **Diversity:** There is a value in having diversity in schools. School leaders need to understand how cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, gender, etc. differences affect learning and leadership styles. Leaders have become culturally proficient leaders and understand how to lead a system that supports diversity.
5. **Community:** Organizations, neighbors, and family members are key players in the education of children. School leaders should know how to mobilize resources in the family and in the community to support student learning.
6. **Inspired Leadership:** School leaders should be committed to a vision of leadership that is collaborative, distributed, data-driven, effective, research-based, ethical, entrepreneurial, reflective, developmental and courageous.
7. **Civic Engagement:** School leaders should create environments within their schools that help students develop the skills to be engaged citizens in our democratic society. School leaders should be aware of the cultural, political, social and historical context of education in the United States.
8. **Explicit and Honest Communication:** School leaders should ensure that communication within the school community is explicit and honest.

9. Head, Hand and Heart: Engaged and committed school leaders must be willing to fully dedicate their knowledge, skills, and passion towards the important work of creating effective schools for all learners.

Appendix B

Seven Norms of Collaboration

1. **Promoting a Spirit of Inquiry:** Exploring perceptions, assumptions, beliefs, and interpretations promotes the development of understanding. Inquiring into the ideas of others before advocating for one's own ideas is important to productive dialogue and discussion.
2. **Pausing:** Pausing before responding or asking a question allows time for thinking and enhances dialogue, discussion, and decision-making.
3. **Paraphrasing:** Using a paraphrase starter that is comfortable for you – “So...” or “As you are...” or “You’re thinking...” – and following the starter with an efficient paraphrase assists members of the group in hearing and understanding one another as they converse and make decisions.
4. **Probing:** Using gentle open-ended probes or inquiries – “Please say more about...” or “I’m interested in...” or “I’d like to hear more about...” or “Then you are saying...” increases the clarity and precision of the group’s thinking.
5. **Putting ideas on the Table:** Ideas are the heart of meaningful dialogue and discussion. Label the intention of your comments. For example: “Here is one idea...” or “One thought I have is...” or “Here is a possible approach...” or “Another consideration might be...”
6. **Paying Attention to Self and Others:** Meaningful dialogue and discussion are facilitated when each group member is conscious of self and of others, and is aware of what (s) he is saying and how it is said as well as how others are responding. This includes paying attention to learning styles when planning, facilitating, and participating in group meetings and conversations.
7. **Presuming Positive Intentions:** Assuming that others’ intentions are positive promotes and facilitates meaningful dialogue and discussion, and prevents unintentional put-downs. Using positive intentions in speech is one manifestation of this norm.

Appendix C

Sample MLQ

For use by Julie Murgel only. Received from Mind Garden, Inc. on September 16, 2009
MLQ Manual, Copyright 1995, 2000, 2004 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio. All rights reserved. Published by Mind Garden, Inc., www.mindgarden.com

Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

Rater Form

Name of Leader: _____

Date: _____

Organization ID #: _____

Leader ID #: _____

This questionnaire is used to describe the leadership style of the above-mentioned individual as you perceive it. Answer all items on this answer sheet. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer, leave the answer blank. Please answer this questionnaire anonymously.

Important (necessary for processing): Which best describes you?

I am at a higher organizational level than the person I am rating.

The person I am rating is at my organizational level.

I am at a lower organizational level than the person I am rating.

Other than the above.

Forty-five descriptive statements are listed on the following pages. Judge how frequently each statement fits the person you are describing. Use the following rating scale:

Not at all

Once in awhile

Sometimes

Fairly often

Frequently, if not always

The Person I Am Rating. . .

1. Provides me with assistance in exchange for my efforts..... 0 1 2 3 4
2. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate..... 0 1 2 3 4
3. Fails to interfere until problems become serious..... 0 1 2 3 4
4. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from Standards..... 0 1 2 3 4
5. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise..... 0 1 2 3 4

MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire
Sample Scoring Key (5x) Short

My Name: _____ Date: _____
Organization ID #: _____ Leader ID #: _____

Scoring: The MLQ scale scores are average scores for the items on the scale. The score can be derived by summing the items and dividing by the number of items that make up the scale. If an item is left blank, divide the total for that scale by the number of items answered. All of the leadership style scales have four items, Extra Effort has three items, Effectiveness has four items, and Satisfaction has two items.

Not at all, Once in a while, Sometimes, Fairly often, Frequently if not always 0 1 2 3 4

- Idealized Influence (Attributed) total/4 =
- Management-by-Exception (Active) total/4 =
- Idealized Influence (Behavior) total/4 =
- Management-by-Exception (Passive) total/4 =
- Inspirational Motivation total/4 =
- Laissez-faire Leadership total/4 =
- Intellectual Stimulation total/4 =
- Extra Effort total/3 =
- Individual Consideration total/4 =
- Effectiveness total/4 =
- Contingent Reward total/4 =
- Satisfaction total/2 =

- 1. Contingent Reward..... 0 1 2 3 4
- 2. Intellectual Stimulation.....0 1 2 3 4
- 3. Management-by Exception (Passive).....0 1 2 3 4
- 4. Management-by-Exception (Active).....0 1 2 3 4
- 5. Laissez-faire Leadership.....0 1 2 3 4

Copyright © 1995 by Bernard Bass and Bruce Avolio. All rights reserved.
It is your legal responsibility to compensate the copyright holder of this work for any reproduction in any medium. If you need to reproduce the MLQ, please contact Mind Garden www.mindgarden.com. Mind Garden is a registered trademark of Mind Garden, Inc.

Appendix D

Leadership Continuum Scales

Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership is a process of influencing in which leaders change their associate's awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way. Transformational leaders are proactive: they seek to optimize individual, group and organizational development and innovation, not just achieve performance "at expectations." They convince their associates to strive for higher levels of potential as well as higher levels of moral and ethical standards.

Idealized Influence (Attributes and Behaviors)

These leaders are admired, respected, and trusted. Followers identify with and want to emulate their leaders. Among the things the leader does to earn credit with followers is to consider followers' needs over his or her needs. The leader shares risks with followers and is consistent in conduct with underlying ethics, principles, and values.

Idealized Attributes (IA)

Instill pride in others for being associated with me
Go beyond self-interest for the good of the group
Act in ways that build others' respect for me
Display a sense of power and confidence

Idealized Behaviors (IB)

Talk about my most important values and beliefs
Specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose
Consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions
Emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission

Inspirational Motivation (IM)

These leaders behave in ways that motivate those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers' work. Individual and team spirit is aroused. Enthusiasm and optimism are displayed. The leader encourages followers to envision attractive future states, which they can ultimately envision for themselves.
Talk optimistically about the future
Talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished
Articulate a compelling vision of the future
Express confidence that goals will be achieved

Intellectual Stimulation (IS)

These leaders stimulate their followers' effort to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways. There is no ridicule or public criticism of individual members' mistakes. New ideas and creative solutions to problems are solicited from followers, who are included in the process of addressing problems and finding solutions.

Re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate

Seek differing perspectives when solving problems

Get others to look at problems from many different angles

Suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments

Individual Consideration (IC)

These leaders pay attention to each individual's need for achievement and growth by acting as a coach or mentor. Followers are developed to successively higher levels of potential. New learning opportunities are created along with a supportive climate in which to grow. Individual differences in terms of needs and desires are recognized.

Spend time teaching and coaching

Treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of the group

Consider each individual as having different needs, abilities and aspirations from others

Help others to develop their strengths

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leaders display behaviors associated with constructive and corrective transactions. The constructive style is labeled contingent reward and the corrective style is labeled management-by-exception. Transactional leadership defines expectations and promotes performance to achieve these levels. Contingent reward and management-by-exception are two core behaviors associated with 'management' functions in organizations. Full range leaders do this and more.

Contingent Reward (CR)

Transactional contingent reward leadership clarifies expectations and offers recognition when goals are achieved. The clarification of goals and objectives and providing of recognition once goals are achieved should result in individuals and groups achieving expected levels of performance.

Provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts

Discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets

Make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved

Express satisfaction when others meet expectations

Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA)

The leader specifies the standards for compliance, as well as what constitutes ineffective performance, and may punish followers for being out of compliance with those standards.

This style of leadership implies closely monitoring for deviances, mistakes, and errors and then taking corrective action as quickly as possible when they occur.
Focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.
Concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures
Keep track of all mistakes
Direct my attention toward failures to meet standards.

Passive / Avoidant Behavior

Another form of management-by-exception leadership is more passive and "reactive": it does not respond to situations and problems systematically. Passive leaders avoid specifying agreements, clarifying expectations, and providing goals and standards to be achieved by followers. This style has a negative effect on desired outcomes—opposite to what is intended by the leader-manager. In this regard it is similar to laissez-faire styles—or "no leadership." both types of behavior have negative impacts on followers and associates. Accordingly, both styles can be grouped together as 'passive-avoidant leadership'.

Management-by-Exception: Passive (MBEP)

Fail to interfere until problems become serious
Wait for things to go wrong before taking action Show a firm belief in "if it is not broke, do not fix it."
Demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action

Laissez-Faire (LF)

Avoid getting involved when important issues arise
Am absent when needed
Avoid making decisions
Delay responding to urgent questions

Outcomes of Leadership

Transformational and transactional leadership are both related to the success of the group. Success is measured with the MLQ by how often the raters perceive their leader to be motivating, how effective raters perceive their leader to be at interacting at different levels of the organization, and how satisfied raters are with their leader's methods of working with others.

Extra Effort

Get others to do more than they expected to do
Heighten others' desire to succeed
Increase others' willingness to try harder

Effectiveness

Am effective in meeting others' job-related needs

Am effective in representing their group to higher authority

Am effective in meeting organizational requirements

Lead a group that is effective

Satisfaction with the Leadership

Use methods of leadership that are satisfying

Work with others in a satisfactory way

Appendix E

Demographic Survey

PART I: YOUR PERSONAL BACKGROUND

1. What is your gender?
 - Male
 - Female

2. Are you of Hispanic or Latino origin?
 - Yes
 - No

3. How do you identify yourself in terms of race/ethnicity?
 - White
 - Black or African American
 - Asian
 - Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
 - American Indian or Alaska Native
 - Other (specify _____)

4. What is your year of birth? 19__ __ year of birth.

5. What is the highest degree you have earned? *Check one*
 - Masters degree in education (MA, MS, EdM)
 - Masters degree in something other than education (specify)

 - Education specialist or professional diploma (at least one year beyond master's level)
 - Doctorate (EdD or PhD)
 - Other (specify) _____

PART II: YOUR LEADERSHIP BACKGROUND

1. INCLUDING THIS YEAR, how many years have you been principal at this school?

2. INCLUDING THIS YEAR, how many years IN TOTAL have you been a principal in elementary or secondary education in this school and any other school? _____

3. INCLUDING THIS YEAR, how many years IN TOTAL have you been employed at Pintler Public Schools? _____

4. How many years IN TOTAL did you have teaching experience inside or outside Pintler Public Schools? _____

5. What school level are you currently leading? *Check one*

- Elementary school (drop down on grades, check all that apply)
- Middle school (drop down on grades, check all that apply)
- High school (drop down on grades, check all that apply)
- Other (drop down on grades, check all that apply)
- Multi levels (drop down on grades, check all that apply)

6. What year did you complete the Daly Program? *Check one*

- 2003-2004 (Cohort 1)
- 2004-2005 (Cohort 2)
- 2005-2006 (Cohort 3)
- 2006-2007 (Cohort 4)
- 2007-2008 (Cohort 5)
- 2008-2009 (Cohort 6)
- 2009-2010 (Cohort 7)

7. How much actual influence did participating in the Daly Program have over your self-perception as a leader?

0	1	2	3	4
<i>No Influence</i>	<i>A little influence</i>	<i>Some Influence</i>	<i>A moderate amount</i>	<i>A great deal of Influence</i>