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Transformational leadership is a well documented and validated leadership perspective studied in management and organizational contexts. This study applies the transformational leadership model to the instructional context. Specifically, this study sought to examine the relationships between transformational leadership and teacher immediacy, student empowerment, learning, motivation, and satisfaction. A positive relationship between transformational leadership and the above variables was hypothesized and all hypotheses were significantly supported. The study ends with an analysis of the transformational leadership model in the instructional context, and directions for future research extending the application of the transformational leadership model in the classroom.
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Chapter 1: Review of Literature

Instructional communication and leadership are two areas of focus for many communication scholars. Instructional communication research focuses on many areas including the effects of different predictor variables on student satisfaction, learner empowerment, learning, motivation, and student affinity for the instructor. Leadership communication research typically focuses on the communication behaviors or practices that yield positive outcomes in an organizational or group context. This study seeks to substitute the teacher – student relationship for the leader – follower relationship in an attempt to test the relationship between transformational leadership and student outcomes.

A relatively underdeveloped area in instructional communication research is the role that teacher leadership plays on student outcomes. Though a research thread has been started no real consistency or solidarity has emerged. Teacher leadership is neglected in both the instructional and the leadership communication fields; however, its utility seems to be hinted at in a few studies. Richmond and McCroskey (1992) assert that the classroom is an organization. In their explanation, they discuss the shared vision and goals (learning), and interdependence involved in classroom learning as a justification for analyzing the classroom as an organization. Some research, (Chory & McCroskey, 1999, Kearney & McCroskey, 1980, Sallinen-Kuparinen, 1992) has examined the relationship between teacher management or leadership style and student outcomes, lending credence to the study of organizational theories within the instructional context. This study will extend the previous studies and offer insight on the effects of transformational leadership on student outcomes.

The concept of the teacher as classroom leader is logical and apparent. Richmond and McCroskey (1992) formulate the classroom as an organization aiming for learning and sharing interdependent relationships, the teacher’s role as the leader is clear. The transformational leadership model can be applied to the instructional context. Pounder (2003) submitted transformational leadership as an applicable theory for the instructional context. His research put forth many positive outcomes associated with teacher transformational leadership including, the development of student capability to use ideas and information, development of student ability to think critically and assess ideas, and development of student ability to critically examine a situation and generate novel approaches to solving the problem (Pounder, 2003). As is evident
from these outcomes, transformational leadership has the power to revolutionize student capabilities.

Traditional approaches to leadership focus on the transactional nature of leadership and the power dimensions. Transformational leadership offers more of a team approach and focuses on empowering followers, or in the instructional context, students. French and Raven (1959) suggest five main bases of power for leaders: referent, legitimate, coercive, reward, and expert. A teacher has the ability to wield power in each of these areas; however, some bases of power (expert, legitimate, referent) are more positively associated with a convergent approach as opposed to “hard power.” Common sense, backed up by research suggests teachers who wield coercive power and reward power as their only power sources will produce less capable students and lower levels of empowerment and satisfaction (Harvey, Royal, & Stout, 2003, Pounder, 2003).

As is evident given prior research and the clear role of an instructor, the teacher serves as the classroom leader. Facilitating learning, managing conflict, disseminating information, allocating resources, empowering learners, motivating students, and aiming for high marks in student satisfaction are all analogous to basic principles of leadership contextualized in organizational settings (Chory & McCroskey, 1999).

The transformational leadership model has dominated leadership research in the past decade (Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002). Transformational leadership has its roots in the theory of transactional leadership. Bass and Avolio (1990) distinguish transactional leaders from transformational leaders in their leadership model. In this model transactional leaders are those leaders who influence followers by “setting goals, clarifying desired outcomes, providing feedback, and exchanging rewards for accomplishments” (Eden et. al 2002, p. 735).

Transformational leaders, on the other hand, are leaders who wield influence additionally by “broadening and elevating followers’ goals and providing them with confidence to perform beyond the expectations specified in the implicit or explicit exchange agreement” (Eden et al., 2002, p. 735). Additionally, the transformational leadership model incorporates a charismatic element facilitating the influence exerted by leaders.

Extensive research has been conducted to analyze the effects of transformational leadership on follower outcomes, mostly within an organizational context. Many outcomes have been analyzed such as, empowerment, innovation, creativity, team performance, motivation,
morality, and performance (Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002; Jung, Chow, & Wu 2003). However, an emerging area of research is concerned with applying transformational leadership to an instructional context (Harvey et al., 2003; Luechauer & Shulman, 1996; Pounder 2003). Most of the previously mentioned studies regarding transformational leadership in the instructional context involve management development.

Given its extensive use and utility in the organizational context, and given the similarities between teachers and organizational leaders, the leap to the instructional context is natural. Many studies have applied organizational theories to other contexts including the instructional communication context. Harvey et al. (2003) substituted the leader / teacher and subordinate / student relationships successfully in their study. They found a positive relationship between teacher’s transformational leadership and student satisfaction with the instructor, student report of instructor performance, and student respect for the instructor. Additionally, Pounder (2003) suggested that transformational leaders attempt to develop subordinates ability to think critically and independently, be creative, and obtain many perspectives on a problem before arriving at a solution. Later in his research Pounder (2003) posits that these goals are similar to those desired in the instructional context. Pounder’s study (2003) and the research by Luechauer and Shulman, (1996) apply the transformational model to management development instruction; however, given the instructional context of this application it is logical to extend the application to other academic disciplines. The focus on management development instruction has its roots in a push in the discipline for instructors to “practice what they preach.” A call for instructors to empower their learners as they teach leaders to empower followers, a call for instructors to maintain high performance expectations and rewards, as they teach leaders to do the same. The positive benefits of transformational leadership in the workplace will hold true in the instructional context.

The general purpose of this study is to examine transformational leadership in the instructional context. This study will substitute the manager – subordinate relationship with the teacher – student relationship to apply transformational leadership to the classroom, seeking to explore a potential positive relationship between teacher transformational leadership and student outcomes. This study will focus on four student outcomes: 1) learner empowerment, 2) student satisfaction, 3) student motivation, 4) learning (affective and cognitive) among college students. First, we will examine the transformational leadership model followed by an analysis of the
outcome variables (student satisfaction, student motivation, student learning and learner empowerment).

**Transformational Leadership**

Extensive research has been conducted on transformational leadership in recent years. The research has centered on many different outcomes of effective transformational leadership (cohesion, performance, employee satisfaction, innovation, organizational commitment, and follower development) in a variety of contexts (military, corporate, emergency response, and a few in the educational sector) (Dionne et al., 2003; Eden et al., 2002; Pillai & Williams, 2003; Pounder, 2003).

In addition to the aforementioned divergence from transactional leaders, transformational leadership involves other dimensions. Transformational leaders exert influence similar to transactional leaders – “setting goals, clarifying desired outcomes, providing feedback, and exchanging rewards for accomplishments” (Eden et al., 2002 p. 735). The influence is used to motivate, empower, foster creativity and critical thinking, and improve engagement (Eden, et al. 2002). However, transformational leaders go beyond task influence and attempt to build follower confidence and elevate follower goals so they can perform beyond expectations. Transformational leadership also encompasses an element of charisma, a distinction from the transactional leadership model.

In addition to the transactional elements and charisma, transformational leadership is composed of the four I’s: individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence (Avolio, Waldman, & Yammarino, 1991). To fully understand transformational leadership we must carefully analyze each of the 4 I’s.

First, individualized consideration is focused on treating members of a team or group as individuals, not just as members of that team or group. Through individualized consideration the individual is not seen as merely a means to achieving a goal, but a part of that goal, or a part of the end. The leader spends time getting to know the follower personally including his or her personal goals, strengths, and developmental needs in an effort to meet the needs of that particular individual (Dionne et al. 2003). The individualized consideration component is often equated to a mentor mentee relationship. As Avolio et al. (1991) suggest, a mentor learns the strengths and weaknesses of his or her student and helps boost confidence and abilities. Another metaphor useful in explaining individualized consideration is a personal advocate. The leader
makes sure followers have access to the resources necessary for them to achieve their goals. This can take the form of negotiation, removing potential problems, or facilitating conflict resolution.

Second, intellectual stimulation focuses on promoting careful problem solving, novel ways of thinking, intelligence building, and questioning assumptions previously held (Dionne et al. 2003; Kark, Chen, & Shamir, 2003; Pounder, 2003). The notion of transformation is especially evident in this element. Transformational leaders focus extensively on helping followers to adopt new ways of thinking about “old” problems, changing the way they think about all types of problems and issues, and searching for creative problem-solving techniques (Avolio et al. 1991). Intellectual stimulation helps to maintain a motivated, excited, positive, and enthusiastic team of followers who are constantly challenging the “status-quo.” Transformational leadership is about constant improvement through constant challenge of the assumptions and values guiding “old” thought processes; an intellectually stimulated team represents the potential for higher levels of performance (Dionne et al. 2003). Additionally, intellectual stimulation is not always a one-way street; followers can intellectually stimulate the leader if the leader is open to such influence resulting in bottom-up influence. For example, if a student proposes an activity to help the class grasp an issue, a transformational leader would willingly embrace the idea as it helps benefit the whole.

Third, inspirational motivation involves formulating, articulating, and sharing a vision or goal for the group or team through the use of shared symbols or emotional arguments and an overall sense of optimism and enthusiasm (Kark et al. 2003; Pounder, 2003). The inspirational leader is able, through honed communication skills, personal charisma, role-modeling, and personal accomplishments, to inspire others to act in accordance with the shared vision. The leader achieves this by sparking, in the follower, a sense of worth, confidence, and opportunity (Avolio et al. 1991). Follower development is an important aspect of inspirational motivation. Many researchers posit that the effectiveness of inspirational motivation is contingent on its interplay with individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation. These theorists conjecture inspirational motivation occurs when individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and the behavioral aspects of inspirational motivation occur simultaneously increasing the feelings of opportunity and value for the follower (Avolio et al. 1991). Some researchers combine inspirational motivation with the next “I,” idealized influence.
Fourth, idealized influence is the charismatic element of transformational leadership. The transformational leader is able to develop extensive personal rapport and influence over followers by treating them with respect, trusting them, showing confidence in them, and viewing them as individuals (Avolio et al. 1991). The idealized influence component of transformational leadership hinges on leader behaviors that focus on instilling pride in followers. These behaviors often foster pride in the follower simply because he or she is associated with the leader. This stems from the leader’s optimism, and allows the working environment to operate positively (Dionne et al. 2003). The notion of transformation is again evident here as the leader projects a mutual benefit for the team and individual if the individual can develop their full potential (Avolio et al. 1991). Increased respect, admiration, and an increased desire to emulate the leader will result if the leader effectively actualizes idealized influence. Often, idealized influence is seen as an appropriate precursor to the other three “I’s” as it facilitates a shared vision. Idealized influence can be seen as “setting the table” for transformational leadership to be effective.

To summarize, the four I’s of transformational leadership, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence, together make up a transformational leader. The 4 I’s offer a prescription and a description; that is, they paint the image of a transformational leader, but also prescribe the necessary behavioral components.

Transformational leadership behaviors exhibited by teachers should have positive relationships with student satisfaction, motivation, empowerment, and learning. As is clear from Pounder’s study and the research in the organizational context, transformational leaders empower their followers and increase motivation (Pillai & Williams, 2003; Pounder, 2003). Additionally, Pillai and Williams (2003) found transformational leadership to be positively associated with follower performance. Though performance and learning do not mesh completely, conceptual linkages between the two are strong. Performance in the workplace and learning in the classroom are the two overarching goals for followers and students respectively. Given the overwhelming evidence that exists supporting the positive relationship between follower performance and transformational leadership we can posit a similar relationship with student learning.

Additionally, empowerment is an evolving trend in the workplace. The informational age has decentralized the workplace, and placed empowerment at the center of a more self-sufficient workplace. Transformational leadership and empowerment have been inseparable in the
organizational research, and given the aforementioned similarities between organizational leadership and instruction we can posit a similar relationship with learner empowerment. Transformational teachers should, and have been shown to in the past to have a positive relationship with empowerment (Harvey et al. 2003; Kark et al. 2003; Pillai & Williams, 2003; Pounder, 2003).

The explanation of transformational leadership above provides insight into its theoretical underpinnings. In an organizational setting transformational leadership is positively associated with subordinate efforts, satisfaction, critical thinking, creativity, and performance in an organizational setting (Pillai & Williams, 2003; Pounder, 2003). The extension to the instructional context shows promise, but this study will expand the previous boundaries. Outcomes will be examined as we evaluate the impact of transformational leadership in the classroom on outcomes such as student satisfaction, student motivation, student learning, and learner empowerment. We will start with an analysis of learner empowerment.

**Learner Empowerment**

Similar to transformational leadership the concept of empowerment has gained increasing amounts of attention in recent years. The special attention has been given to empowerment because of its linkages to increased employee participation, involvement, and productivity (Chiles & Zorn, 1995). Employee empowerment is a trend in the organizational context, and is gaining some steam in the educational sector. Learner empowerment is becoming an increasingly researched variable based on research imploring teachers to “practice what they preach” in the classroom (Harvey et al. 2003; Luechauer & Shulman, 2002, Pounder, 2003). Luechauer and Shulman (1993) conceptualized empowerment as “the humanistic process of adopting the values and practicing the behaviors of enlightened self-interest so that personal and organizational goals may be aligned in a way that promotes growth, learning, and fulfillment” (p.13). This definition puts transformational leaders in a great position to empower learners. Transformational leaders articulate and foster acceptance of a shared vision, similar to the alignment of personal and organizational goals notion of empowerment.

Chiles and Zorn (1995) conceptualized empowerment as both a process and a perception. The perception of empowerment is intrinsic based on an individual’s assessment of his or her own competence and control over actions; whereas, the process allows for external influence over an individuals empowerment (Chiles & Zorn, 1995). The leader enters the equation when
his or her behaviors exert influence over individuals’ perceptions of empowerment. Conger and Kanungo (1988) posited certain managerial techniques, practices, and behaviors can positively or negatively influence employee empowerment. Examples are manifested in praise or encouragement, pay raises, positive performance evaluation, or delegation of responsibility (Chiles & Zorn, 1995). These techniques form a circular process that increases empowerment.  

As management techniques such as reinforcement and encouragement occur learners feel empowered (Chiles & Zorn, 1995). Frymier, Shulman, and Houser (1996) extended the notion of leader influence to the classroom as they posited teacher behaviors would impact learner empowerment. Teachers, as the classroom leaders, are responsible for creating a culture (system of shared beliefs and values) that facilitates student devotion to producing high quality work (Frymier et al. 1996).

Frymier et al. (1996) provide the guiding conceptual definition of empowerment for this study. Based on research on empowerment in the workplace conducted by Thomas and Velthouse (1990) they conceptualized empowerment as comprised of four dimensions: meaningfulness, competence, impact, and choice. The *meaningfulness* dimension evaluates the value of a task in comparison with an individual’s beliefs and values. The more alignment between the task and one’s beliefs and values the more meaningful the task. If students deem the assignment, course, content, or instructor as consistent with their beliefs and values they will be more empowered and motivated (Frymier et al. 1996; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990).

The *competence* dimension refers to the degree to which an individual feels capable to perform the tasks he or she is faced with. Students with low self-esteem typically have a difficult time with this element and need encouragement from their empowering faculty member (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). Frymier et al.(1996) found a positive and significant correlation between self-esteem and competence. Transformational leaders are in a great position to raise the perception of competence in individuals through individualized consideration and inspirational motivation thus employing the process element of empowerment (Chiles & Zorn, 1995).

The *impact* dimension is the degree to which an individual perceives that the accomplishment of a particular goal will affect his or her larger personal goals (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). For example, if students’ career goals include political campaign speeches, they may see a basic speech course as having a large effect on their larger personal goals. Theoretically, the more impact a person perceives the higher their empowerment and motivation
In their original study Frymier et al. found that choice collapsed with impact; thus did not emerge as a factor in the study.

Lastly, the choice dimension is the degree to which an individual feels he or she is in control of the tasks or goals sought and the methods for accomplishing said tasks and goals. The more choice an individual is given the more empowered he or she will feel (Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). In their explanation, Frymier et al. (1996) explained choice may not be as relevant for students as it was for employees in the Thomas and Velthouse (1990) version of the scale. Additionally, Frymier et al. (1996) offered a social explanation for the collapse of choice. They explained, “students have not typically been socialized in most classes to expect or exercise choice and thus the felt need to say may be minimal” (Frymier et al., 1996, pg. 190). In this study choice will be examined in an attempt to see if differences occur for choice in the presence of a transformational teacher.

Chiles and Zorn (1995), Frymier et al. (1996), and Luechauer and Shulman (2002), submit teacher behavior can be a central influencer on learner empowerment. Additional studies have showed support for teacher influence on learner empowerment and the benefits of learner empowerment. Research from the organizational literature consistently shows a positive relationship between transformational leadership and empowerment among followers (Eden et al., 2002, Kark et al. 2003). Given the substitution and analogous leadership situations, it is logical for this relationship to transcend the workplace and show up in the instructional context. Given this rationale the following hypothesis and research question are offered.

**H1:** Teacher transformational leadership will have a significant positive relationship with learner empowerment.

**RQ1:** What element of transformational leadership accounts for the most variance in learner empowerment?

Additionally, transformational teachers are uniquely adept at positively impacting learner empowerment through individualized consideration and inspirational motivation. In Frymier et al.’s study of learner empowerment, the meaningfulness, competence, and impact dimensions were all shown to be positively and significantly correlated with learning. Meaningfulness had the largest correlation with affective learning among the three dimensions (Frymier et al., 1996). As a result of the previous research positively linking learner empowerment and learning the following hypothesis is offered.
**H2:** Student empowerment will have a significant positive relationship with student learning.

**Immediacy**

Teacher immediacy is perhaps the most widely accepted predictor variable in instructional communication research. Teacher verbal and nonverbal immediacy have been linked to student outcomes such as: learning, motivation, and satisfaction (Adersen, 1979; Chesebro, 2003; Frymier, 1993; Kelley & Gorham, 1988). Mehrabian, (1969 p. 203) defines immediacy as communicative behavior that enhances closeness to another. Immediacy has been conceptualized with both verbal and nonverbal dimensions. Immediacy behaviors consist of things such as proximity, appropriate touch, and calling students by name. These behaviors create perceptions of closeness and are associated with liking.

Immediacy behaviors exhibited by an instructor have clearly been shown to increase student affect for the teacher and for the class. This offers the teacher direct involvement in increasing student affect and therefore, increasing students’ potential to learn (Witt & Wheeless, 2001). Additionally, teacher immediacy has been clearly linked to overall teaching effectiveness. Nonverbal immediacy has been positively linked to many student outcomes. Nonverbal immediacy has been positively associated with student affective and cognitive learning (Andersen, 1979; Kelley & Gorham, 1988; Whit & Wheeless, 2001). Additional studies have shown positive relationships between nonverbal immediacy and receiver apprehension, student affinity, trust and motivation (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001; Jaasma & Koper, 1999,).

Immediacy behaviors serve to reduce “psychological distance by recognizing individual students and their ideas and viewpoints, by incorporating student input into course and class design, by communicating availability and willingness to engage in one-to-one interactions and by enhancing their humanness via humor and self-disclosure” (Gorham, 1988, p.52). Immediacy is likely the most sustained and solidified variable in instructional communication research. The relationship between immediacy behaviors and transformational leadership should be a positive one; however, no study to date has examined the relationship. Immediacy, by its definition, has conceptual linkages to transformational leadership. Transformational teachers would engage students, respect and recognize students as individuals in the class. All of these characteristics comprise the definition of immediate teachers.
Immediacy seems to be an underlying principle at work within the 4 I’s of transformational leadership, particularly, in the idealized influence and individualized consideration components as these two “I’s” are interpersonal in nature as is immediacy. Because of the seemingly natural link between the transformational leadership and immediacy, and as a means to fortifying the validity of transformational leadership in the instructional context the following hypothesis is proposed.

**H3:** Teacher transformational leadership will have a positive significant relationship with teacher immediacy.

**Student Satisfaction**

Student satisfaction with teacher – student communication is an outcome variable studied in instructional communication (Arbaugh, 2001; Fusani, 1994; Myers 2002). Student satisfaction has been found to have a positive relationship with immediacy, clarity, teacher style, and extra – class communication (Fusani, 1994). Student satisfaction is conceptualized as the positive emotion students feel in the classroom because of instructor-student interactions (Myers, 2002). As this definition suggests student satisfaction is assumed to be a direct result of student – teacher interactions. Student satisfaction with student – teacher communication, as it is conceptualized in the instructional context is based on teacher – student communication.

The linkage between student satisfaction and transformational leadership is based on the proposition that transformational leadership is a communication centered leadership approach (Pounder, 2003). Communicating expectations, giving inspirational motivation, the charismatic element, and individualized consideration are impossible to achieve without a heavy focus on leader – follower, or in the instructional context, student – teacher communication. In order for these things to be actualized students and teachers must engage one another. The perception of transformational leadership is the result of direct interaction between the student and the teacher.

Marsh (1984) reports student satisfaction as a multi-dimensional construct made up of many in-class characteristics and individual rapport. As a result, instructors have a great deal of control over the level of satisfaction students will report. This is especially pertinent to transformational teachers who focus their classroom leadership on helping students feel satisfied with the instructional process (Pounder, 2003). To that end, higher student satisfaction should be
a result of an effective transformational teacher. Based on this the following hypothesis is offered:

**H4:** Teacher transformational leadership will have a significant positive relationship with student satisfaction with student – teacher communication.

**Student Motivation**

Similar to student satisfaction, student motivation has been the subject of many instructional communication studies as an outcome variable (Frymier & Shulman, 1995; Jaasma & Koper, 1999; Richmond, 1990). Motivation is also identified as an important mediating variable between instructor behaviors and student learning (Jaasma & Koper, 1999). Many instructional variables have been found to impact student motivation including teacher immediacy and teacher style (Frymier, 1993b).

Student motivation exists as a state or a trait (Frymier & Shulman, 1995). State motivation is dependent on situation, time, and other variables. It is the motivation a student feels for a specific course, task, or subject area at a specific time (Frymier & Shulman, 1995). Trait motivation, however, is a more longstanding attribute that refers to a student’s motivation in regard to a specific task (Frymier & Shulman, 1995). The distinction between the two is especially important as it positions the teacher to impact student’s state motivation through behavior; explicitly, teachers are able to impact the state motivation of students. Richmond (1990) suggested classroom interactions as the “primary means by which motivation can be increased.” Richmond (1990) did not stop there. Her research hypothesized a mutually causal relationship between motivation and learning. That is to say, students who are motivated, learn more, and as students learn more they become more motivated (Richmond, 1990). Though Richmond (1990) did not find outright support for this hypothesis, it was found that motivation and learning are likely to reciprocally increase. These conclusions give the teacher an immense opportunity to positively influence student outcomes; therefore a teaching style most able to capitalize on this opportunity is of great importance.

Richmond (1990) differentiated between compliance and motivation imploring instructors to motivate students. Compliance is doing something because someone else wants us to do it; whereas, motivation, is doing something because we desire to do it. The premise of her study hinged on effective teaching is motivating not compliance gaining as she examined the “larger perspective” (Richmond, 1990). Richmond’s vision of motivation goes hand in hand
with the notion of transformational leadership in the classroom. Seeking compliance is a transactional approach, but motivating students is transformational. Pounder (2003) illustrates the motivating impact of a transformational teacher. The intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration elements of transformational leadership are posited to be key components to student motivation (Pounder, 2003). As a result the following hypothesis is offered:

**H5:** Teacher transformational leadership will have a significant positive relationship with student state motivation.

**RQ2:** What element of transformational leadership accounts for the most variance in student state motivation?

**Student Learning**

Student learning is a multidimensional construct. According to Bloom (1956), student learning can have many faces: cognitive, affective, and/or behavioral. In Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy an explanation for each of these aspects is offered. Affective learning is described as the cultivation of a positive or negative attitude toward learning in a particular context, cognitive learning is described as understanding and retaining information, and behavioral is described as an observable change in behavior based in learning (Bloom, 1956). Research extending Bloom’s taxonomy has gained momentum in asserting these three dimensions as interrelated aspects to the overarching concept of learning (Kelley & Gorham, 1988).

Many studies have linked transformational leadership with subordinate performance (Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, & Spangler 2004; Pillai & Williams, 2003). Transformational leaders, specifically the individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation aspects, contribute directly to performance in the organizational context. Performance here is likened to an input-output process similar to the conceptualization by Rodriguez, Plax, and Kearney (1996). Their study hypothesized cognitive learning as a process of inputs (motivation, affective learning, and immediacy) that together helped to yield cognitive learning; however, measuring cognitive learning is not an easy process. A relatively new measurement has emerged to examine behaviors students typically engage in when they are learning. This measure is designed to analyze behaviors that indicate a student is learning. This is the revised learning indicators measure developed by Frymier and Houser (1999). Because transformational leadership has been strongly linked to bottom line outcomes in the workplace (performance,
productivity), and the main outcome in teaching is learning we can project that students with transformational teachers will report higher learning indicator behaviors.

In addition to cognitive learning, student attitudes are always an important consideration for instructional communication scholars. Extensive research has focused on student affective learning. Affective learning is the sphere of learning concerned with the beliefs and attitudes a student holds about a specific task or subject area (Rodriguez et al. 1996). Affect can either be positive or negative. When students display positive affective learning they value the course or subject, become more involved, display higher motivation in “task-relevant behaviors” (Rodriguez et al. 1996).

Sidelinger and McCroskey (1997) define affective learning as “the development of positive attitudes toward a subject matter being studied,” further explaining “this affect has been found to be related to the motivation to keep learning long after a course is finished” (p. 2). Cognitive learning can be defined as the reception, retention, transference, and application of knowledge (Messman & Jones-Corley 2001). Affective learning can be differentiated from cognitive learning because when students cognitively learn they acquire information then compute it into knowledge; however in affective learning students start to personally invest in what they study (Mottet & Beebe, 2004). Mottet and Beebe (2004) explain that affective learning takes place once students decide to “take ownership of their learning” (p. 9). Affect is also divided into segments. Affect for the instructor is focused on students’ attitudes toward their teacher – positive or negative; whereas, affect for the course content is focused on students’ attitudes toward the particular course in question (Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001).

Affective learning is a unique construct particularly significant to the instructional communication literature because student affect offers the teacher a great opportunity to influence student learning. Sorensen (1989) suggests that teacher communication skills, such as delivery, immediacy, clarity and organization, have an immense possibility of increasing student affective learning. The importance of affective learning becomes increasingly evident when it is seen as causal mediator to cognitive learning (Rodriguez et al. 1996). Student affect often contributes to cognitive learning because student interest, motivation, and involvement heighten as affective learning heightens (Rodriguez et al. 1996). If these relationships are true the teacher has a great opportunity to impact cognitive learning through affective learning.
Extensive research has been conducted to determine the moderating or contributing variables leading to affective and cognitive learning. Teacher nonverbal immediacy has been extensively linked to positive affective learning (Whit & Wheeless, 2001). In addition to the historical findings about affective learning, more recent research has focused on other variables that may lead to affective learning. Student interest, receiver apprehension, class size, teacher communication style, self-disclosure, and teacher delivery have all shown promise for their impacts on affective learning (Messman & Jones-Corley, 2001; Sorensen, 1989; Weber, Martin, & Patterson, 2001). Research into the impacting variables on cognitive learning distinguishes teacher nonverbal immediacy, delivery style, and affective learning as good indicator variables (Messman & Joines-Corely, 2001, Whit & Wheeless, 2001).

A relatively unexplored area in regard to its impact on student learning is the application of the transformational leadership model to instruction. Transformational leadership is focused on articulating and adopting a shared vision. A shared vision implies both the leader and the followers ascribe to it with enthusiasm and optimism; similar to the goal of affective learning (Kark et al. 2003). As a result transformational teachers are well positioned to encourage student learning. To this end the following hypothesis and research question is proposed:

**H6:** Teacher transformational leadership will have a significant positive relationship with student learning.

**RQ3:** What component of transformational leadership accounts for the most variance in learning?
Chapter 2: Methodology

Participants and Procedures

This study used 117 students enrolled in multi-section introductory communication courses at a Midwestern liberal arts university. The questionnaire was administered at the end of the spring semester with supplemental data collected in the first summer session. 93 students were surveyed at the end of the spring semester with 24 students surveyed in the first summer session.

The particular courses selected were chosen to represent a broad cross-section of academic disciplines and class rankings. In order to maximize the number of instructors and disciplines evaluated, respondents were instructed to evaluate the instructor of the course they had immediately before their communication class (Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986). Respondents were also asked to report on instructor sex; 68 male teachers and 49 female teachers were reported. Department was omitted; however given the nature of the procedure a wide variety of departments can be assumed. The instrument was completed in the latter portion of the semester to ensure respondents were familiar with their instructors’ classroom behaviors. Respondents were given class credit for participating in the research study.

The respondents who filled out the questionnaire in the summer session were asked to use the instructor from the last class they attended the previous semester while completing their questionnaire per Plax et al. (1986). Given the short time between the summer session and spring semester (approximately two weeks) we can safely assume students were still able to effectively recall teacher behaviors.

Announcements for the research study were given to instructors one week before the study. Students who wished to participate signed up for specific dates and research rooms. Upon entering the research room students were asked to read and fill out an informed consent document signaling they understood they were participating in a research study. After completing the informed consent document the students were given instructions for filling out the questionnaire then proceeded to fill out the questionnaire. After completing the questionnaire the students were debriefed and thanked for their time.

Measures

Transformational Leadership: Teacher transformational leadership was operationalized in this study using a modified condensed Multi-factor Leadership Questionnaire version 6s
(MLQ) developed by Bass (1990). This original scale is a self-report leadership diagnosis tool that consists of 21 items measuring the leaders’ leadership style. It consists of four subscales measuring the elements (individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, inspirational motivation, and idealized influence) of transformational leadership, as well as, assessing leaders’ levels of transactional leadership, management by exception, contingent reward, and laissez-faire leadership. For this study, the scale was modified to other-report that students used to evaluate their teachers’ leadership style, and the laissez-faire leadership subscale was dropped, as it was not studied in this project. These modifications dropped the total items to 18 in the scale.

The original scale uses “I” as the subject and then follows with a stem indicating a leadership behavior. In the modified version, the “I” is changed to “My teacher” in order to allow for a descriptive other report scale. Below in Figure 1 the modified version used in this study is shown. The MLQ has been used extensively in academic research and organizational training and development and is considered a valid measure (Jung et al., 2003). Previous alpha reliabilities from academic research have been .90 (Eden et al., 2002, Harvey et al., 2003). Alpha reliability for this study was .925 with $M = 44$, $SD = 14.24$; the range of scores on the transformational scales was 3 – 72 with the range = 69.00. The subscale reliabilities for idealized influence was .879 with $M = 8.16$, $SD = 3.18$; the alpha reliability for inspirational motivation was .935 with $M = 7.57$, $SD = 2.67$; the alpha reliability for individualized consideration was .830 with $M = 6.06$ and $SD = 3.22$; and the alpha reliability for intellectual stimulation was .940 with $M = 7.56$, and $SD = 2.76$. 
**Figure 1:** Revised Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire – 6s

**Directions:** This questionnaire asks you to describe your teachers’ leadership style. Judge how frequently each statement fits your teachers’ behaviors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My teacher makes students feel good to be in class with him / her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My teacher expresses with a few simple words what we could and should do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My teacher enables students to think about old problems in new ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My teacher helps me develop personally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My teacher tells me what I need to do in order to achieve recognition or reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My teacher is satisfied when the class meets the agreed-upon standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The class has complete faith in my teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>My teacher provides appealing descriptions about what we can accomplish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My teacher provides alternative ways of looking at confusing things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My teacher lets students know how he/she thinks they are doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My teacher provides recognition/reward when others reach their goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>As long as things are working OK my teacher does not try to make changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I am proud to be associated with my teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My teacher helps the class to find meaning in their work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My teacher gets students to rethink ideas they had not previously challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>My teacher gives personal attention to students who seem rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My teacher calls my attention to what I can get for what I accomplish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My teacher tells students the standards they have to know to carry out their work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0= Never  1= Rarely  2= Occasionally  3= Often  4= Almost Always

**Learner Empowerment:** Learner empowerment was operationalized, in this study, using Frymier et al. (1996) Learner Empowerment Instrument. The learner empowerment scale is based on Thomas and Velthouse’s (1990) conceptual definition of the empowerment construct, and adapted from Shultz and Shulman’s (1993) empowerment scale. The instrument evaluates
each of the four elements: meaningfulness, competence, impact, and choice; although, Frymier et al. found that choice items loaded with impact items. Similar to Frymier et al. (1996), respondents “were asked to report their empowerment experience in the class immediately preceding their communication class, and not their general level of empowerment” (p. 186). As a result, empowerment was measured for a particular class in relation to a particular teacher.

The scale consists of 30 likert-type items using a 0 (Never) to 4 (Very Often) format (Frymier et al. 1996). Frymier et al. (1996) reported alpha reliability of .90 for the overall scale with reliabilities for meaningfulness .89, competence .83, and impact .81. Additional studies have found alpha reliabilities to be above .80 for all three dimensions (Frymier & Houser, 1999, Weber, Martin, & Patterson, 2001). Overall reliability for the learner empowerment measure in this study was .87 with \( M = 66.74, SD = 17.06 \). The reliabilities for the subscales were as follows: impact .76 with \( M = 15.91, SD = 5.48 \), competence .40 with \( M = 21.27, \) and \( SD = 4.45 \), choice .42 with \( M = 19.34, SD = 5.33, \) and meaningfulness .84 with \( M = 15.98, \) and \( SD = 5.83 \).

**Immediacy:** Immediacy was operationalized, in this study, using Richmond et. al (1987) Nonverbal Immediacy Behavior Scale. The Nonverbal Immediacy Behavior Scale consists of 14 Likert – type items anchored by 0 (never) to four (very often). Previous reliabilities for the use of these scales have ranged from .80 - .92 (Christophel, 1990; Frymier, 1993a; Gorham & Zakahi, 1990). In the current study the researcher inadvertently deleted one item from the scale. Reliability for the nonverbal immediacy scale in this study was .64 with \( M = 34.91, SD = 5.3 \).

**Student Learning:** Respondents were asked to report on their attitudes regarding the course, the instructor, and the content using the revised affective learning scale developed by Mottet and Richmond (1998). The measure employed in this study is based on earlier affective learning scales (Andersen, 1979, Gorham, 1988), but an expanded version of the scale was introduced and established valid by Mottet and Richmond (1998). The original version of the revised scale put forth by Mottet and Richmond (1998) had eight sub – constructs. The scale used in this study consists of five sub-constructs of the original eight sub – constructs each made up of four items. The additional three sub – constructs were omitted from this study. The omission was based on previous research deeming the three additional constructs redundant and irrelevant to the thrust of the study (Weber et al. 2001).

The five sub-constructs each consist of four items that represent student attitudes about the course, four items about student appreciation about course content, four items about “real
life” application of content, four items regarding student attitudes about the instructor, and four items evaluating the likelihood of taking another course with the same teacher. Each subconstruct is measured with four bi-polar adjectives (good/bad, worthless/valuable, fair/unfair, positive/negative or likely/unlikely, impossible/possible, probable/improbable, would/would not) (Mottet & Richmond, 1988).

Previous alpha reliabilities for affective learning scales have been above .90 (Christophel, 1990; Frymier & Houser, 2000; Gorham, 1988; Weber et al. 2001). Reliability for the affective learning scale in this study was .89 with $M = 104.19$ and $SD = 22.62$.

A second measure of student learning, the revised learning indicators scale as developed by Frymier and Houser (1999), was used as a measure for student behaviors that indicate learning. This measure was used to add richness to the learning outcome. By using the learning indicators measure students not only reported on their attitudes, but they reported on behaviors indicative of student learning.

This learning indicators measure consists of seven items addressing learning activities anchored by 0 (never) to 4 (very often) (Fymier & Houser, 1999). The learning activities include: I like to talk about what I’m doing in this class with friends and family; I explain course content to other students; I think about course content outside the class; I see connections between the course content and my career goals; I review the course content; I compare the information from this class with other things that I have learned; and I feel I have learned a lot in this class. Frymier and Houser (1999) reported an alpha reliability of .85 in their initial application of the scale. Reliability for the learning indicator scale in this study was .88 with $M = 15.09$ and $SD = 6.47$.

**Student Satisfaction:** Student satisfaction was measured in this study using a three-item (pleased/displeased, dissatisfied/satisfied, and content/discontent) seven-point bipolar adjective instrument. The three items asked students to report on their overall satisfaction with their instructor (in the course immediately before the class for which they were filling out the instrument). Previous reliabilities have ranged from .94 - .97 (Myers, 2002; Myers & Knox, 2000). Reliability for the student satisfaction measure in this study was .81 with $M = 15.97$ and $SD = 4.13$.

**Student Motivation:** Student state motivation was operationallized in this study by the score on Richmond’s (1990) motivation scale using five 7-step bipolar adjectives
(motivated/unmotivated, excited/bored, interested/uninterested, involved/uninvolved, dreading it/looking forward to it) to evaluate students’ motivation in regards to the course and instructor. Previous alpha reliabilities have been above .80 (Frymier & Houser, 2000; Frymier et al. 1996; Richmond, 1990). The reliability for the motivation scale in this study was .75 with $M = 23.26$ and $SD = .5.26$. 
Chapter 3: Results

To examine the hypotheses in this study, Pearson’s correlations were used. Regression was used to examine the research questions. Initially all correlations were examined and are shown in Table 1.

Hypothesis one sought to examine the relationship between transformational leadership and learner empowerment and was tested using Pearson’s correlation. The results of the correlation showed a significant relationship between teacher transformational leadership and learner empowerment \( r = .71, p < .01 \).

Hypothesis two stated a positive relationship exists between learner empowerment and student learning, and was also tested using Pearson’s correlation. The results of the correlation show a significant relationship between learner empowerment and affective learning, \( r = .60, p < .01 \). The results for learning indicators, the second measure of student learning, show a significant relationship between learner empowerment and learning indicators, \( r = .63, p < .01 \).

Research question one asked what element of transformational leadership accounts for the most variance in learner empowerment and was tested using a multiple regression. The predictor variables in this regression were inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, idealized influence, and intellectual stimulation with learner empowerment as the criterion variable. All of the 4 I’s showed significant correlations with learner empowerment with idealized influence \( r = .673, p < .01 \), inspirational motivation \( r = .568, p < .01 \), individualized consideration \( r = .604, p < .01 \), and intellectual stimulation \( r = .642, p < .01 \).

A multiple regression was performed to determine the relative impact on variance each of the 4 I’s had in learner empowerment. The linear combination of the 4 I’s was significantly related to learner empowerment \( R^2 = .76 \), adjusted \( R^2 = .55 \), \( F(6, 110) = 24.57, p < .01 \). This
Table 1: Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TFL</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>IMM</th>
<th>LEMP</th>
<th>MGF</th>
<th>CPT</th>
<th>IM</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>SAT</th>
<th>MOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Influence</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediacy</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Empowerment</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Indicators</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Learning</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
suggests a significant relationship among the sum of the 4 I’s with learner empowerment. However, in analyzing the beta weights more precise analysis of the variance is evident. The beta weights suggest intellectual stimulation ($\beta = .346, p < .01$) as the only significant predictor at the $p < .01$ level; however, idealized influence ($\beta = .287, p = .014$) and individualized consideration ($\beta = .258, p = .018$) approached significance. Inspirational motivation did not prove a significant predictor of learner empowerment ($\beta = -.086, p = .445$).

Hypothesis three stated that a positive relationship exists between transformational leadership and immediacy behaviors and was tested using a Pearson’s correlation test. The result of the correlation showed a significant correlation between teacher transformational leadership and teacher nonverbal immediacy $r = .252, p < .01$.

Hypothesis four stated that a positive relationship exists between transformational leadership and student satisfaction and was also tested using a Pearson Correlation. The result of the correlation shows a significant relationship between teacher transformational leadership behavior and student satisfaction, $r = .584, p < .01$.

Hypothesis five stated that a positive relationship exists between transformational leadership and student state motivation and was also tested with a Pearson Correlation. The result of the correlation showed a significant relationship between teacher transformational leadership and student state motivation, $r = .263, p < .01$.

Research question two asked what element of transformational leadership accounts for the most variance in student state motivation and was tested using a multiple regression. Inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, idealized influence, and intellectual stimulation were set as the predictor variables with state motivation as the criterion variable. The correlations among student state motivation and the 4 I’s of transformational leadership reveal significant correlations between motivation and idealized influence ($r = .263, p < .01$), inspirational motivation ($r = .256, p < .01$), with individualized consideration ($r = .207, p = .013$), and intellectual stimulation ($r = .211, p = .011$) approaching significance.

The linear combination of the 4 I’s did not show a significant impact on motivation $R^2 = .093$, adjusted $R^2 = .044$, $F(6, 110) = 1.89, p = .089$. These results suggest that the sum of the 4 I’s of transformational leadership do not have a significant impact on the variance in student state motivation. The beta weights for the 4 I’s showed no significant impact as expected with
idealized influence ($b = .199, p = .235$), inspirational motivation ($b = .086, p = .6$), individualized consideration ($b = -.060, p = .7$), and intellectual stimulation ($b = .045, p = .712$).

Hypothesis six stated that a positive relationship exists between transformational leadership and student learning and was tested using a Pearson Correlation. The results of the test show a significant correlation between teacher transformational leadership and student affective learning $r = .56, p < .01$. The results of the correlation between transformational leadership and learning indicators show a significant relationship, $r = .49, p < .01$.

Research question three asked what component of transformational leadership accounts for the most variance in learning and was again tested with a multiple regression. Inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, idealized influence, and intellectual stimulation were set as the predictor variables with affective learning as the criterion variable. The results of the Pearson correlations showed significant correlations between affective learning and idealized influence ($r = .633, p < .01$), inspirational motivation ($r = .537, p < .01$), individualized consideration ($r = .439, p < .01$), and intellectual stimulation ($r = .409, p < .01$).

These results suggest a significant relationship between the sum of the 4 I’s and affective learning confirmed by the linear combination, $R^2 = .410$, adjusted $R^2 = .378$, $F(6, 110) = 12.74, p < .01$. In order to understand which element of transformational leadership had the most impact on affective learning the beta weights for the 4 I’s were examined. This analysis revealed a significant beta weight only for idealized influence ($b = .559, p < .01$) with inspirational motivation ($b = .158, p = .233$), individualized consideration ($b = .021, p = .866$), and intellectual stimulation ($b = -.027, p = .978$).

A multiple regression was also used to analyze the relationship between the 4 I’s and learning indicators. Idealized influence, inspirational motivation, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation were again the predictor variables with learning indicators as the criterion variable. The results of the correlations showed significant relationships between learning indicators and idealized influence ($r = .502, p < .01$), inspirational motivation ($r = .472, p < .01$), individualized consideration ($r = .370, p < .01$), and intellectual stimulation ($r = .530, p < .01$).

This suggests that all of the 4 I’s are significantly correlated with student learning indicator behaviors, and is confirmed by the linear combination of the 4 I’s significant relationship with learning indicators $R^2 = .342$, adjusted $R^2 = .306$, $F(6, 110) = 9.53, p < .01$. 


This shows the relationship among the sum of the 4 I’s; however, to analyze which one of the 4 I’s has the most impact on variance an analysis of beta weights is necessary. The beta weight analysis revealed only one significant “I,” intellectual stimulation ($b = .340, p < .01$), with idealized influence ($b = .219, p = .125$), inspirational motivation ($b = .184, p = .189$), and individualized consideration ($b = .037, p = .781$). The beta weight analysis showed the majority of the variance accounted for by the 4 I’s is attributed to intellectual stimulation.
Chapter 4: Discussion

Transformational leadership and instructional communication are two important and convergent ideas. The instructional field is always looking for novel ways to transmit information, engage students, empower learners, increase motivation, and improve learning. A transformational approach to teacher leadership can provide the necessary tools to achieve these broad goals. Luechauer and Shulman (2002) called for management development instructors to “practice what they preach;” however, other disciplines should also practice what management development instructors preach. The transformational leadership model is an appropriate and effective model for classroom instruction.

This study sought to examine the relationship between teacher transformational leadership and student outcomes, particularly, learner empowerment, student motivation, student satisfaction, and student learning. The hypotheses of this study suggested a positive relationship between teacher transformational leadership and these outcome variables. All of the hypotheses were supported significantly. While one research study does not “prove” any definite conclusions this study should lay the groundwork for the development of a transformational model of instructional leadership.

The first hypothesis focused on the relationship transformational leadership has with learner empowerment. The hypothesized relationship was a significant positive one, and the hypothesis was confirmed. As Frymier et al. (1996) suggested in their analysis, learner empowerment can play a crucial role in learning. This case was also confirmed by hypothesis two which sought to show a positive relationship between learner empowerment and affective learning. Consistent with Frymier et al.’s findings, the relationship was significant and positive. The conclusion we can take from these two hypotheses is simple. Transformational teachers produce empowered learners, and empowered learners report high levels of affective learning. The relationship makes sense conceptually, though this study did not seek nor prove a causal relationship. However, future research can extend this study and seek to establish causality. Transformational teachers should be stimulating students, making material relevant, empowering learners through inspirational motivation, and using communication to show utility and relevance in the material. According to Frymier and Shulman (1995) relevance is also a crucial factor for learning. Because of their nature, transformational teachers are well positioned to capitalize on these relationships and positively impact student learning.
In analyzing the predictors for learner empowerment among the 4 I’s, intellectual stimulation emerged as the significant predictor. Intellectual stimulation involves questioning assumptions, promoting novel thought patterns, and challenging the status quo (Avolio et al., 1991). These characteristics should cause learner empowerment as students are encouraged to think outside the box and come up with solutions and information in their own new ways. As a result, students should feel empowered to solve problems and think in their own creative ways.

Hypothesis three sought to examine the relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and immediacy behaviors. As outlined earlier, immediacy and transformational leadership are solidly linked conceptually as the outcomes and actions of each are similar. It should be consistent that teachers who are transformational in nature should also be highly immediate. This hypothesis was significantly supported. This result provides two significant implications. First, it lends more credence to studying transformational leadership in the instructional context. Immediacy, as the most established and valid instructional variable, lends support transformational teachers. In regard to the student – teacher relationship this tells us that transformational teachers are likely to be in a great position to influence student outcomes similar to the way immediate teachers do. Given the immense support and research behind immediacy this suggests a high utility for a transformational approach in the classroom. Because the hypothesis was supported, we can deduce transformational leadership behaviors should be studied in the instructional context. Second, it suggests that transformational leadership and immediacy overlap. For example, a leader who scores highly on the idealized influence dimension and is charismatic is likely to be highly immediate. Immediacy behaviors and transformational behaviors should have similar relationships with student outcomes. In examining the correlations in this study significant correlations were evident between transformational leadership and student outcomes similar to previous studies linking immediacy to learning, satisfaction, and motivation (Frymier, 1993a). Further research should explore the extent to which immediacy and transformational leadership overlap.

Hypothesis four sought to explore the relationship between teacher transformational leadership and student satisfaction. The hypothesis was supported; teacher transformational leadership and student satisfaction were significantly positively correlated. This result is consistent with previous studies linking the two (Pounder, 2003). However, the analysis suggests the centrality of communication to the transformational leadership model. The student
satisfaction measure is a measure of student satisfaction with the communication between the student and teacher. Transformational leadership is behavioral in nature. Transformational leadership can only be applied and successfully implemented if the followers feel motivated and empowered. Leaders and teachers convey these feelings and employ the transformational approach through interactions – leader – follower or student-teacher. As the results suggest, communication is a central feature in teacher transformational leadership.

Another important finding is that transformational leadership behaviors are positively correlated with student state motivation. Again, this result is consistent with previous studies linking transformational leadership and motivation in the instructional context (Avolio et al., 2001; Harvey et al., 2003; Pounder, 2003).

Significant correlations between the 4 I’s and state motivation; however, the combination did not produce a significant prediction, and none of the 4 I’s provided a significant portion of the variance in state motivation.

Affective learning and teacher transformational leadership are positively correlated. This result is sensible given the characteristics of transformational leaders. Affective learning is focused on how a student “feels” about the material in their course (Sorensen, 1989). Transformational teachers focus, not only on outcomes, but on the means. Transformational teachers are concerned with the affective dimensions as well as performance.

Research question three sought to discern which of the 4 I’s of transformational leadership accounted for the most variance in affective learning. The correlations were significant for all of the 4 I’s; however, only idealized influence provided a significant beta weight. Idealized influence is the “I” concerned with developing a personal rapport with the follower and instilling pride (Dionne et al., 2003). Idealized influence and affective learning should go hand in hand given the focus on relevance. In previous studies (Frymier & Shulman, 1995), relevance has been shown to be positively correlated to affective learning. The idealized influence dimension of transformational leadership emphasizes relevance by focusing on a mutual benefit approach to the team. Additionally, the idealized influence component should foster pride and admiration for the leader which seemingly, and the results confirm this, would increase affect for the teacher and the class due to positive feeling that is fostered (Avolio et al., 1991).
When students are engaged, teachers are immediate, and learners are empowered the likelihood of students to engage in learning indicators is increased; all of these characteristics are those of students with transformational teachers. As a result, transformational teachers are well positioned to positively influence learning indicator behavior.

Given the focus on novelty, innovation, and critical thinking encompassed in intellectual stimulation, and the similarities between these characteristics and the learning indicator behaviors these results are expected. Transformational teachers, especially those with high scores on the intellectual stimulation component, are well positioned to positively impact student learning.

This study, as with most social science studies, has a few limitations. The measures used in this had all been previously established reliability and valid; however, the results of this study proved problematic in this area. The motivation and immediacy measures both resulted in moderate reliabilities with immediacy unusually low. Both of the measures were well below their typically reported reliabilities. A few explanations for the low reliability emerged. First, on the immediacy measure, the researcher inadvertently omitted an item, the last item. The omission was not intentional or purposeful; instead it was a mistake made by the researcher. This mistake certainly would effect the integrity of the scale, but should not have accounted for the drastically lower reliability reported in this study.

The low reliability on the immediacy measure typically would suggest a higher probability of a type II error; however, the correlation between immediacy and transformational leadership among teacher was significant. This result, in combination with the low reliability, may suggest an even higher correlation than was reported in this study. Nonetheless, the low reliability of the immediacy scale is certainly one limitation of the study.

The other striking limitation regards the low reliability and non – significant relationship between student state motivation and the 4 I’s of transformational leadership. The reliability concern, could account for the non-significant relationship given the aforementioned type II error discussion. The student motivation measure is, similar to the immediacy measure, a typically reliable measure. The reliability of the motivation measure was not as drastically low as the immediacy measure; however, given its normal reliabilities are much higher the score is equally surprising.
One possible reason for the low reliability of the motivation measure is fatigue. Although the questionnaire was relatively short, the motivation measure was at the end of the questionnaire. Given its position, it is possible that students lacked the focus, concentration, and/or desire to think through the questions so as to answer them honestly. Another possible explanation for the low reliability of the motivation measure could be the time during the semester that the questionnaire was administered. Students completed the questionnaire during the last week of the semester (the week before final examinations). As a result, motivation could have been decreased due to stress, pressure, grade concerns, or simply the finality of the semester. Given the motivation scale does not ask students to think back on their motivation over the course of the semester, this could be a possible explanation for the low reliability of the motivation scale. In addition to the low reliability, these explanations could explain the fact that the 4 I’s were all significantly related to affective learning in the regression, but none were significantly related to motivation. Given the strong similarity between affective learning and motivation, to the point of redundancy, this result was a surprise, but can be explained using the aforementioned logic.

Finally, this study set out to apply a leadership theory primarily used in management development, organizational development, business, and organizational communication to the instructional context. Richmond and McCroskey (1992) posit that the classroom is analogous to an organization with the teacher as the leader and the students as followers. Most instructional research analyzes the behavior of a teacher and the effects it has on student outcomes such as learning, satisfaction, motivation, and attitudes. This relationship is similar to the approach taken in organizational communication and leadership research. The follower outcomes are often evaluated in terms of leader behaviors. Building on this rationale this study sought to analyze the relationship between teacher transformational leadership and various student outcomes.

In the workplace transformational leaders build rapport and influence follower satisfaction and performance by actualizing the 4 I’s through such behaviors as asking employees about families and personal information, rewarding employees that go above and beyond their job description, challenging employees to come up with a new solution to an existing structure, and encouraging employees with optimism (Pillai & Williams, 2004). These behaviors appear in the instructional context in similar ways. For example, a teacher can ask
students about their extra-curricular activities or families thus establishing personal rapport. A teacher can assign students difficult problems without a clear solution to encourage students to think outside the box, and a teacher can praise student participation and encourage novel ways of thinking. All of these behaviors would lead to higher levels of teacher transformation.

The purpose of this study was multi-faceted. First, the study served to apply leadership theory to the instructional context. This goal serves many goals, but one of the more altruistic is to examine the crossover between the various sects within the communication discipline. That is, can we study leadership communication theory in the context of instructional communication? The result of this goal was an overwhelming yes. It is clear given the correlations between transformational leadership and immediacy along with the correlations between transformational leadership and the outcome variables that transformational teachers are well positioned to influence student outcomes. Similar to Harvey et al. (2003) and Pounder (2003) this study used the transformational leadership model to make that leap. This should open the door to other areas of the discipline to internally borrow from other sects. For example, perhaps instructional scholars or small group scholars can borrow from rhetoric and vice versa. Studies such as this one add solidarity and continuity to the field and benefit the overall strength of the discipline.

Additionally, this study showed significant positive relationships between transformational leadership and learning. Perhaps, given both are outcomes, leaning and performance are similar. For example, transformational leaders in the workplace have been shown to increase performance in their followers (Dionne et. al 2003). Because organizational leadership was substituted with instruction learning seems to be the logical bottom line outcome analogous to performance in the workplace. In the current study students with transformational teachers also reported significant levels of affective learning and behaviors that indicate students are learning. One of the primary goals of instruction is student learning, as one of the goals of management is performance.

Other more, academic goals were also sought and achieved in this study. The study sought to examine the role that transformational leadership plays in the classroom. One fundamental question before this study was done was, does transformational leadership even exist in the classroom. The result of this inquiry, at least in three studies, is an overwhelming yes (see Harvey et al., 2003; Pounder, 2003). The significance of this goal achieved is profound. As the main focus of the study the achievement of this goal paves the way to model formulation and
other avenues of study applying transformational leadership to the instructional field. Transformational leadership among teachers was present and is evidenced by the range and the mean of the transformational leadership scale and the subscales representing the 4 I’s.

Building on the previous research examining how teachers manage the classroom this study, and others to follow, focused on how teacher leadership impacts the classroom, particularly student outcomes. Of particular importance here are the significant correlations evident between transformational leadership and student outcomes; however, an underlying trend may emerge. This underlying trend would involve the relationship between transformational leadership and the traditional instructional predictor variables such as teacher clarity and immediacy. Future studies should examine the relationships between teacher transformational leadership, immediacy, and clarity. Additionally, future studies should attempt to analyze to what extent transformational leadership accounts for variance in student outcomes in comparison to other instructional predictors. For example, does transformational leadership account for a relatively small amount of variance in comparison to clarity, immediacy, and other predictors?

On the other hand, perhaps future research and testing will show transformational leadership as an overarching construct to typical instructional predictor variables. More correlations should examine the relationship between transformational leadership and traditional predictors. For example, are all teachers that are highly clear and immediate also highly transformational? If so, what does this tell us about teacher transformational leadership? These questions certainly emerge from the encouraging results here.

A secondary goal for this study was to explain how teachers translate behaviors from the private sector (military and business) to the classroom. Future research should focus on this. Future studies should collect data and segment out transformational teachers based on the MLQ 6s to be further studied. Once the transformational teachers are segmented researchers should conduct experiments to ascertain what behaviors those teachers exhibit that fall into the 4 dimensions of transformational leadership. As a result, a more prescriptive approach can be used to help teachers who want to be more transformational.

Without any direct behavioral observation prescription is difficult; however, based on the data collected and relationships examined in this study some advice can be given to teachers who want to improve student outcomes. For example, teachers who want to improve student affective learning should focus on improving their idealized influence and inspirational motivation.
dimensions of leadership. This would involve increasing out of class communication, discussing non-class related subjects with students, being available out of class for assistance, encouraging students to participate and praising input. On the other hand, if a teacher wanted to increase student behaviors that indicate learning a teacher would focus more on intellectual stimulation.

This study is introductory, basic, and had many limitations; however, the results should stand in future research. Future research should apply transformational leadership to other situations and add to the specificity of this research along with attempting to replicate these findings.

Future research should continue to focus on crossover between sects of the communication discipline. The utility of such crossover applications offers a fresh perspective and perhaps results not immediately evident. Clearly, this study, and the two studies similar to it cited here have shown the great promise transformational leadership shows in the instructional context; however, to what extent, and what role is still up in the air. Is it possible that transformational leadership could emerge as an effective and consistent instructional model? Is it possible that transformational leadership could emerge in textbooks for teacher training? The only sure thing to emerge from the results of this research is that transformational leadership has utility in the classroom; however, more research is necessary to determine the true role of transformational leadership in the instructional context.
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