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This multiple-methods study explored the influence that leadership style has on philanthropy and fundraising, and investigated how behaviors and characteristics associated with leadership style promote successful fundraising in three P-12 independent schools. Research was conducted via a multiple-methods design in which qualitative and quantitative approaches were used. Initially, qualitative interviews were conducted with the head of school, the director of development, and a major donor to the respective school. Subsequently, quantitative data were collected using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for a more complete understanding of each head of schools’ unique leadership style. Findings revealed that heads of school utilize both transformational and transactional leadership behaviors and characteristics. Additionally, results indicated that the ability of independent heads of schools to delegate leadership tasks, thereby utilizing a distributive leadership approach in addition to transactional and transformational leadership, achieved maximum success in their fundraising efforts.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

“Philanthropy starts at the top.”

--Bruce Stewart, Retired Head of Sidwell Friends School, Washington, DC

Introduction to the Problem

Enrollment in P-12 independent schools has fluctuated in recent decades (Aud et al., 2011; Ewert, 2013). Although enrollment increased during the late 1990s, Ewert (2013) reports that enrollment in independent schools has declined during the first decade of the twenty-first century. Independent schools are those whose finances and organizational controls are operated and controlled independently (Colson, 2015). As such, independent schools are operated and controlled independent of public, state-mandated schools.

Colson (2015) edited a seminal work on fundraising, now in its fourth edition, entitled Handbook of Philanthropy at Independent Schools, published by the National Association of Independent Schools. Colson wrote two of the seventeen chapters and edited the others written by eighteen co-authors who are practitioners and experts in the field of P-12 fundraising. Thus, the book was written by independent school practitioners for school professionals. As such, Colson believes, “the book offers valuable information and new insights for everyone involved in independent school philanthropy, from the beginner to the 30-year development professional, and from the long-term trustee to the new volunteer” (Colson, 2015, p. vii). In this way, the book’s suggestions give sage advice to an entire development team and provide invaluable insights for the head of school (Colson, 2015).
Helen Colson is president of Helen Colson Development Associates in Chevy Chase, Maryland. She is the former associate headmaster for development and planning at Sidwell Friends School in Washington, DC. She has written, co-authored, and helped edit all four editions of *Philanthropy at Independent Schools*. (p. 15)

Since the literature is limited in the area of P-12 fundraising, especially as it pertains to school leadership, Colson (2015) represents a major voice in fundraising and philanthropy in P-12 schools.

There are numerous terms and vocabulary associated with philanthropy and fundraising. The following terms will help set the context and framework of the study.

**Definition of Terms**

**Annual fund.** According to Rosso (2003), the annual fund can be defined as the building block for all fundraising. It establishes a base of donors who can serve as an effective device to involve, inform, and bond a constituency to the organization. It can further serve as an instrument that compels accountability to the cause the organization is serving (p. 1).

**Capital campaign.** A capital campaign is a method of raising the necessary funds to build a new building or to launch a new initiative or program. Capital campaigns can also be used to fund an endowment. They are widely used in non-profit organizations such as churches, independent colleges and schools (Diaz, 2013; Quinn, Doherty, Street, & Wienk, 2006; Roach, 2009).
**Charter school.** Charter schools vary in their overall make up. Charter schools exist that are funded by the public education system and not by philanthropy. They may operate under different administrative guidelines such as reduced standardized testing. Some charter schools do not receive any outside funding. Some must close or restrict their enrollment due to insufficient funds. “Charter schools are independent public schools funded with taxpayer dollars that operate free from many of the laws and regulations that govern traditional public schools” (*Education Week*, 2016, p. 16).

**Director of development.** This is a key person in an organization who oversees the capital campaign from start to finish. The director usually reports to the head or assistant head of the school. This individual often works with community members, local businesses and major donors in soliciting and securing both short term and long term donations to the school or organization (Diaz, 2013; Roach, 2009).

**Distributed leadership.** Distributed leadership is more than an individual leader. It results from a number of interactions at several loci within an organization. Distributed leadership is a style of leadership that purposefully involves numerous members of the organization (Harris, 2014; Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Zolters-Sherer, 2004).

**Fundraising.** Fundraising is a method of securing additional funding to run programs, initiatives and facilities within a for-profit or non-profit organization. Fundraising can increase an organization’s ability to remain competitive in a competitive marketplace (Diaz, 2013; Quinn et. al., 2006).

**Philanthropy.** A general term used to refer to money given to support a charitable cause or initiative that otherwise could not happen without the in-kind
donations from independent contributors. Philanthropy includes annual funds, capital development campaigns, and all aspects of fundraising (Minnesota Council on Foundations, 2015).

**Successful campaign funding.** The ability to increase the amount of financial support characterizes successful campaign funding. This involves a multi-channel approach to engagement, including branding, print, email, web, and social media. Most successful campaign funding utilizes all these initiatives. A strong communication strategy also includes branding, timing, incentives, and resending emails. These two components, a multi-channel approach and a strong communications strategy, are the cornerstones that lead to long-term fundraising success (Barry, 2011).

**Transactional leadership.** Transactional leaders motivate their employees by exchanging rewards for services the workers provide. For example, a principal may provide a professional release day in order for teachers to collaborate on a new curricular initiative (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

**Transformational leadership.** Transformational leaders help their employees to achieve unusually high performance outcomes through the four I’s: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass & Avolio, 2015, p. 4). Transformational leaders inspire workers to work for the greater good and to do more than is expected of them (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

**Independent school.** Another term that needs further clarification is independent school. Some literature refers to private and independent schools synonymously. The
term private school is a broader term that encompasses independent as well as parochial schools. While this study draws on literature from sectarian and non-sectarian literature, the three schools explored in this multiple case study are all part of the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS).

Enrollment in independent schools is not growing and is in decline in many areas due to increased financial pressures on the middle class (Galins, 2015). Increased enrollment in charter schools as well as the home school movement may be at the heart of this trend (Ewert, 2013). Government statistics also suggest that enrollment in independent schools has declined, although this trend has not been well examined (Aud et al., 2011).

Independent schools, however, comprise a significant part of the education sector (Ewert, 2013). In fact, the Council for American Private Education (2016) reports that “10 % of all students in the United States attend independent school while 25 % of all schools in the United States are independent” (p. 1). The funding needs of these non-public educational organizations have also risen sharply because independent schools receive little to no state or federal support or assistance (Quinn et al., 2006). Tuition alone does not provide adequate financial support needed to run independent schools, such as maintenance of facilities (Colson, 2015). Despite funding difficulties, independent schools often have academic and athletic facilities that are second-to-none (Taylor, 2010). Goodison (2015) theorizes that independent schools construct major upgrades to athletic facilities as a means to remain competitive in answer to student and parent demands. Goodison (2015) goes on to say, “The $10 million-plus plans of
Boston’s Roxbury Latin, an independent boys’ secondary school in West Roxbury, include a new hockey rink and eight-lane 400-meter track. Austin Prep, meanwhile, has started a $3.75 million renovation to its stadium” (p. 1). The ability to maintain facilities and build new innovative designs places a lot of pressure on independent schools to raise the funds necessary to attract, recruit, and grow the student population (Colson, 2015). Therefore, independent P-12 schools must turn to other means of financial support that enable them to flourish. As Colson (2015) has stated,

Smart, strategic fundraising is a must for independent schools because reliance on charitable gift revenue will only continue to increase. Development links donors whose desire to give and to do good for our students and our schools is inspirational, humbling, and transformative. (p. 15)

Thus, independent schools turn to annual fundraising, capital development campaigns, and philanthropy not only to run their organizations but also to enable them to grow and to thrive.

This need for smart, strategic fundraising raises an essential question: what role does leadership play in attracting donor philanthropy, supporting fundraising, and running a capital development campaign? Given that fundraising is an expectation of school leaders, further examination needs to be conducted using different methods and approaches into the behaviors and characteristics associated with leadership style and fundraising. Different behaviors and approaches must be examined from one head of school to another as they relate to fundraising. Another area not explored in other studies and contexts is distributing leadership tasks as well as further examination of behaviors
associated with interactions between the head of school and the donor. While one leader may look at the background of the donor, another likes to get to know the person and form a relationship first.

Leadership behaviors and characteristics related to fundraising have been studied in higher education. Nicholson (2007) currently serves as the Vice-President of Development at Winthrop University in Rock Hill, South Carolina. Previously, Nicholson (2007) studied the role that leadership plays in fundraising and development in higher education. In his research, he studied transformational and transactional leadership styles and their impact on fundraising success. This study, however, goes beyond the study completed by Nicholson (2007) and looks not only at transformational and transactional leadership, but further explores how distributive leadership influences fundraising in independent P-12 schools. Distributive leadership has not been examined in terms of leadership style, fundraising, and philanthropy at the P-12 level.

There is considerable research on fundraising and capital campaigns in higher education (Caboni & Proper, 2007), as well as a plethora of research on leadership and leadership styles (Yukl, 2012). Some research also exists on the role of the college president in fundraising (Nicholson, 2007). However, literature is virtually non-existent on the leadership style of P-12 heads of schools and their skill and ability to attract donor philanthropy. Several other studies have been conducted on leadership style as it relates to fundraising. Diaz (2013) conducted a study on leadership and capital development campaigns in higher education. Rita Bornstein (2003; 2005), President Emerita of Rollins College and one of the most successful fundraisers in higher education, has
written extensively on the subject. Bornstein (2003; 2005) coined the term
transformative leadership in which she believes that leaders must engage in both
transactional and transformational leadership in order to be successful fundraisers. Burk
(2013) investigated and wrote extensively on leadership and fundraising in her book,
*Donor-Centered Leadership*, and Proper (2011) examined the board of trustees’ role in
fundraising in four independent colleges. Drezner (2014) of Teachers’ College at
Columbia University has also written extensively on fundraising in higher education and
nonprofit leadership.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this multiple case study was to explore the leadership behaviors
and characteristics of three independent heads of school in relation to their ability to raise
funds. The influence of leadership style on philanthropy and fundraising is generally
defined as the ability and power to positively influence others to successfully raise funds.
Roach (2009) states,

> Raising money for new or renovated facilities is called a capital campaign. In
addition to funding the project that motivated it, a successful capital campaign
builds and refines a school’s development program for the foreseeable future;
builds visible volunteer leadership that should continue to support the institution
as well as builds the school’s credibility in the philanthropic sector; and stretches,
redefines, and expands the level of contributed income a school should expect to
receive after the campaign is completed. (pp. 1-2)
There is ever-increasing competition among P-12 schools, and today, more than ever, parents have choices in where to send their children for their education. Catholic schools are plentiful but face adversity in light of an ever-changing set of societal norms and changing demographics (Ewert, 2013; Muraskin & Stullich, 1998). Charter schools are opening on a more frequent basis, while home schooling has become very popular among certain segments of the population (Ewert, 2013; Mathews, 2012). Virtual schools have become readily available, some are state sponsored, free of charge, and include all the required technology (Barth, Hull, & St. Andrie, 2012). The American Christian Schools International (ACSI) is a longstanding network of Christian schools across the country and around the world. In addition, the schools within the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) have provided quality education, usually for those who can afford independent schooling for their children. With increased availability of school choice, there is also increased competition for money to run these schools and pay the staff that serves them (Colson, 2015).

The Council for Advancement and Support of Education’s (2009) Fundraising Index theorizes that annual giving to schools will decrease over the next several years. At the same time, many independent schools across the country are in the midst of major capital campaigns, some needing to raise millions of dollars (Roach, 2009). These patterns suggest that fundraising and the ability to attract donor capital should be a high priority for school leadership. School leaders, then, need to analyze studies from higher education for models and perspectives on fundraising and philanthropy that meet the needs of their organizations.
Much research exists on fundraising and philanthropy in higher education settings (Caboni & Proper, 2007). However, the literature is limited at best and is only beginning to emerge in the independent, P-12 school setting. We do not know or fully understand the effects of leadership style on the ability to raise funds in a P-12 setting, particularly in an independent school context. Nicholson (2007) states that,

A better understanding of transformational, transactional, and transformative leadership theory, and the attributes that are associated with them, can not only help leaders shape and mold their approach to fundraising but also enable them to infuse a greater sense of meaning into their respective institutions while increasing the amount of financial support they garner. (p. 256)

The role of fundraiser has become increasingly important for college and university presidents (Cook & Lasher, 1996). In fact, Cook and Lasher (1996) believe that the role of fundraiser is the most important role of the college president. Today, successful college and university presidents are able to integrate their leadership style with their ability to conduct fundraising activities (Nicholson, 2007). Bornstein (2005) adds that successful change in higher education stems from the university president balancing leadership, social capital, governance, and fundraising. Since models of fundraising and philanthropy in P-12 independent schools are based on similar models in higher education, heads of independent schools should be aware of these factors.

**Background of the Study**

Fundraising and philanthropy in P-12 independent schools largely follows models of fundraising and philanthropy in higher education. The present climate of college
president success depends on his or her ability to blend their unique style of leadership with their ability to raise money for the school (Nicholson, 2007). At the same time, the ability to create a culture of philanthropy in independent P-12 schools is at the forefront of all independent schools’ strategic goals (Seltzer, 2015). Nicholson (2007) also reports that university presidents feel that more often than not, they are ultimately responsible for the financial success of the university.

One of the first ways to build a strong culture of philanthropy is to demonstrate positive examples of generosity that can build on stories and institutional pride (Seltzer, 2015). Nicholson (2007) theorizes that the abilities and skills of the best college presidents in terms of philanthropic donations can serve as a model for other academic leaders in their school settings. A strong culture, orchestrated by school leadership, has many benefits. Colson (2015) theorizes that school leaders are better able to concentrate on nurturing the deep, long-term relationships that lead to transformative gifts. However, limited studies have been conducted on the leadership styles of college presidents (Cook & Lasher, 1996).

Colson (2015) theorizes the head of school has a major influence on creating and supporting a strong, vibrant culture of philanthropy. The head of school must support the work of the development office and understand the messages that they send (Seltzer, 2015). Thus, leadership and the role of school leadership are tantamount in fostering a strong philanthropic program in the independent school setting. In fact, the ability to attract donor philanthropy may be the top priority for independent heads of school today (Bornstein, 2005; Colson, 2015; Nicholson, 2007). Their leadership in this area should
be a high priority. Some leadership styles, characteristics, and leadership behaviors may make significant contributions in the area of strong fiduciary leadership.

**Leadership**

Transactional leadership results when subordinates listen to and follow their leader’s directives in exchange for some reward (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). According to Yukl (2012), transactional leadership is sometimes known as the leader-exchange model of leadership. In contrast with transactional leadership, transformational leadership occurs when leaders and followers are motivated and elevated in an organization to achieve at higher levels of engagement (Hoy & Miskel, 2013; Yukl, 2012). In order for heads of school to thrive, they must be leaders, not managers and highly focused on transforming schools (Senge, 2012). Educational practice must be informed by critical reflection even though schools are sites of cultural politics (Senge, 2012). Heads of school need support and new resources and to work with parents and donors to connect the school with family and community resources (Senge, 2012). Senge (2012) argues that restricting attention to optimizing individual parts of an organization maximizes the whole ultimately denies the systemic functioning of organizations. Life in an organization is very complex since it is part of an interconnected web of social and political relationships (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). The school can therefore be viewed as a social system whereby a situation can only be understood in connection to the whole organization (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Senge (2012) refers to this idea as systems thinking. Hoy & Miskel (2013) state that,
Schools are service organizations that are committed to teaching and learning. The ultimate goal of the school is student learning; in fact, its very existence is based on such activity. Schools more than any other kind of organization should be learning organizations, that is, places where participants continually expand their capacities to create and achieve, where novel patterns of thinking are encouraged, where collective aspirations are nurtured, where participants learn how to learn together, and where the organization expands its capacity for innovation and problem solving. (p. 34)

Therefore, transformational leadership, along with an open systems approach, sound decision making by the head of school, as well as shared decision-making are all vehicles that can and must foster organizational learning in schools (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

**Learning Organizations**

The notion of a learning organization embodies more than just working together and communicating with one another (Senge, 2012). Bornstein (2003) reports that a learning organization’s ability to positively change stems from leadership, governance, social capital, and fundraising. Senge (2012) postulates that there are five learning disciplines in a learning organization. These include personal mastery, shared vision, mental models, and team learning (Senge, 2012). The notion of a shared vision and team learning are akin to the tenets of distributive leadership. As Senge (2012) noted,
People with a common purpose can learn to nourish a sense of commitment in a group or organization by developing shared images of the future they seek to create and the principles and guiding practices by which they hope to get there. (p. 7)

Researchers such as Antonakis (2001) believe that a strong and clear vision must be communicated in order for transformational leadership to occur. Again Senge (2012) stated

Through such techniques as dialogue and skillful discussion, small groups of people transform their collective thinking, learning to mobilize their energies and actions to achieve common goals and drawing forth an intelligence and ability greater than the sum of individual members’ talents. (p.8)

Birnbaum (2002) thinks of college presidents as masterful storytellers who link history, traditions, and a vision for the university’s future. Transactional leadership usually can be thought of as having four components: contingent rewards, passive management, active management, and laissez faire according to seminal author (Bass, 1985). In this way, the transactional leader uses rewards to achieve results, uses punishment and corrective measures in addition to having a sometimes hands-off approach to their leadership. It is believed that transformational leadership is needed where learning organizations need to change and subordinates need motivating, whereas learning organizations that are already successful fare better with a transactional leader (Clark, 1992; Hoy & Miskel, 2013; Yukl, 2012). Bornstein (2003) suggests that transformative leadership consists of both transformational and transactional leadership
styles, particularly if the president is promoting organizational and systemic change (Bornstein, 2003; Hoy & Miskel, 2013; Yukl, 2012). Transformative leadership represents a spectrum of leadership characteristics accessible to all college presidents. Hoy and Miskel (2013), state that, “Transformational leaders build commitment to the organization’s objectives and empower followers to achieve these objectives” (p. 451).

From one study by Nicholson (2007), several conclusions can be drawn. Both transactional and transformational leadership styles are used in regards to fundraising. All university presidents studied by Nicholson (2007) exemplified transformational behaviors when they were carrying out fundraising activities. They make use of transactional leadership in order to build a bridge to fundraising. According to Nicholson (2007), “In fact, the results of this study suggest that transactional and transformational leadership approaches work hand in hand to help the leader and donor accomplish higher-order change in fundraising” (p. 258). Because of the work of Bass and Avolio (2015) and Bornstein (2003), Nicholson (2007) proposed the Transformative Leadership Fundraising Model. The transformative leadership model incorporates both transactional and transformational leadership in order to build trust and confidence in the school-donor relationship. Transformational leadership behaviors then lead to successful fundraising when implemented at the right moment in time.

Vision also plays a key role in a leader’s ability to raise funds and is one of the key tenets of transformational leadership. That is, a transformational leader is said to have the ability to communicate a clear vision for his or her followers. Each university president in Nicholson’s (2007) study used history and story to link the philanthropist
with the school. For example, the University of Virginia has a very rich history that served to link fundraising to their president’s visionary leadership (Nicholson, 2007). Also, when President Gordon Gee arrived at Vanderbilt University, he immediately created a vision (Nicholson, 2007). These presidents construct their vision based on the history of the donor or of the institution, and they use stories of the donors and of the universities to enhance the vision (Nicholson, 2007). In Nicholson’s (2007) words, “The use of story emerged as one of the distinguishing factors in a president’s ability to be a highly successful fundraiser” (p. 263). The ability to take risks is also key in a president’s ability to raise funds successfully (Nicholson, 2007). For example, President Gordon Gee reorganized recreational sports and college athletics into one department, thereby reorganizing university priorities (Nicholson, 2007). Ultimately, transactional leadership was used to build donor trust whereas transformational leadership was utilized to heighten donor motivation at the right, critical moment. Creating and sustaining a vibrant culture of philanthropy, according to Seltzer (2015), is at the forefront of all school leaders’ goals. Therefore, school leaders must focus “on nurturing the deep long-term relationships that lead to transformative gifts” (Seltzer, 2015, p. 44). All development programs must be enthusiastically supported and encouraged by the head of school (Seltzer, 2015). Both public and independent school leadership must consider their unique role in guiding a strong philanthropic program in their learning organizations.
Statement of the Problem

Leaders in higher education know that leadership styles, behaviors, patterns, and characteristics influence the school’s ability to attract donor philanthropy. Similarly, independent P-12 schools face the challenge of finding sources of money in order to build new buildings, run new programs, focus on new initiatives, and maintain state-of-the-art facilities (Colson, 2015). Tuition alone does not come close to covering the costs to maintain and run an independent school. Independent schools located in Appalachia typically are not able to charge the tuition levels found elsewhere in the United States. Faculty salaries and compensation for support staff alone can run into the millions of dollars depending on the size of the school (Colson, 2015). Tuition must be kept affordable for those able to provide an independent school education for their children (Colson, 2015). Additionally, most independent institutions provide scholarships to a number of students who otherwise would not be able to afford an independent school education (Galins, 2015). Leadership is ultimately responsible for all aspects of the school including raising the funds necessary to not only run the school but to make it competitive with other independent schools (Galins, 2015).

Some schools are more successful at raising these funds than others and are therefore able to provide the finest educational facilities in existence today (Colson, 2015). Leadership is critical to successful capital development campaigns in addition to securing philanthropic support for the school (Savage & Hamlin, 2015). It is the head of school who builds the bridge with donors – who creates the story that links the donor to the school in such a way that donors feel compelled to give (Colson, 2015). It is the
people and ideas – the story of the school coupled with the donor’s story that compels donors to invest in new facilities, programming, athletic and academic initiatives (Galins, 2015). So the style of leadership (Colson, 2015) must come into play in creating a desire in people to want to give to the school. The exact leadership style, behaviors, and leadership characteristics need to be closely examined so that maximum fundraising success is achieved.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this multiple case study was to explore three heads of schools’ leadership style in terms of their ability to raise funds in three independent schools located in northern and southern Appalachia (see Figure 1). At the beginning stage of the research, the leadership style’s influence on capital development campaigns was generally defined as the ability and power to positively influence others to successfully raise funds.
Rationale

The conceptual underpinnings section provides a brief rationale for the approach of the study through leadership theory and through fundraising theories. This study explored the influence of heads of schools’ leadership style, characteristics, and leadership behaviors on philanthropy, capital development campaigns, and fundraising in three independent schools in Appalachia. This research investigated the factors associated with donor philanthropy (Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007) to facilitate a better understanding of educational organizations and how they increase their ability to raise funds. Burk’s (2003) Donor-Centered Fundraising theory, Chung-Hoon, Hite, & Hite’s (2005 & 2007) Donor/Organizational Integration Model theory, and Prince and File’s
Seven Faces Donor Profile theory guided the conceptual framework. Fundraising theory related to public relations also served as a guiding theory (Kelly, 1998).

This investigation is a multiple case study on leadership and fundraising. While independent schools face increasing financial deficits in addition to a declining enrollment, capital campaigns have become a necessity in independent, P-12 institutions. The knowledge of leadership skills remains in question as they relate to an institution’s ability to raise funds. This research set out to explore leadership influences on philanthropy and fundraising. Results of this study outline important lessons learned and offer implications for boards of trustees and school leadership at independent, P-12 learning organizations.

**Research Questions**

This is a multiple-case study. A multiple-case study is organized around two or more cases and relies on a companion case in order to augment the single case (Yin, 2014). The companion case can serve to supplement the findings of the first case such that data from the second case may fill a gap left by the first case or respond better to a shortcoming or criticism of the first case (Yin, 2014). Finally, Yin (2014) believes that the two cases taken together may create a stronger overall case study, while a third case may serve to make the findings even more compelling. Case study research has five key components according to Yin (2014). These include: a case study’s questions, its propositions, its units of analysis, the logic linking the data to the propositions, and the criteria for interpreting the findings (Yin, 2014). Case studies often have set boundaries, which may include: (a) a select period of time, a particular social group, organization or
geographic area, (b) the type of evidence to be collected, and (c) the priorities for data collection and analysis (Yin, 2014). This multiple-case study focused on three heads of school, two development directors, and three major donors in PK-12 independent school settings. Interviews were the primary vehicle for collecting and documenting evidence. According to Marshall and Rossman (2011), “Case studies take the reader into the setting with a vividness and detail not typically present in more analytic reporting formats” (p. 267). Case studies rely on historical and document analysis, interviewing, and observations for the purposes of data collection (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Research questions that guided this study were supported by a theoretical and conceptual framework affirmed by literature in the areas of fundraising and leadership, in addition to interviews of leaders at their respective schools. The following research questions guided this study:

1. What role does leadership play in attracting donor philanthropy, supporting fundraising, and running a capital development campaign?

2. How do independent heads of schools’ leadership style affect the success in multi-year capital campaign fundraising?
   a. Sub-Question 1. Is one leadership style better than another in attracting donor philanthropy?

3. How does school leadership approach opportunities and challenges within the capital campaign and in donor philanthropy?
Significance of the Study

Capital campaigns are absolutely critical in running and supporting independent schools today because revenue generated from tuition alone is not enough to support the daily operations of an independent school (Savage & Hamlin, 2015). There must be funding available for maintaining facilities, construction of new buildings, program innovations, faculty, support staff, and administrative salaries, in addition to the capital needed to support the day-to-day operations of the school (Colson, 2015). Capital campaigns are vital to recruit and attract new students through innovative and creative programming (Savage & Hamlin, 2015). A new science facility or a newly constructed natatorium can enhance attraction and recruitment of new families and students (Colson, 2015). The support of an artist-in-residence program or an author on campus for a semester can be a tremendous resource for student retention and recruitment (Colson, 2015). Independent schools must be competitive in order to attract families not only willing to pay tuition and fees to send their students to these schools, but also must offer innovative programs that will attract students to their particular school site (Savage & Hamlin, 2015). The manner in which leadership guides, supports, and facilitates philanthropy is essential in conducting a successful fundraising program (Burk, 2013; Drezner, 2014). While there is some research on higher education leadership and fundraising, this researcher was only able to find research on leadership and fundraising in separate contexts related to K-12, but not linking the two together in the same context. This researcher was not able to find much extant literature regarding successful fundraising and capital development campaigns in independent P-12 schools. Virtually
no literature exists on the influence of leadership style related to successful capital
development campaigns in P-12 independent schools.

The significance of this study is that leadership style may impact an educational
organization’s ability to raise funds, conduct a capital development campaign, and obtain
and influence donor philanthropy based on studies conducted by Bornstein (2003), Burk
philanthropy, capital development campaigns, and successful fundraising programs in
order to operate, maintain facilities, and run programs. The most successful capital
development campaigns will allow the organization to thrive, attract and recruit talented
students and faculty. The ability to construct the best school facilities helps tremendously
with student retention and recruitment because families are attracted to beautiful
campuses with innovative and progressive programs.

In the future, this study can guide the board of directors’ ability to recruit, hire,
and retain a head of school that has the necessary behavioral characteristics, skills,
attributes, expertise, and leadership style to conduct and oversee a successful capital
development campaign. In addition, school leaders can use the findings of this
investigation to strengthen their ability to raise the capital necessary to build facilities and
programs that attract and retain an ever-growing student body.

A successful capital development campaign can determine if a school will be able
to grow and expand or will only be able to maintain the status quo. Schools that want to
grow, prosper, attract new students, and build state of the art facilities must be able to
raise capital necessary for these projects. In order to fund the programs and innovations
that distinguish a good school from a great school, educational leaders must be able to successfully raise enough money for these innovations. Leadership must have the ability to attract and secure the necessary funding to put these innovations into practice.

The purpose of this investigation was to explore how three heads of school influence philanthropy, fundraising, and a capital development campaign. Their leadership characteristics were examined and the emergence of particular patterns and themes were examined. The heads of schools’ ability to influence the success of donor philanthropy and a capital campaign was based on leadership theory and fundraising theory. It was difficult to predict how one school leader would have a greater impact on fundraising and philanthropy than another school leader. It was hoped that key leadership traits and perspectives would enable the researcher to find patterns and emerging themes that could influence the successful pursuit of capital campaigns and donor philanthropy in other school contexts.

Assumptions and Limitations

The subject of this investigation involved a multiple case study. The researcher assumed that the information gathered through interviews was truthful and accurate.

Several limitations existed with this investigation. Case study research does not readily allow for broad generalizability since the population selected and the sample size is not an important factor in case study analysis (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Yin, 2014). Although three schools were critically examined, the findings from these schools may not represent successful philanthropic and capital development campaign strategies in all independent schools. The schools in this multiple case study all represented schools that
have been successful in past fundraising. Other schools may not have as many successful
capital campaigns or may not have the same key leadership in place to run a successful
capital campaign. Each school is vastly different and has its own unique context and
setting. The research, however, can be reproduced in any school setting. The criteria
used to hire these heads of school were another unknown factor.

In addition, the leaders interviewed were not representative of all school leaders.
Since these leaders were chosen because these schools are highly successful, it may be
that their leadership traits and characteristics are not typical. It would suggest that these
leaders have the most experience in fundraising as well as the most knowledge in their
ability to run and navigate capital development campaigns.

The data present certain limitations in that some of the data is based on
interviews. An investigation that includes more varied heads of school in different
contexts and settings would enable a greater degree of understanding into what leadership
characteristics are more prevalent in terms of successful fundraising ability. This study
did not look at which specific area of transformational leadership moves a philanthropist
to donate money to the school. One institution’s capital campaign might be vastly
different from another institution’s campaign.

One of the most significant assumptions in this study was the selection of the
schools themselves. Although three schools were investigated, the findings from these
schools did not necessarily represent the fundraising efforts and donor philanthropy at
other independent schools. Every independent school has differences in their fundraising
and philanthropy philosophies. Three different schools were explored and each school
was vastly different and had its own unique context and setting. This research, however, can be reproduced in any school setting. Since every independent school is unique and different, to assume that one school’s ability to attract donor philanthropy is the model to follow should not be a major assumption. Other factors such as location, school history, and community support also are critical factors to consider.

Furthermore, the leaders interviewed were not representative of all school leaders. Since these leaders were chosen because two of these schools are successful in their fundraising abilities, it may be that their leadership traits and characteristics are not typical. It was also assumed that the responses on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire were truthful and accurate. This researcher felt that the development director’s responses were perhaps less candid than the major donors since the head of school is their supervisor and they report to him.

An additional limitation of this research study was the time for the completion of the work that restricted the researcher to selecting three heads of school for interviews. With more time and resources, interviews of additional heads school would provide a wider viewpoint of the behaviors and characteristics studied in this research. Clearly, there is more that can be gleaned from future work with these heads of school.

**Organization of the Remainder of the Study**

This investigation includes five chapters. Chapter 1 is introductory in nature and includes the guiding research questions, purpose of the study, introduction, and significance of the investigation as well as the assumptions and limitations inherent in a case study design. Chapter 2 takes a closer look at the extant literature surrounding
philanthropy, fundraising, and transformational as well as transactional leadership style and associated behaviors. Current studies are also reviewed that link leadership style with successful fundraising. Leaders in community-based organizations are expected to bring in both earned and donated sources of funding in running their businesses (Bell, Masaoka, & Zimmerman, 2010). Chapter 3 reveals the research methodology involved in a multiple case study design and includes details about the sampling strategy used, interview protocols. Further, information is presented regarding the multiple methods design involving the utilization of a survey. Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study including information about the individual schools, interview summaries, analysis of the data, and a summary of the case. Chapter 5 summarizes the entire case and makes recommendations about other independent and public P-12 institutions. School leaders, according to Bell et al. (2010), are expected to raise the funds necessary to produce measurable results for their major donors.
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

“As models of leadership shift from the organizational hierarchies with leaders at the top to more distributed, shared networks, people will need to be deeply committed to cultivating their capacity to serve what’s seeking to emerge.”

--Peter Senge, 2005, p. 186

Introduction

The demand for an independent school education grew during the late 1990s and early 2000s (Narodowski & Moschetti, 2015a; Quinn et al., 2006). However, it should be noted that enrollment in independent schools has decreased during the last decade (Ewert, 2013). Galins (2015) wrote that,

As fiscal needs continue to escalated, our schools are examining their very sustainability. For years, tuition growth has outpaced inflation, and, increasingly, tuition alone can’t cover the cost of education. Enrollment is flat or declining in many markets as middle-class families struggle financially. Innovation itself brings new costs; technology becomes more and more sophisticated, and so must cyber security. As schools add dynamic programs that set them apart from other school choices, staff sizes and program costs grow. (p. 4)

At the same time, parents are still looking for educational alternatives for their children such as home schooling and virtual programs. Galins (2015) advocated that,

It is also a time of great change in education as school options expand, tuition costs mount, competition for students intensifies, family demographics shift, and students’ post-educational outcomes become less certain. These changes may
bring instability and uncertainty, but they also present tremendous opportunity.

Our independent schools may be uniquely poised to meet the challenges of our changing world. (p. 3)

Many American parents still feel that a quality education is necessary to achieve the American dream, and as such attempt to provide the best educational experience available to their children. Independent schools, however, cost money to attend, and they require a source of revenue and funding beyond tuition. As Anderson (2012) stated,

Relentless fundraising, be it for the annual fund, the spring benefit or the latest capital campaign, is as much a feature of independent schools as small classes and diverse offerings. But with schools hitting the upper limits of what they can charge for tuition, consultants, parents and school heads say the race for donations has become notably more intense and aggressive. (p. 1)

In contrast with public schools, independent schools rely almost exclusively on charitable donations, philanthropy, investments, revenue generated from tuition, and an endowment to allow the school to operate successfully (Ladd & Goertz, 2015). In order to grow and thrive, independent schools frequently construct new academic and athletic facilities. More often than not, independent schools tend to follow a university model of fundraising involving a capital campaign, annual giving, and investing. Additionally, independent institutions are in need of available working capital to pay their teachers and support staff, their utility bills, and run the day to day operations of the school (Farber, 2012; Quinn et al., 2006). Transportation of student athletes is another expenditure that independent schools face. Frequently, travel to other independent schools for athletics
involves long trips and dependable transportation. This working capital often comes from funds generated from the capital campaign and from fees generated from investments.

The construction of new facilities represents a significant area of need and debt in an independent school (Dortch, 2013; Quinn et al., 2006). Independent schools must not only renovate their existing facilities, but they must also construct new facilities. In order to have new academic centers, buildings, and athletic facilities, a capital campaign is usually launched (Poderis, 1996; Savage & Hamlin, 2015). The monies generated from the campaign allow the school to be competitive with other public and independent schools. The school facilities and athletic programs can make a difference in student recruitment and retention. Parents have become increasingly particular regarding new, innovative programs and facilities in addition to ultra-modern science facilities and the latest in technology education (Colson, 2015; Quinn et al., 2006).

Although there is evidence the independent school enrollment has been in decline, more recent trends suggest that there will be significant net growth in independent school education (Narodowski & Moschetti, 2015b; Quinn et al., 2006). For example, there were more than 3,300 new independent schools that emerged during the last ten years according to Aud (2013). Aud (2013) goes on to say

Enrollment in independent schools at the end of 2013 was over 6.8 million, which represents about 12 percent of elementary and secondary enrollment in the United States. Since 2004, independent school enrollment has increased by 500,000
students. A substantial increase is expected in independent elementary and secondary enrollment during the next ten years. (p. 51)

“The National Center for Education Statistics projects a cumulative increase in independent elementary and secondary enrollment of 7% between 2001 and 2013” (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014, p. 3). These trends suggest that there will be significant growth in independent school education for the foreseeable future.

Today, independent school leaders are faced with challenging, complicated problems that necessitate quick, thoughtful decisions. “For nonprofits, financial sustainability and programmatic sustainability cannot be separated” (Bell et al., 2010, p. 67). Financial information and impact on programs almost never include the specific impact that a fundraising activity had in a particular program (Bell et al., 2010; Farber, 2012). Program evaluations are usually reviewed without discussing the responsible fundraiser for that program (Bell et al., 2010). Bell et al. (2010) stated that,

Like nonprofit executives, funders and consultants also struggle with the need for plans that unify mission and goals on the one hand with financial realities and sustainability on the other. In particular, consultants with backgrounds in finance often tend to overemphasize conventional financial projections, whereas too many consultants in the area of strategic planning focus on consensus-building processes but lack the financial skills to bring financial perspectives productively into play. (p. 10)

Throughout the remainder of this study, key aspects of leaderships including transformational, transactional, transformative, and distributive leadership styles are
discussed. Both philanthropy and community relationships are reviewed. Community relations related to leadership is examined as well as philanthropy programs in public schools are explored. Finally, the overall design of a capital development program related to leadership, fundraising, and donor philanthropy are examined.

**Theoretical Framework**

The conceptual support section provides a brief rationale for the approach of the study through leadership theory and through fundraising theories. This study explored the influence of heads of schools’ leadership style, characteristics and leadership behaviors on capital development campaigns and fundraising in three independent schools. This research investigated the factors associated with donor philanthropy (Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007) to facilitate a better understanding of educational organizations and how they increase their ability to raise funds. Burk’s (2003) Donor-Centered Fundraising theory, Chung-Hoon et al.’s (2005 & 2007) Donor/Organizational Integration Model theory, and Prince and File’s (1994) Seven Faces Donor Profile theory guided the conceptual framework. Fundraising theory related to public relations also served as a guiding theory (Kelly, 1998). Nicholson’s (2007) Transformative Fundraising Model (see Figure 2) also guided the conceptual framework.
This study is a multiple case study set in the larger phenomena of leadership and fundraising. While independent schools face increasing financial deficits, capital campaigns have become a necessity in independent, P-12 institutions. The knowledge of leadership skills remains in question as related to an institution’s ability to raise funds. This research explored leadership influences on philanthropy and fundraising. This study learned important lessons and has implications for boards of trustees and school leadership at independent P-12 learning organizations.

**Leadership**

Today’s heads of independent schools have become increasingly aware of the need for a strong financial plan for their schools. “Today’s effective leaders hold impact and financial return in an integrated way, all the time” (Bell et al., 2010, p. 50). Working with the board of trustees, independent school leaders are analyzing their financial situations and that of other schools in innovative ways. Working in conjunction with the
board of trustees, independent school leadership must develop, adhere to, and maintain a vision and mission, a plan for new buildings and facilities, as well as a strong short term and long range financial strategy. Bell et al. (2010) states “We know from our work with leaders all over the country that the struggle for sustainability--for deep impact and adequate working capital--has never been greater” (p. 75). In this way, educational organizations and their donors can be strengthened. According to Anderson (2012), independent school leaders suggest that they spend much of their time in search of money and their efforts are being noticed. According to the National Association of Independent Schools (as reported in Anderson, 2012) the annual giving raised per school increased 268 percent over the last decade to $1.7 million from $462,341. Nationally, Anderson (2012) reports that the national median donation has increased by 63 %.

Bornstein (2005) wrote that:

Fundraising is cited by fifty-three percent of all the respondents as a daily activity. As many as ninety-one percent say they engage in fundraising activities at least every week. Since colonial times, presidents of higher-education institutions have been expected to demonstrate both academic leadership and fundraising prowess. But the magnitude of dollars that presidents must now raise dwarfs past expectations; added to the other demands that presidents cite, the job is much more complex today. (p. 2)

The following sections turn to a discussion of various leadership styles that school leaders should consider in running a successful philanthropic program in independent P-12 schools. These leadership styles include transactional, transformational, and
distributed leadership. Seemingly, all three may be necessary to run a successful annual fund, capital campaign, and strong fundraising program in independent learning organizations. Bornstein (2003), one of the most successful fundraisers in higher education, believes that fundraising results from a combination of both transactional and transformational leadership, and she put forth the notion of transformative leadership. Transformative leadership results from the combination of transactional and transformational leadership. Nicholson (2007) also found that university presidents who are successful in their fundraising efforts use both transactional and transformational leadership at different times. However, the role of the university president and head of school is so complicated that one cannot do it alone. Harris (2014) states, “So where professionals work collectively and systematically, when they engage in systematic or disciplined collaboration, then positive outcomes are much more likely to result” (p. 32). Harris (2014) also believes that distributed leadership is how influence is shared.

**Transactional Leadership**

A transactional leader motivates employees through an open exchange of rewards for employee performance (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). For example, a superintendent may provide release time for principals to plan major curricular changes in their schools. Transactional leaders attempt to understand what employees want from work and try to provide them that support (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). “Transactional leaders pursue a cost-benefit, economic exchange to meet followers’ current material and psychological needs in return for contracted services rendered by the subordinate” (Bass 1985, p. 16).
Transactional leadership can be subdivided into three categories (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Contingent rewards are used by the transactional leader whereby rewards are provided to the employee contingent upon completing the task. Leaders get what they want and employees get what they want in the contingent rewards system of leadership (Kuhnert & Lewis, 1987; Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Active management by exception is a form of transactional leadership in which leaders stay on top of situations and employees. Leaders watch subordinates and situations very closely and make recommendations if they perceive something is out of line. Passive management-by-exception occurs when leadership does not intervene until the situation becomes deleterious. In the latter case, leaders wait to take corrective action until a particular situation is called to their attention. Transactional leadership can be effective (Bass & Riggio, 2006; Yukl, 2012). Transactional leadership can be better, however, when transformational leadership is also used (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

**Transformational Leadership**

Bass (1996) and Yukl (2012) have written extensively on both transactional and transformational leadership. The basic difference is in the type of behaviors used to influence subordinates as well as the impact of leadership on subordinates. Transformational leaders inspire a sense of trust, respect, loyalty, and admiration for the leader. Subordinates, in turn, are more highly motivated to do more work than was originally intended. In other words, the transformational leader inspires workers to go above and beyond what is expected of them. Bass (1996) reported that the leader inspires subordinates by making them more aware of the results of their hard work. This going
above and beyond, according to Senge (2012) and Bass (1996), places the workers emphasis on the learning organization rather than their own interest. Their ability for the worker to be influenced by the leader to work for the greater good of the organization is at the very heart of transformational leadership.

Transactional leadership may result in the subordinate compliance; however, there may be little buy-in or a sense of urgency to work for the greater good. Transactional leadership does not inspire the worker or subordinate to achieve for the greater good (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Transactional leadership does not inspire or raise the level of urgency so that the worker takes it upon herself to change. Rather, transactional leadership may only result in compliance (Hoy & Miskel, 2013).

Yukl (2012) feels that effective leaders make use of both transactional as well as transformational leadership. Transformational and transactional leadership can be described in terms of the leader’s behaviors and can be further divided into subcategories (Yukl, 2012). According to Bass and Avolio (2015), “For example, transformational behaviors include idealized influence (builds trust and acts with integrity), individualized consideration (coaches and develops people), inspirational motivation (encourages others), and intellectual stimulation (encourages innovative thinking)” p. 4.

Transactional leader behavior is based on contingent rewards (rewards achievement), active management by exception (monitors deviations and mistakes), and passive management by exception (fights fires) (Bass, 1996). The naming within each style of leadership was developed by Bass (1996) through his development of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire or MLQ.
The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire identifies behavioral characteristics associated with each style of leadership. Bass (1996) and Lambert (2007) identified three behavioral characteristics within transformational leadership. Lambert (2007) described school principals with high leadership capacity as having a clear self-identification and strong beliefs in democracy. Lambert (2007) also reports that high capacity leaders think strategically, have a deliberate persona, are knowledgeable of the work of teaching and learning, and ultimately have the ability to develop capacity in others and in the organization. Idealized influence creates a passionate identity between the leader and the follower. Intellectual stimulation enables the follower to see problems and change in a new light. The leader highlights the current situation and creates a sense of urgent change. Support, motivation, and encouragement for followers are characteristics of individualized consideration. The leader acts much like a football or basketball coach by coaching the followers. Inspirational motivation is another component of transformational leadership behavior in which the leader puts forth a vision and not only uses symbols but also lives certain characteristic behaviors (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Lambert (2007) describes high capacity school leaders as caring and collaborative.

Transactional leadership theory describes two characteristic types of leader behaviors. These include contingent reward and passive management by exception (Yukl, 2012). Leaders who demonstrate contingent reward behavior make the rules clear in addition to using contingent rewards to motivate employees. If a subordinate succumbs to a shortcoming, the leadership characteristic of passive management by exception may be employed. In this case, contingent punishments such as an
improvement plan are the behavior employed if corrective action is needed in order to motivate an employee to improve his or her performance. Bass and Avolio (1990) added another behavioral characteristic to their theory of transactional leadership. Active management by exception focuses on mistakes and reinforces the acceptable norms in order to minimize organizational and performance failures. Transactional leadership enforces and reinforces compliance with organizational mandates. Bass and Riggio (2006) describe nine leadership factors ranging from laissez-faire to transactional to transformational leadership.

Transformational leadership results in intrinsic behaviors in which followers are so impassioned to do more for the organization in order to bring about change that he or she relates their values with that of the greater good. The transformational leader articulates a clear vision and mission for the organization and communicates his or her vision and mission clearly (Yukl, 2012). However, Bass (1996) also believes that a transformational leader must exhibit charisma. Charisma is an important part of transformational leadership, but taken alone, charisma is not all that transformational leadership entails (Bass, 1996).

Transformational leadership works in all organizations and cultures (Bass, 1997; Hargreaves & Fink, 2007). Yukl (2012) finds that there is no part of transformational leadership theory that does not coincide with various learning organizations and school cultures. Bass (1997) supports this notion by citing that transformational leadership works in varying organizations, in varying countries, and at various levels of organizational hierarchy. In most situations, at least some degree of transformational
leadership is beneficial (Yukl, 2012). Hargreaves and Fink (2007), state “Sustainable leadership develops and does not deplete material and human resources. It renews people’s energy” (p. 445). However, certain situations may not call for transformational leadership, even though transformational leadership may be universally positivistic. Often, for example, learning organizations that are high-performing will opt for a leader who is more transactional than transformational (Bornstein, 2005).

Most research studies conducted on transformational leadership analyzed leader behavioral characteristics and how they motivate subordinates. Researchers in the field used surveys to identify leadership behaviors that are considered to be transformational. Bass and Avolio (1990) developed a questionnaire that measures transformational leadership behaviors and was more recently evaluated by Antonakis, Avolio, and Sivasubramaniam (2003). A meta-analysis was conducted on thirty-nine studies about the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Lowe, Kroeck, and Sivasubramaniam (1996) found that charisma, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation were related to leadership effectiveness. Hargreaves and Fink (2007) point to three sources of renewal in schools, which include trust, confidence, and emotion. Hargreaves and Fink (2007) went on to state, “Positive emotion creates energy; negative emotion saps it” (p. 466). Effective leadership behaviors were strongly correlated with transformational leadership (Yukl, 2012). Some correlation with leadership effectiveness was reported on transactional leadership involving the leadership behavior of contingent rewards.

Kirkpatrick and Locke (1996) conducted an actual experiment to examine the effects of key leadership behaviors. These behaviors included visioning, expressive
communication, and providing clarifying work advice to subordinates. These leadership behaviors resulted in a greater sense of subordinate trust. Followers of leaders who had a vision had a greater sense of urgency about completing the work and thought that the work was interesting. Subordinates also set higher performance goals. Having a clear message and a strong vision had a positive impact on subordinate’s work. Hoy and Miskel (2013) describe the importance of vision in organizations as follows:

These leaders display conviction about important issues; exhibit high standards of ethical and moral conduct, sharing risks with followers in setting and attaining goals; consider the needs of others over their own; and use power to move individuals or groups toward accomplishing their mission, vision, and cause, but never for personal gain. Transformational leaders energize people by projecting an attractive and optimistic future, emphasizing ambitious goals, creating idealized visions for the organization, and clearly communicating to followers that the vision is attainable. Hence, team spirit, enthusiasm, optimism, goal commitment, and a shared vision arise and coalesce within the work group or organization. (p. 450)

Experiments in the field have also demonstrated the positive outcomes of transformational leadership. Barling, Weber, and Kelloway (1996) conducted a study in a bank in which managers were training branch managers. One group of branch managers was trained to use intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. These managers, in turn, were compared with a control group that did not receive the transformative behaviors. As a result, there was a larger degree of organizational
commitment and increased sales with the group that was trained in transformational leadership.

Another study supported the benefits of transformational leadership. This study, conducted by Dvir, Eden, Avolio, and Shamir (2002) used an experiment on Israeli infantry officers. One group of commanding officers who trained the infantry officers received transformational leadership behavior and another group did not use transformational leadership behaviors. The group of infantry officers who received the transformational leadership behaviors had higher platoon scores when performing exercises in the field and the subordinates had higher scores in the areas of motivation including self-efficacy, independent thinking, and putting forth the extra effort (Yukl, 2012).

Bennis and Nanus (1985) conducted a descriptive and comparative study on ninety leaders in the public and independent sector that had been identified as transformational leaders. They found these leaders all had a vision or a dream about the future of the organization. The leaders were all committed to the visions that they held. Some leaders utilized the strategic mission statement, whereas others merely had a dream. Followers who bought into the vision depended upon the trust built between them and the leader. The leaders built trust through their use of consistent actions and statements. Ultimately, these leaders made use of the self-efficacies of subordinates and used the collective efficacy of the organization to realize the leader’s vision.

Yukl (2012) believes that another type of descriptive research makes use of case studies of individual transformational leaders. For example, Roberts (1985) studied a
superintendent of schools in two successive positions. The superintendent’s first position required massive budget cuts and the elimination of jobs. The school board accepted her decisions without question. They approved her budgetary cuts unanimously. Yet, she was still able to implement program innovations in the schools. At board meetings she had a cult-like following and meetings often ended with teachers giving her a standing ovation. Parents, teachers, school board members and other administrators described her as a visionary (Yukl, 2012).

This superintendent achieved her transformational leadership status by maintaining and referring often to a clearly defined organizational vision. She created a mission statement and referred to it frequently while initiating change. She involved other key district staff and leadership in creating a strategic vision. She replaced several key positions in the organization with individuals who were in support of the change effort. She developed a clear line of communication with her immediate subordinates, the school principals. She developed action plans for them, held regular follow-up meetings with them, and included them in all aspects of the change process. She set up task forces to solicit input from all stakeholders regarding where and how to make the necessary budget cuts. Staff members received the necessary skills to lead meetings seeking public input and support from the various stakeholders. Roberts (1985) felt that this leader captured the collective-efficacy of the stakeholders. This leader had tremendous energy, and motivated people into action through her enthusiasm and involvement of others. The superintendent enabled the organizational stakeholders to see that they could work together for the greater good.
Subsequently, this superintendent was promoted to the state superintendent in charge of public instruction. She led the state educational systems in a highly similar fashion as she did in her previous position. She created a mission statement and held a firm vision for change. She replaced several key staff members so that her change initiatives would be supported. She visited every school district in the state thereby creating enthusiasm for her innovations and her leadership. However, after her four years in office, she was not viewed as a transformational leader, even though she was transformational in her previous position as a school superintendent. “The commissioner’s initiatives had some positive benefits, but they did not generate any widespread support for major change in the educational system” (Yukl, 2012). Other researchers, such as Roberts and Bradley (1988), suggest that the superintendent was transformational in one position but not in another because there was a major need for organizational change at the local level whereas at the state level, there were no pressing issues. Also, as a local superintendent, she had much more say about key issues than she did at the state level. Her second position was a political appointment that involved a highly complex bureaucratic structure. She had to delegate more responsibilities and duties to other individuals due to the large complex nature of running the state educational system. Politics also got in the way of her need to change key players on her organizational team. Thus, she was unable to enact wide sweeping change initiatives as she did at the local level. She also did not develop the same, tight-knit relationships that she did at the local level and the personal element was lacking among the various stakeholders. Therefore, trust was not built in the same way that it was at the local level.
Large-scale venues also made her speeches less passionate than they were at smaller local town meetings. She was reappointed, but not viewed by others as a transformational leader (Yukl, 2012).

Transformational leadership refers to some change or transformation between leaders and followers. The leader changes or transforms the behavior of the followers in some capacity in order to bring about profound change. Some experts, such as Yukl (2012) and Avolio and Bass (2002), view charisma or charismatic leadership as distinct or overlapping with transformational leadership. Other leadership theorists, such as Bass (1985) and Hargreaves and Fink (2007), feel that the attribute of charisma is a vital component of transformational leadership. Bass (1985) also believed that a leader might exhibit charismatic behaviors but might not be transformational. Hargreaves and Fink (2007) reported that when leaders feel energized and alive, there is no limit to all that they can accomplish. The fundamental premise of transformational leadership is developing and inspiring leadership capacity in others (Yukl, 2012). Transformational leaders empower their followers to want to carry out the greater good. Transformational leaders build a school culture that allows its stakeholders to contribute to the decision making process in a genuine fashion.

Transformational leaders, according to Yukl (2012), articulate a clear and enticing vision. They communicate how the vision can be achieved. These transformational leaders lead with confidence and are genuinely positive in nature. They also place a lot of trust, hope, and optimism in subordinates, which in turn empowers followers. Transformational leaders lead by doing. They not only talk the talk, but they walk the
walk. They use symbolic actions to underscore important cultural norms within the organization. Finally, transformational leaders build trust and confidence in their followers, which in turn builds a sense of achieving for the greater good. Followers of transformational leaders want to do anything and everything they can to achieve the dream, vision, and mission that the transformational leader has clearly articulated.

**Distributed Leadership**

The head of an independent school must work with a development team in order to coordinate the annual fund, capital development campaigns, and organize major donors (Colson, 2015). Distributed leadership is the ability to lead with teams and groups (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Multiple groups or several individuals share the leadership responsibilities that historically are given to one individual (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). “Leadership, then, is distributed across the organization at need” (Hoy & Miskel, 2013, p. 447). Gronn (2002) reported that change functions, such as creating a vision for change, motivating others, and monitoring organizational dynamics can be accomplished through a distribution of leadership. Individuals that support distributing leadership capacity believe that school organizations are so complicated that it would be impossible to manage all of the tasks efficiently (Hoy & Miskel, 2013). Moreover, distributive leadership means distributing power (Gronn & Hamilton, 2004). March (2005) advocated that efficient organizations result when situations are handled by individuals close to the problem. Spillane’s (2006) model of distributive leadership is based on the premise that multiple individuals in the school organization identify, acquire, allocate, coordinate, and use social, material, and cultural resources to enhance the learning
organization. Reasoning that principals and superintendents cannot succeed alone, Spillane (2006) observed that “multiple formal and informal leaders and their followers mobilize to guide and do the tasks necessary to transform or make major changes in their schools.” (p. 447). In other words, leadership activities are distributed in an interactive web of leaders, followers, and situations” (Spillane, 2006, p. 447). He went on to suggest that the situation is the key because tasks are coordinated as leadership practice emerges through the in situ interaction of leaders, subordinates, and the context (see Figure 4). Distributive leadership is a critical consideration in the coordination of a successful philanthropy program in an independent school. No head of school could do it alone. Development teams vary in size in accordance with the size of the school. Some heads of school are more involved in development than others, however, highly successful heads of school work in harmony with their development team (inside the school), major donors, alumni, parents (outside the school) and other philanthropic constituents (between other schools) (see Figure 3).

Hargreaves et al. (2010) theorized that high performing organizations in business, medicine, and education underscore that purposeful team action is imperative for organizational success. Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) reported that social capital is key for an organization to stay at peak performance and enables the organization to work in harmony. As Harris (2014) purposed,

It is increasingly clear that the only way to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement is to invest in collective capacity building. This means harnessing the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the system in
order to improve the system. Creative collaboration has a sweet spot that consists of the right mixture of established relationships and newcomers. Within this collaborative cocktail, distributed leadership is pivotal because it is the social glue that supports effective interdependent working. (p. 4)

According to Harris (2014), distributed leadership is an important way in which to increase organizational performance that yield better results. Distributed leadership has the potential to create collaboration and cohesive work that leads to optimal successful performance in an organization (Harris, 2014). “There is emerging empirical evidence to suggest that distributed leadership is more than just a theoretical perspective” (Harris, 2014, p. 15).

Leithwood (2008) believed that distributed leadership is a by-product of positive school cultures, but it usually results from careful planning and thoughtful design. Leithwood (2008) suggested that leaders utilizing a distribution of leadership have several key traits. These include beliefs that individuals care about the organization, a great deal of trust of others, trustworthiness, building and reinforcing relationships, strategies that demonstrated consistent values, and vision resulting in success (Leithwood, 2008). Hargreaves et al. (2010) pointed out that “The high performance leaders invested heavily in building strong relationships, sharing leadership with others, developing collaborative teams, and generating high levels of intra-organizational trust” (p. 22). Spillane, Halverson, and Diamond, (2001) put forth the idea that quality relationships matter a great deal. Spillane (2006) theorized that distributed leadership results from many individuals working together through complex interactions and
relationships, and interrelationships among all members of the organization (see Figure 3).

Distributed leadership, according to Spillane (2006) is “practice distributed over leaders, followers and their situation and incorporates the activities of multiple groups of individuals” (p. 12). Harris (2014) theorized that distributed leadership is two-fold: how leadership happens with an organization and how leadership is developed and extended. “Distributed leadership is primarily concerned with mobilizing leadership expertise at all levels in the organization to generate more opportunities for change and to generate the capacity for improvement” (Harris, 2014, p. 40). In practical terms, distributive leadership must be carefully planned and orchestrated by those in formal authority (Harris, 2014). “It won’t just happen” (Harris, 2014, p. 41). Therefore, formal leaders must lay the groundwork and create the opportunities for distributive leadership to occur (Harris, 2014).

In order to distribute leadership, a shift in organizational culture must occur from top-down leadership to a shared organic sense of leadership (Harris, 2014). Harris (2014) stated, “The challenge is to develop organizational cultures that are conducive to supporting and nurturing the interactions between individuals and teams that result in problem solving and innovation” (p. 43). As Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) asserted, “Groups, teams, and communities are far more powerful than individuals when it comes to developing human capital” (p. 3). There is reason to believe that there is a powerful relationship between distributed leadership and organizational outcomes and success (Harris, 2014). Again, Harris (2014) noted, “Distributed leadership is increasingly being...
viewed at the system level as a strategic lever for building the collective capacity for change” (p. 59). International countries are making use of distributed leadership as part of their systemic reform process (Harris, 2014). Countries such as Norway believe that a successful head of school is associated with distributed leadership practice (Moller et al., 2005).

Social capital is a result of relationships that occur when structures are in place that enable people to coordinate and achieve desired goals (Harris, 2014). Social capital stems from shared values and behaviors that make events come together (Cohen & Prusak, 2001). As Harris (2014) stated, “The essence of social capital therefore is
equitable participation in a joint enterprise, implying shared or distributed leadership and interdependent or collaborative working” (p. 78). Distributed leadership, then, occurs when collaboration builds social capital that increases organizational performance (Harris, 2014). Evidence suggests that by focusing upon and improving productive relationships, leaders can alter an entire organization’s ability to achieve better outcomes (Harris, 2014). Distributed leadership sets boundaries and norms that lead to enhanced outcomes (Harris, 2014). Distributed leadership enables professionals to have opportunities to be leaders in their own right so that they can have a positive influence. Ultimately, distributed leadership has powerful influence on the professional practice of others (Harris, 2014).

Harris (2014) described eight characteristics of distributed leadership as:

1. Vision undergirds the mission.
2. Leaders are experts with no formal authority.
3. Teams work together to achieve a specific goal.
4. A sense of community is evident.
5. Each team member becomes a stakeholder.
6. Goals of the organization are subdivided and broken down.
7. Specific roles and tasks are distributed.
8. Questions must be asked in order to change and grow.

The eight characteristics of distributed leadership that Harris (2014) outlines are the hallmarks of success in an organization. Spillane (2006) described stretch leadership whereby pockets of leadership opportunities are created by senior leadership laterally
across the organization. The distributive leadership model described by Spillane and Diamond (2007) portrays a relationship between leaders, followers, and their situation (see Figure 4). A second model, however, depicts distributive leadership by analyzing the structural alignment, compositions, and patterns of distributed leadership (Harris, 2014). This model describes ways in which organizations are rearranging leadership practice.

Figure 4. Leaders, Followers, Situation, and Time Continuum (Spillane, 2006)

Another distributive leadership model (see Figure 5) portrays both tight and loose organizational coupling (Harris, 2014). The model also depicts diffuse and deep forms of leadership distribution. By plotting these typologies on an axis, four different forms of distributed leadership practice occur. Ad-hoc distribution represents a flexible, loose organization structure where leadership practice is uncoordinated and random (Harris,
Autocratic distribution has a rigid leadership structure in which involvement is encouraged. Additive distribution occurred when leadership opportunities are deliberately created for developmental and innovative work. The work results in additive leadership that is not transformational. Ambitions distribution results in transformative organizational practices in which innovation and change are created. Again, Harris (2014) noted “The leadership work is coordinated and disseminated in ways that impact positively upon the organization and other organizations” (p. 122).

Evidence from the medical, education, and business communities indicates that distributive leadership is imperative to success of the organization (Harris, 2014).

Figure 5. Models of Distribution (Harris, 2008, p. 122)
Philanthropy

The characteristics of donors and their reasons for giving are explored by Loyd (2010), in addition to their desire to give freely. Loyd (2010) also looked at organizations receiving those gifts and their beliefs about donating. The barriers to donating must also be considered regarding the effort to raise funds. The responsibility of managing and receiving philanthropic donations is one aspect of stewardship that the school leader must consider (Conway, 2003). Conway (2003) also encouraged school leaders to consider the core values and mission of the organization when managing fundraising since a great deal of trust is afforded the school leader. Muir and May (1993) suggested that leadership should consider a sense of caring for donors and ensure that all members of the organization have a deep appreciation for and sense of caring for the donors. At the time that school leadership makes the donors a part of the school culture, the school is moving toward an effective fundraising program (Muir & May, 1993). Schein (1996) reported that the culture of an organization is portrayed through its artifacts. However, a group’s culture is also more accurately described by its members’ shared beliefs. Moreover, the way in which those shared beliefs came to fruition is an important consideration (Schein, 1996). Organizational stewardship is an important culture when considering donors and their willingness to give freely. This cultural belief of organizational stewardship is often neglected when school leaders consider budgets within the organization. However, it is through a deep cultural understanding of donors and the mission and vision of the organization that the school leader can create a pathway toward transformational giving (Grace & Wendroff, 2001). It is therefore critical for the
school leader to consider characteristic traits of people who are major donors and
contributors to the school organization and their reasons for giving (Loyd, 2010).

Seymour (1999) stated that,

Every cause needs people more than money. For when people are with you and
are giving your cause their attention, interest, confidence, advocacy, and service,
financial support should just about take care of itself. Without them, you might as
well go and get lost. So you’d better know as much about people as you can. (p. xvii)

According to the Donor-centered fundraising model (Burk, 2003), more donors
will stay with a learning organization longer and the individual employing the model will
encourage donors to increase the size of their gifts. Donor-centered fundraising elevates
the donor’s giving to transformational giving. A tremendous amount of time is spent
attracting new donors to give to the organization, therefore, it is important that a
continued relationship be maintained into the future because ultimately fundraising is
about building lasting relationships Burk (2003). He also believed that school leadership
must build lasting relationships with donors immediately after receiving the first gifts.

Prince and File (1994) segmented donors into seven faces or seven emergent
donor clusters (see Figure 6). Furthermore, development and advancement officials
agreed with the findings of the Seven-Faces Study (Prince & File, 1994). According to
Loyd (2010) and Prince and File (1994, p. 9-10), the seven faces or seven types of donors
include (a) the communitarians, local business owners who donate to help their local
businesses and their communities; (b) the devout who give out of devotion to God; (c) the
investors who represent the wealthy giving for estate and tax benefits; (d) the socialites, members of local society involved in charity work; (e) the altruists, who give to good causes; (f) the re-payers, individuals who have benefitted from the school and want to pay something back to the organization; (g) the dynasts, whose families have a longstanding tradition of philanthropic endeavors.

Schervish and Herrman (1988) conducted a study entitled *The Study on Wealth and Philanthropy*. In their study, they explored the sociology of money and ask questions about why wealthy people give to charitable organizations. According to Schervish and Herman (1988), wealth brings empowerment. Philanthropic giving is a
method that establishes a place in the world and a lasting presence. Wealth creates a positive resource to influence society and to create a lasting identity within a social context (Loyd, 2010). People want to be identified as a member of a worthwhile cause (Seymour, 1999). Wealthy donors want to create a lasting legacy and to be identified as a respected group. Another basic motivation is keeping the present connected with the past while maintaining a sense of continuity (Seymour, 1999).

Grace and Wendroff (2001) coined the term *transformational giving*. By this they meant that once the relationship is established with the donor, that relationship must be continuously fostered and nurtured so that the giving becomes transformed to lasting giving. The relationship must be continuously renewed and this continued relationship leads to successful fundraising (Loyd, 2010). Donors that are transformational want to be centrally involved in the organization in order to see the realization of their gifts. Some donors simply like being affiliated with the organization and derive pleasure from the association with the charitable organization. For example, some donors to independent schools like to continue their relationship with the schools through the years, and allow the school to use their donation any way the school prefers. Nearly all independent schools set up their own nonprofit foundations for their donors contribute. Some individuals like to give out of their own generosity for spiritual purposes. Still others give in order to establish an institutional framework on which they base their lives (Schervish, 2005).

Donors also give to issues (Bovernini, 2006). Grace and Wendroff (2001) reported that donors like value-laden organizations with clear vision and mission
statements reflective of those core values. These donors want to be accepted along with their opinions and philosophies. School leaders should have an appreciation for donor ideas, donor issues, their involvement in the organization, as well as the donor’s potential impact and long-term investment (Grace & Wendroff, 2001).

Some interesting conclusions about philanthropy in New York’s charter schools were developed in a study by Baker and Ferris (2011). Per pupil expenditure in New York’s charter schools varies widely and is determined by independent donor philanthropy (Baker & Ferris, 2011). Although independent donor philanthropy does not appear to influence student achievement in New York City, the charter schools have far greater resources with which to do great things (Baker & Ferris, 2011). Baker and Ferris (2011) found, “Despite the lack of relationship between the spending by NYC charters and their test scores, philanthropists continue to give large sums and advocates continue to argue that the charters are doing more with less” (p. 27).

Corporations, such as Honda, also devote funds they donate to schools. For example, Honda of America has a philanthropic foundation that supports schools with a STEM focus (Easton, 2012). As a philanthropic organization, the Honda Foundation “doesn’t just give; it makes sure the philosophies that the corporation embraces are deeply manifested in the initiative” (Easton, 2012, p. 23). Honda of America has invested heavily in Eagle Rock School in Colorado (Easton, 2012). Honda invested more than twenty years ago and matches its corporate philosophies with its philanthropy (Easton, 2012). The Eagle Rock School also serves as a professional development center
for adults. The Honda Foundation contributed nearly thirty million dollars in forty-nine states (Easton, 2012).

**Community Relationships**

Burk (2003) theorized that school organizations can achieve better long term success when they make their schools centered around the donors rather than particular school related issues. Involving the donors in the school organization goes a long way toward donor retention and toward successful fundraising. Burk (2003) suggested that schools give serious consideration to donors’ interests and concerns. Prince and File (1994) also suggested giving the donors’ advisors a similar amount of attention since they are in direct communication with the major donors. Moreover, the donors can be segmented into categories in which Prince and File (1994) advocated. By placing the donors into one of the seven categories, school leadership can tailor their efforts toward maximum fundraising success. Seymour (1999) suggested studying the donors in great detail because they are needed more than the money itself. Schervish and Herman (1998) suggested that the wealthy give to philanthropy so that they can shape the world. Examples of this include the Rockefeller’s restoration of Williamsburg, Virginia, and Nelson Rockefeller’s vision for Grand Teton National Park. The carriage roads in Acadia National Park, donated by the Rockefeller’s also have left a lasting legacy. Carnegie Hall and Carnegie-Mellon University are lasting legacies of the Carnegie Family. Paul Mellon has certainly left a legacy and Cumberland Island National Seashore is part of his way of shaping the world. Donors to schools have a similar impact and influence through programs, facilities, centers and buildings. The Benefields of Sea Island, Georgia,
funded Benefield Hall at Frederica Academy located on St. Simons Island, Georgia that houses Frederica Academy’s Middle School.

A deep understanding of organizational culture is also critical for school leadership. Heads of school must understand the cultural ideals, beliefs, vision, and mission of the individuals that make up the learning organization. Chung-Hoon et al. (2005) and Weerts (2007) also suggested active engagement and donor involvement for successful fundraising, and they recommended getting a clear understanding of the organizational structure in order to suggest the best possible method for attracting independent donations (see Figure 7).
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**Figure 7.** Organizational Structure (Chung-Hoon et al., 2005)
Another avenue of fundraising is celebrity endorsements, which can also play a unique role in school philanthropy and fundraising. Recently, Laura Bush appeared at an independent school in Jacksonville, Florida and helped the school raise large sums of money. Heads of independent schools need to carefully consider the power of utilizing celebrity endorsers for the purposes of raising funds for their schools, which also creates excitement and enthusiasm in the process. Miciak and Shanklin (1994) reported that about one-fourth of American television commercials contain a celebrity endorsement. People have a sense of trust of most celebrities and view them as successful. Success breeds success. Domino (2003) added that celebrities can get into the consumer’s psyche and can bring an important message through their own unique personality. Celebrities create a sense of belonging and a sense of connectedness. If a school program or facility is recommended by a celebrity, potential donors not only feel connected with the celebrity, but they also feel that it is important to donate to the cause endorsed by the celebrity. Martin (1996) said that celebrities put forth certain characteristics that donors use to link to the cause. Indeed, positive attitudes and energy are brought by celebrities to particular causes (Kamins, Brand, Hoeke, & Moe, 1989). Celebrities bring excitement and extraversion to such routine charitable events as the annual fund or the spring fling (Atkin & Schiller, 2002). Celebrities can motivate donors to give generously when coupled with school leadership’s strategic planning. Wheeler (2002) cautioned that not all donors are influenced by celebrity endorsers. Credible celebrities that are linked to a particular cause make better celebrity endorsers than those not necessarily linked to the
According to Domino (2003), celebrities are best suited for charitable fundraising when they have a link with the school organization.

Laura Bush, mentioned previously, frequently promotes literacy, and is a former first lady, and school librarian. Laura Bush is a highly trusted, highly educated individual who has played an integral role in public and independent education. Former students who have gone on to careers in arts and entertainment make highly influential celebrity endorsers. The Asheville School in Asheville, North Carolina has several former students that have gone on to illustrious careers in singing and acting including *CSI: Miami*’s Amy Bellamy Young (‘87) and Roy Kim (‘12), a famous pop singer in South Korea. Actress Gwyneth Paltrow graduated from The Spence School in Manhattan, while Tommy Lee Jones and Owen Wilson graduated from St. Marks School in Dallas. Reese Witherspoon also graduated from Harpeth Hall in Nashville, Tennessee. Famous politicians are also independent school graduates including President Obama who is a graduate of the famous Punahou School in Hawaii, President George W. Bush, Phillips Exeter Academy, and Vice-President Al Gore, St. Albans School, Washington, D. C.

Domino (2003) described and summarized four models of fundraising. The first model is based on creating a positive public image in which only positive information is released about the school organization utilizing a clear emotional appeal during this approach. Another model, already in existence, is based on giving out information about unmet needs within the organization. In this model, according to previous research by Kelly (1998), informed donors are targeted and direct mail is most frequently used. Still another approach is to use research that persuades the donor with a strong desire to give
freely. Persuasive research is used to deliver the message and is usually believed by the audience (Domino, 2003). The last model presented by Domino (2003) is based on a mutual exchange of information between the potential donor the school organization. It is based on a sense of mutualism and cooperativeness. This mutually collaborative model, previously described by (Tindall, 2002), is built on lasting relationships between the donor and the school. (Domino, 2003) considered the latter mutually collaborative model to be critical, imperative, and tantamount.

**Community Relations and Leadership**

Gronstedt and Thorsen (1996) advocated that public relations must form relationships with people inside and outside of the organization. Individuals with strong public relations skills have a keen understanding that one group of stakeholders must relate to individuals that have a stake in the organization’s routines. The two-way asymmetrical model of public relations makes use of research to persuade an organization. The two-way symmetrical model is based on the public relations theory that theorizes that there is a relationship between management and the effect that an organization has on the public (Domino, 2003). Systems theory places these public relations models as open systems. They are open systems because information gathered through research shapes the message to the public that leads to some organizational change. Multiple models of fundraising are the way to go according to Alessandrini (1998). Tindall (2002) agreed that mixed models of fundraising is critical to fundraising success. Born and Wilson (2000) reported that,
Grant makers’ governing boards should examine the possibilities of unintended consequences when making grant decisions for public education. For example, foundations should be cautious about doing the work of schools and school leaders. They should not put themselves in the position to taking responsibility away from the community and from school officials as it is very hard to transfer such responsibility back once taken away. (p. 16)

The entire community needs to be involved in philanthropy and fundraising in independent schools. Major donors are critically important; however the community as a whole needs to be an integral part of the campaign. Community includes alumni, parents, students, faculty, and staff (Jarrell, 2015). The entire school community needs to be invited during the public phase to take ownership of the campaign (Jarrell, 2015). The school community should have the opportunity to network, volunteer, host events, and even build community by wearing school attire because each member of the school community needs to feel a personal connection to the school story (Jarrell, 2015).

Campus-wide enthusiasm and donor pride must be an integral part of philanthropy and fundraising (Jarrell, 2015). Videos, photos, t-shirts, and other projects adopted by various stakeholders in the community are ways of building support for the campaign and create a powerful message that strengthens support for the campaign (Jarrell, 2015).

“That’s when you know your campaign story is truly successful--when it’s too compelling, too big, too contagious for the advancement office to contain” (Jarrell, 2015, p. 127).
There are a number of cultivation techniques with potential community partners. The ability to attract planned gifts necessitates personal interaction with prospective donors in addition to effective partnerships with members of the school community. One strategy is to begin with individuals that you know want to contribute to the school through legacies, wills, and trusts, and with individuals who want to do more for the school (Ketting, 2015). Individuals such as alumni and parents who have given in the past are good sources for planned gift conversations and face-to-face conversations are absolutely essential because it is absolutely necessary to listen to potential donors (Ketting, 2015). According to Ketting (2015), “Knowing what concerns them may present an opportunity for a gift solution” (p. 137). As a school leader, it is imperative to take the time to listen to potential donors and then to illuminate prospects about your school’s opportunities for planned giving.

It is also necessary for school leadership to build school-wide partners with such people as the members of the board of trustees, the head of school, and the chief financial officer who are all members of the school community that can build the planned giving program, as well as a trustee who is highly respected by the other board members and who is highly visible with the board in his or her own planned giving initiatives (Ketting, 2015). The head of school can facilitate community partnerships by visiting with donors, and making phone calls so he or she can speak with top legacy society members about their future impact (Ketting, 2015).

Ketting (2015) also felt that the school’s chief financial officer is critical for the perfunctory tasks of managing planned gifts in addition to adding enthusiasm and
excitement for planned giving. The chief financial officer can also work with legal partners in coordinating planned giving (Ketting, 2015).

Alumni represent some of the strongest school-community networks, should be engaged with the school so that they feel some responsibility for its success, and are usually some of the best individuals to solicit donations from former students (Higginson & Hosea, 2015). “Be sure to honor, recognize, train, and reward alumni who help encourage classmates to give. These volunteers are worth their weight in gold” (Higginson & Hosea, 2015, p. 144). An alumni council is critical in organizing events and activities that are aligned to philanthropic initiatives, therefore it is important to keep the alumni council up to date on the school’s needs so that they can seek opportunities to facilitate those needs (Higginson & Hosea, 2015). Alumni officers are responsible for making connections in the community that lead to fundraising. The best fundraisers work to build relationships with potential donors in the community (Higginson & Hosea, 2015).

**Philanthropy in Public Schools**

Philanthropic donations to public schools are on the increase, but many public schools lack fundraising capabilities and often fail in obtaining donor philanthropy because they hope for donations rather than truly understanding donors and how to ask for the donations (Born & Wilson, 2000). More often than not, the schools with the greatest need for philanthropy often lack the ability or knowledge to secure the funds and public school districts should have employees in place to write and secure grants and make the necessary connections with potential donors in the community (Born & Wilson,
In smaller, rural communities, this position could be shared and school leaders should consider the development of local community resources; if public schools want to develop philanthropic relationships within their respective communities, then they must commit to that type of work within their organizations (Born & Wilson, 2000).

Corporate foundations donated more than twenty-two billion dollars in 1999, and as their endowments continue to grow, P-12 schools will continue to benefit (Domanico, Innerst, & Russo, 2000). Serious school reform can be accomplished through donor philanthropy, but corporate philanthropists sometimes have the mindset that it is easier to create a new school than to invest in the existing system (Domanico et al., 2000). In today’s standards-based reform movement, there is also room for competition-based reform. As Domanico et al. (2000) stated,

Standards specify the results to be achieved by schools--and assessments provide vital consumer data about how well each school is performing--while choice and competition offer alternative and thereby press ineffective providers to change, even as they liberate needy children from unsatisfactory school situations. (p. 58)

Increasingly, recent education news theorizes that there is a growing influence of educational foundations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (Scott, 2009). Philanthropy in public schools has shifted the political arena by which we educate our youth because philanthropies are pouring money into school choice (Scott, 2009). Scott (2009) put in these terms, “Perhaps it is no accident that the new philanthropists have come to favor school choice, privatization, and charter schools, among other deregulatory educational reforms” (p. 107). Philanthropy in education and it ability to influence policy
are creating shifts in the structure of education when philanthropists zero in on urban schools since they are perceived to be replete with problems (Scott, 2009). Children trapped in poverty must not be trapped in poorly performing schools and school choice is becoming increasingly important in light of high stakes testing and the standards based movement, therefore, donor philanthropy is very much needed to support students (Mulaney, 2014). Although some individuals feel that school choice and students opting for independent schools will lead to social ills, studies of students’ civic values demonstrate that independent schools are better able to inculcate civic responsibility because infusing the curriculum with moral perspectives ensures an educated, democratic citizenry (Mulaney, 2014).

**Development**

The ability to fundraise successfully requires the synthesis of several other disciplines including public relations, marketing, education, and the ability to successfully manage a non-profit organization (Mack, 2009). According to Edles (1993) there is much more than people realize to successful fundraising, and it is not as simple as asking for monetary donations. Russo and Schwartzberg (2007) elevated the practice of successfully raising funds to an experience that brings with it a high level of emotions and great pride and joy. Donors must have an emotional connection and a general feeling that they are making a contribution for the greater good. Fundraising is inherently about the art of building lasting and committed relationships (Kelly, 1998). The ability of an organization to communicate well with its donors is significant in the practice of fundraising and communication is a key aspect of building those relationships.
Marketing also plays a major role in philanthropic success. Successful fundraising is the ability to market an idea centered around the organization and its major donors (Burnett, 2002). A unique bond must be created based in part on trust, and there must be nothing that interferes with that bond (Mack, 2009).

**Capital Campaigns and Annual Giving**

Capital campaigns and annual giving represent two methods for successful fundraising. Annual giving is automatically conducted every year. According to Payne and Forrester (2006), annual giving is dependable revenue that builds based on repeating gifts. It grows over time much the same way that an investment account grows over time. Generally speaking, annual giving refers to gifts given annually in excess of one thousand dollars (Payne & Forrester, 2006). Annual giving programs can double in scope about every five years if other support is found. An annual giving program requires human resources and thus is more expensive than campaign gifts.

Capital campaigns are specific and targeted fundraising development programs that have specific strategies to achieve specific goals in a definite amount of time. The capital campaign should have leadership at its center and add value to the overall mission of the organization (Payne & Forrester, 2006). Campaign gifts are sought as one-time commitments and are paid-out over multiple years. The donor in a capital campaign usually pulls the funds from his or her assets rather than from income. Campaign gifts usually take less than twelve months to develop (Quinn et al., 2006). Capital campaigns are designated for facilities, permanent endowments, and equipment. A special initiative campaign is designated for a special project that does not impact the entire organization.
A comprehensive campaign has goals for multiple purposes such as special projects, the annual fund as well as the capital campaign. Some schools do not have a major giving program before conducting a capital campaign, whereas others have a major giving program in place prior to launching a capital campaign. A capital campaign at one school may include equipment and program initiatives. A campaign conducted at another school might include equipment, a science lab, the annual fund, working capital, program innovations, and the permanent endowment fund. It should be emphasized that annual giving is critical and paramount to capital development. Annual donors should be recognized and shown appreciation if continued support is to be expected (Quinn et al., 2006; Roach, 2009).

However, there are several challenges to annual campaign support because new prospects must be continuously identified and voluntary leadership must be continuously sought. In fact, volunteer leadership should be engaged for both annual giving and the capital campaign (Payne & Forrester, 2006). Confusion can be avoided by soliciting larger donors at the end of the campaign. Key staff must be identified for the entire duration of the capital campaign.

Capital campaign teams are comprised of the following organizational structure. At the top of the organizational hierarchy are the board campaign chair and the capital campaign leadership team, usually consisting of about six volunteer leaders (Payne & Forrester, 2006; Roach, 2009). The head of school and chief executive officer are involved in about 95% of all solicitations (Payne & Forrester, 2006; Roach 2009). Special projects are handled by a director who coordinates the public phase. The
The membership associate coordinates the public phase of data entry including acknowledgements and billing. The vice-president of the campaign also acts as the manager of community development and coordinates the campaign billing and recognition efforts (Payne & Forrester, 2006; Roach, 2009).

The post-campaign development organizational structure for major gifts consists of the president, the senior director of membership, a membership manager, and a volunteer manager. The membership manager supervises membership associates and major and mid-level giving associates (Payne & Forrester, 2006). The volunteer manager supervises the volunteer coordinator. The president oversees the senior vice president of broadcasting, the vice president of the foundation, and community development as well as the manager of community development and the development producer. The senior director of membership coordinates the mid-level giving director, the major giving director, as well as the data systems manager (Payne & Forrester, 2006).

Payne and Forrester (2006) go on to report that some capital campaigns are simply comprised of a board of directors, a campaign cabinet and an annual giving support committee. The campaign is run by the campaign manager, the major-giving manager, and major-giving officer. These individuals must coordinate the top campaign prospects, the annual donor prospects as well as the new donor prospects. These individuals coordinate strategies for major gift prospects of all types including individuals, foundations, and corporations (Payne & Forrester, 2006).
Capital campaigns are a one-time investment that helps to propel the organization to new heights. Annually, ongoing support helps to ensure that the mission of the organization is carried forward into the future (Payne & Forrester, 2006; Roach, 2009).

The role of the board in a capital campaign oversees donor recognition and gift counting. According to Payne and Forrester (2006), all donor recognition for campaign and annual giving that includes short term or long term recognition, publications, and announcements must be approved. Gift counting for the campaign and annual giving including the beginning date, pledge period, type and purpose of the gifts, and a clear understanding and acceptance of differences between financial and campaign counting must be board-approved (Payne & Forrester, 2006).

The following are myths about campaigns and annual giving. Campaigns thwart the annual giving program (Payne & Forrester, 2006). It is permissible to overlook the campaign planning phase. Campaigns can be integrated with annual giving initiatives with little or no additional resources and no consequences (Payne & Forrester, 2006).

Savage and Hamlin (2015) stated, “In the life of virtually every independent school, the time comes when there’s a clear, urgent need for significant gift support and the school leaders announce, ‘We need a campaign!'” (p. 99). Colson (2015) said that campaigns rarely go off as planned, the most critical aspect of a capital campaign is the detail of the planning that precedes the campaign itself. At the outset of the campaign, Savage and Hamlin (2015) believed there are three fundamental principles. These include (a) there must be a clear reason for giving, (b) there must be a number of major donors with a willingness to give, and (c) there must be a clear path, a team of
individuals, and tactics that steer the fundraising activity. Since every school is unique, boilerplate theories likely will not work (Savage & Hamlin, 2015).

According to Payne and Forrester (2006), capital campaigns have a number of themes that make them highly successful:

- The organization and its leaders are both visible and act with integrity and a clearly delineated case for the needed support is made known based on detailed plans. (p. 19)
- There are a realistic number of donor prospects who can carry out the campaign goal. (p. 19)
- There are an adequate number of volunteers who can solicit donors. (p. 19)
- Issues that are tactical and paramount are identified and sorted through. (p. 19)
- There are key policies in place for gift counting, donor recognition, and for donor support. (p. 19)
- There is a strong and supporting staff as well as resources that support the voluntary initiative. (p. 19)
- There must be a community and organizational climate that is supportive of fundraising. (p. 19)

According to Roach (2009), when independent schools are at maximum student capacity and have waiting lists, the revenue generated from tuition and fees provides coverage for most operating and program costs. A loan must be taken when older facilities are renovated or new facilities are constructed (Roach, 2009). That loan, however, can be reduced by raising the capital necessary to either reduce or completely
cover the costs of the construction loan. The bulk of the loan can be repaid through funds generated from charitable contributions to the school by independent donors, independent individuals, corporations, and foundations that gave over $190 billion to charitable organizations in 1999 (Roach, 2009). Roach (2009) added, “Gifts from individuals, at $154.2 billion, accounted for 88.5 percent of all charitable giving” (p. 3). By making a donation, income is contributed and is therefore a gift. There is nothing bought, sold, or exchanged. The donor, however, does have the option to reduce his or her taxable income.

According to Roach (2009), most P-12 organizations that solicit monetary donations are considered independent or church-sponsored non-profit entities. In other words, they have 501(c)(3) status. Schools that are church schools may be exempt from 501(c)(3) status if their church affiliation pre-dates the Internal Revenue Service (Roach, 2001). According to Roach (2009), “Contributions to an unincorporated church school are actually designated gifts to the sponsoring church” (p. 1).

A capital campaign is launched when there is a need to renovate or construct new facilities. Roach (2009) pointed out that successful capital campaigns:

- build and refine a school’s development program for the foreseeable future; builds visible volunteer leadership that should continue to support the institution as well as build the school’s credibility in the philanthropic sector; and stretches, redefines, and expands the level of contributed income a school should expect to receive after the campaign is completed. (p. 1)
Designing a Capital Development Program

There are several important pieces to consider when implementing a comprehensive development program. These include the utilization of software, allowing time for staff to build donor profiles, collect the necessary data, and implementing all components of a comprehensive development program (Roach, 2009). Commonly used software includes *The Razor’s Edge* and *DonorPerfect*. These keep track of potential donors and donor information. In Roach’s words, “A good software program greatly enhances the efficiency of the persons assigned with fundraising responsibilities, provided they receive good training in its use” (Roach, 2009, p. 2). Regarding time for staff to input and analyze donor data, it is vital to “have complete, accurate, and accessible data” (Roach, 2009, p. 2).

A comprehensive fundraising program includes the annual fund, major gifts, deferred and planned giving, and the coordination of a special event. The annual fund strengthens the list of potential donors and familiarizes people with the notion of giving to and receiving a thank you for their donations to the school. Annual funds should be regular and asked for twice yearly (Roach, 2009). Roach (2009) stated, “An annual fund builds donor relations and donor giving histories – an important first step in preparing for the major gifts needed in a capital campaign” (p. 2). Regarding major gifts, “the Board of Directors should always have a standing committee devoted to identifying, cultivating, and ultimately soliciting contributions from persons capable of making major gifts. The board must define the term ‘major gift’ within the school’s context and needs” (Roach, 2009, p. 2). Major gifts can range below $10,000 to well above $100,000. In order to
strengthen donor support and build donor contingencies, the school leader should keep donors apprised of development and future facility plans as well as the important role that they play as donors (Roach, 2009). Planned giving should also be a part of the leadership team’s development initiatives. Planned giving or deferred giving can be in the format of trusts or annuities, for example, “an active and visible development program for deferred gifts adds to the credibility and long-range context for a capital campaign” (Roach, 2009, p. 2). Special events are usually held in the spring, but any time of year could work. Some schools have a silent auction while others have a formal spring fling. Special events need to be well publicized, clearly communicated, and their goals should be clear. “Be aware that a large percentage of the ticket price for special events is not tax deductible, and much of the other money collected at a special event is ‘earned income’ from sales rather than ‘contributed income’” (Roach, 2009, p. 2).

In order to plan a successful capital campaign, a fundraising expert should be utilized. In order to do so, the school’s leadership team should contact several other schools to find out which consultants they have used. Different kinds of consultants from independent individuals to small and large firms should be considered. As Roach (2009) stated, “A good consultant will interview you and a few of your colleagues at the first meeting. At the second meeting, the consultant will outline a plan, including a projected timetable, for conducting the capital campaign” (p. 3). Finally, it is important to not only like but trust the consultant.

It is recommended to assemble the following materials prior to the launch of a capital campaign: (a) a temporary case statement, (b) a list of needs, (c) an architect’s
elevations and floor plans, (d) potential campaign volunteer leaders, and (e) a list of potential campaign donors (Roach, 2009). A campaign planning study should be launched and should include sources of affluence, sources of influence, sources of information, and sources of negativity (Roach, 2009). A campaign study, such as a feasibility or planning study, can be “the tool for developing a strategy to identify and solicit major donors and donors at subsequent lower levels” (Roach, 2009, p. 4). Identifying campaign solicitors is another critical component, and these solicitors should be credible, respected leaders who will encourage others to make donations (Roach, 2009). Sources of affluence include those persons perceived as able to make major gifts. Sources of influence are individuals able to persuade fundraising behavior. Point sources of information are people capable of telling and recounting stories about the school from days gone by. They are familiar with individuals who have had or have a relationship with the school (Roach, 2009). Ultimately, the capital campaign that is proposed should be one that is based on the results of the planning study.

During the past decade, the nonprofit arena has increasingly emphasized leadership (Bell et al., 2010). Leadership and its development are critical in the nonprofit world. Most nonprofit leadership frameworks neglect the importance of the nonprofit leader in maintaining sustainability in nonprofit organizations (Bell et al., 2010). Since sustainability is not fixed, leadership must constantly practice sound decision-making. Many organizations that maintain the status quo rather than striving for excellence are not able to maintain funding relationships or support staff in the long run (Bell et al., 2010). The vision and mission of the organization developed during the critical planning stages
is a milestone, but leaders must make fundamental decisions on a daily basis. In the long run, these day-to-day decisions result in the actual rather than the planned financial health and the actual impact on their organizations (Bell et al., 2010). The new thought is to focus on strategic planning, strong decision making and reflection in order to maintain positive financial health (Bell et al., 2010). What is needed, then, is leadership that is capable of exerting a powerful force over donor philanthropy and fundraising in independent schools.

When considering the research that has been conducted on fundraising, most of the studies are focused on a single institutions and donors unique to that single organization (Kelly, 1998). Other studies that have been conducted on fundraising and philanthropy were largely grounded in theories from a field of study informed by theories from other disciplines (Caboni & Proper, 2007). Other studies according to Caboni and Proper (2007) related to fundraising and philanthropy examined sociology, organizational theory, social psychology, communication, human resources, economics, and accounting. Less than two percent were carried out related to fundraising and leadership (Caboni & Proper, 2007).

When launching a capital campaign, one can expect a quiet but busy leadership gift phase (Colson, 2015). However, one should not give up on sequential, pyramid giving. Colson (2015) theorized anything that will divert donors to small gifts should be avoided. Know that the leadership team and the consultant will need to be flexible. School leaders should be prepared to say thank you a lot and when staff, the fundraising consultant, and the leadership team have reached consensus that all major donations have
been obtained, the campaign should move into the next phase (Colson, 2015). To be sure all major donations have been obtained, a capital development program needs significant donations at the commencement of the campaign (Roach, 2009). School leadership should select campaign leaders who will embrace the campaign with vigor and who will work with school leadership in order to achieve the campaign goal. According to Roach (2009),

> when you have demonstrated a credible need and financial goal, engaged the services of a fundraising professional at an appropriate level of involvement, recruited committed volunteer leadership, and identified potential major donors, you have the key ingredients for achieving maximum fundraising success in your capital campaign. (p. 5)

What is missing or unknown then is the influence of leadership style on the overall philanthropy and fundraising in independent schools. What leader behaviors and characteristics have the greatest influence not only on donors but also on the entire campaign leadership team? More research needed to be conducted to elucidate and illuminate the influence of leadership on development, fundraising, and philanthropy in our independent, P-12 schools.
Chapter 3: Method

“If there were only one truth, you couldn’t paint a hundred canvases on the same theme.”

--Pablo Picasso, 1966

Introduction

Enrollment in independent schools increased until the early 2000’s (Ewert, 2013). After that, however, enrollment in independent schools has steadily decreased (Ewert, 2013). These enrollment trends are partially due to trends in population; however, the economy also played a role in the recent declining enrollment in independent P-12 schools (Aud, 2012). Many parents who once could afford an independent school education for their children can no longer afford independent school tuition (Ewert, 2013; Aud, 2012). The purpose of this multiple case study is to explore the impact of the leadership style of three heads of school on the ability to raise funds in three independent schools.

There exists limited research on fundraising and philanthropy in the higher education setting (Caboni, 2007). However, even less literature exists and is only beginning to emerge in the independent, P-12 setting. We do not know and fully understand the effects of leadership style on the ability to raise funds in a P-12 setting, particularly in an independent school setting. Nicholson (2007) theorized that, A better understanding of transformational, transactional, and transformative leadership theory, and the attributes that are associated with them, can not only help leaders shape and mold their approach to fundraising but also enable them to
infuse a greater sense of meaning into their respective institutions while increasing the amount of financial support they garner. (p. 255)

Research Questions

This study was a multiple case study and involved three separate schools. The research questions were guided by a theoretical lens, which stems from fundraising theory in addition to transformative, transactional, transformational and distributive leadership theory. The main research questions were as follows:

1. What role does leadership play in attracting donor philanthropy, supporting fundraising, and running a capital development campaign?
2. How do independent heads of schools’ leadership style affect the success in multi-year capital campaign fundraising?
   a. Sub-Question 1. Is one leadership style better than another in attracting donor philanthropy?
3. How does school leadership approach opportunities and challenges within the capital campaign and in donor philanthropy?

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

All participants were invited to participate in the research including the interview and the survey by completing the informed consent form. The informed consent form included all researchers including the primary investigator and the advisor. Benefits and potential risks were disclosed to participants before administering the survey or conducting the interviews. The informed consent form also includes an explanation of the study. In the explanation of the study, the informed consent form states that “You
should not participate in this study if you are uncomfortable completing an interview about an individual’s leadership style as well as a questionnaire that measures an individual’s style of leadership.” The participant will be asked to complete the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire on the first day which should take approximately 30 to 45 minutes to complete. On the second day, participants were asked to participate in an in-depth interview lasting approximately 45 minutes.

Participant confidentiality was maintained at all times and all data were kept confidential by destroying audio recordings as soon as they were transcribed. Pseudonyms were used in all cases including school names, individual names and geographic names that could have been associated with the individual schools. All data collected was destroyed one year from the completion of the study. The master list was also destroyed at the same time. It was also stated in the informed consent form that while every attempt was made to keep their information confidential, the information may have to be shared with members of the Ohio University Institutional Review Board. Contact information will also be provided for the principal investigator, my advisor, as well as the director of research compliance at Ohio University.

Participants had an opportunity to ask questions prior to their participation in the survey and had them answered. No participants chose to leave the study. Formal approval was granted to the researcher on March 25, 2016. The IRB expires on March 25, 2017, and the IRB approval can be found in Appendix D.
Methodology

A multiple case study utilizing multiple methods approach was utilized in this study. According to Yin (2014), validity may be enhanced through the application of multiple methods through the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Quantitative and qualitative data each have their strengths and limitations. Therefore, combining the two approaches gives added validity and credibility to the research design. For example, a qualitative and quantitative approach is sometimes used in the evaluation of program effectiveness. A multiple-method research design can utilize both a qualitative and a quantitative approach to complement, strengthen, or corroborate data and findings when they are integrated and intertwined to make a stronger applicable case for the multiple case study (Bamberger et al., 2012). When quantitative and qualitative approaches are combined, quantitative surveys are used in conjunction with a wide variety of qualitative techniques. Occasionally, the qualitative techniques focus on the process and analysis of the context and at other times, the focus is on the same unit of analysis as the surveys. However, in this case different data collection methods were employed. The complementarity of using a multiple methods approach can result in a very high quality research design (Bamberger et al., 2012).

The majority of this study was qualitative in design, however a questionnaire (see Appendix A) known as the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire or MLQ (Bass & Avolio, 2015) was also used. Theories can be tested through language resulting from interview conversations and dialogue. According to Field (2013), both qualitative research and quantitative research are complementary to one another and should not be
thought of as competitive. Qualitative research starts with ideas and the use of theoretical frameworks that guide the research investigation that relate to some dilemma or problem. A qualitative researcher, therefore investigates people and places in a particular context and is able to establish a particular pattern or theme (Creswell, 2013). Qualitative research is more subjective than quantitative research. Therefore, different methods of collecting data were be used in carrying out the qualitative aspect of the investigation. Qualitative methods involve extrapolating evidence for a theory from what people say or write (Field, 2013). Interviews were used with major donors, school leaders as well as with development directors at each respective school. The decision to use qualitative methods resulted in part from the fact that the literature is limited at best and the author could not find any current literature in the area of independent P-12 education. No studies were found that examined heads of schools’ leadership style as related to successful fundraising. Denzin and Lincoln (2011) stated that,

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. Qualitative research consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. (p. 3)

The quantitative aspect of this investigation was to issue the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (See Appendix A) in order to determine how often the head of
school partook in thirty-two specific transformational or transactional indicators. This questionnaire was distributed to the heads of school, the major donors, and the directors of development at each school. This questionnaire was administered to ascertain the varying degrees that leadership style has an impact on fundraising in terms of transactional and transformational leadership. Quantitative methods infer evidence for a theory through measurement of variables that produce numeric outcomes (Field, 2013).

This study used quantitative methods to clarify the leadership behaviors and characteristics associated with three heads of school. Qualitative methods were used to gain additional insight into how these behaviors enhance the head of school’s fundraising efforts and abilities. The quantitative aspect of the research was a questionnaire using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), while the qualitative aspects of the investigation included in-depth interviews. Together these research aspects supported each other and enhanced the quantitative aspects of the study resulting from the multiple methods approach.

For the quantitative aspect of this study, the head of school, director of development, and a major donor took the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to ascertain how often the head of school exhibited each of the thirty-two characteristics of transformational and/or transactional leadership characteristics. The questionnaire served to enhance the qualitative aspect of the study in that the questionnaire provided a measurable way to obtain the influence of transactional and transformational leadership characteristics on fundraising. The quantitative results of the questionnaire defined leadership behaviors and characteristics of independent heads of school.
Self as Researcher

Another key area that I brought to this research was my knowledge and experience working in an independent school setting. During the 1998-1999 school year, I taught at Frederica Academy, located on St. Simons Island, Georgia. Frederica is a traditional, southern, independent school located in an island community. My experience at Frederica Academy introduced me to the cultural norms of independent school education, the organizational structure of an independent school, as well as the constant need for available funding to support the school. I learned the critical role that the board of trustees plays in conjunction with the head of school. I observed the amount of parental involvement in an independent school as well as the special needs and issues associated with independent school education such as transporting students to athletic events at other independent schools, cultural expectations in an independent school, and student and parent beliefs in independent school education. I observed firsthand the organizational structure consisting of the head of school and an assistant head of school. At Frederica Academy, the assistant head of school is in charge of capital development in conjunction with the board of trustees. At other larger, independent schools, there is often a director of development in addition to an assistant head of school. Finally, I learned that independent schools are almost entirely dependent on student tuition, fundraising, capital development, and donor philanthropy to run and support the school. An annual major fundraiser such as a spring fling is part of independent school tradition at most independent schools. I was also introduced to the National Association of
Independent Schools network and governing body that oversees hundreds of independent K-12 schools across the country with a similar focus as Frederica Academy.

I have experience in school administration and leadership. I am beginning my fourth year as a middle school principal in Ohio and have studied leadership extensively through a principal’s preparation program at The Ohio State University and through continued doctoral level leadership studies at Ohio University. I have a keen understanding of varying leadership styles as they relate directly to the principalship. I also hold a school superintendent’s license, thus understanding the leadership needed at the head of school level. Superintendents and heads of school constantly juggle a large number of items on their plates simultaneously. At the heart of the juggling act is fundraising and capital development. I bring my own leadership styles to the table, have studied varying leadership styles, and practice school leadership in Ohio Appalachian communities on a daily basis. I have walked the walk and talked the talk. Coupled with my experience at a NAIS School, Frederica Academy, my knowledge of the people of Ohio and their needs in addition to my background in education spanning twenty years positioned me well for conducting a study about leadership styles and fundraising in an independent school context.

**Research Design**

This study used a multiple case study approach and made use of Yin’s (2014) lists of resources which includes interviews. Leadership style and leadership attributes will be examined for patterns, trends, and emergent themes. Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggested that the validity of qualitative research must conform to being credible, transferable,
dependable, and confirmable when the data is analyzed. Yin (2014) suggested that the quality of qualitative research design can be examined through four lenses: construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability.

The case study design was used to enhance, strengthen, and further support the quantitative aspect of the study, namely the survey. A case study provided breadth and depth and a purposeful understanding not garnered by numbers alone. The case study compared the reality of heads of schools’ leadership style related to fundraising compared with what the literature suggests is good practice. Those leadership styles that seem to affect success as reported in the literature and not previously studied, were explored qualitatively in this study.

Case studies are frequently used to chart previously unchartered territory and can serve as the basis for future investigations by creating richly written descriptions (Yin, 2014). This case study on K-12 independent schools attempted to explore previously unchartered territory and create a comprehensive look at the leadership style of three independent heads of school related to their ability to successfully raise funds.

This case study made use of description by asking questions such as, what were the characteristics of these school leaders? What could we learn from independent schools that had the most successful ability to raise funds? However, it moved beyond description and asked questions such as: Why did the donors choose to support the school? How did each head of school factor into fostering a successful capital campaign?

Yin (2014) suggested a case study approach for research questions that are cutting-edge and ones that the investigator cannot directly manipulate. While a
questionnaire was utilized in this study, this researcher did not feel that questionnaires alone could capture the rich, candid description and situational context that could be gleaned through live interviews. In addition, questionnaires may not produce completely truthful results and may be responded to less frequently than a scheduled one-on-one interview. A study that focuses on society and culture in a group, a program, or an organization usually results in a case study (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Case studies entail immersion in the setting and are based in the investigator’s and the participants’ worldviews (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Interviews served as the basis for the multiple case study. Interviews, according to Patton (2002), can be categorized into three general types: (a) the informal, conversational interview; (b) the interview guide or topical approach; and (c) the standardized, open-ended interview. The dialogic interview is another type of interview according to Rossman and Rallis (2003). These types of interviews range from informal to highly formal. Marshall and Rossman (2011) advocated a standardized, open-ended interview in a single case involving multiple sites. Standardized interviews ask direct questions in a specific sequence without follow up (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). This research involves three different sites in Appalachia. Interviews can be very beneficial to researchers and produce large sums of data quickly (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Multiple persons involved in interviews can also produce richer data that has breadth and depth. There are challenges, however, to interviewing (Marshall & Rossman, 2011), because much trust must be built during the interview process. A large amount of data
can be obtained through interviews, however, a large amount of time will also be required to analyze the data.

In-depth interviews are thought to be the most appropriate research methodology. In-depth interviews will provide expert opinion about leadership styles and fundraising efforts. Because no researchers were studying fundraising at the P-12 level in independent schools, in-depth interviewing of eight individuals was deemed a better approach to obtain baseline data. Interviewing provides a wealth of detail not found in a questionnaire alone (Wimmer & Dominick, 2013). In conjunction with the selected population, the interviewer builds a genuine rapport with those that are interviewed. However, the researcher must remain neutral when carrying out the interview itself (Legard, Keegan, & Ward, 2003).

**Target Sample**

The sample of independent school heads were solicited by email from a pool of schools in the National Association of Independent Schools located in Appalachia. Emails were sent to ten heads of school in the eastern United States. Heads of school were emailed based on the researcher’s familiarity with these schools. Specifically, schools, independent schools located in Appalachia were emailed during the summer prior to beginning research. According to Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009)

Purposive sampling is typically associated with qualitative research and may be defined as selecting a relatively small number of units because they can provide particularly valuable information related to the research questions under examination. Purposive sampling techniques are primarily used in qualitative
studies and may be defined as selecting units based on specific purposes associated with answering a research study’s questions. (p. 170)

Maxwell (1997) speaks about purposive sampling in the following way.

“Purposive sampling is a type of sampling in which particular settings, persons, or events are deliberately selected for the important information they can provide that cannot be gotten as well from other choices” (p. 87).

One school that was contacted had a very strong reputation and large endowment. A second school had a growing endowment that had recently been rebuilt. A third school was working to rebuild its endowment. The National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) is a network of schools throughout the United States that includes independent P-12 schools. It was founded in 1963 and it includes day and boarding schools. These schools include all boys, all girls, and coeducational schools at the elementary and secondary level. There are approximately 1,400 independent schools in the United States (National Association of Independent Schools, 2016). NAIS schools are run as nonprofit organizations. The National Association of Independent Schools (2016) reports “NAIS serves more than 675,000 students and includes 1,541 independent schools” (p. 1). The Appalachian region of the United States was chosen based on my proximity to be able to travel to the school sites to conduct in-person interviews in addition to my personal and professional interest in Appalachian studies.

**Data Collection**

This investigation made use of the meta-inference technique in which quantitative aspects of the study are carried out separately from the qualitative aspects. Some authors
such as Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) refer to the utilization of quantitative and qualitative aspects as a parallel mixed design (See Figure 8). “The quantitative and qualitative components are conducted separately (and in a parallel manner), followed by a meta-inference process, which integrates the results” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 12).

Figure 8. Graphic Illustration of Parallel Mixed Designs (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 152)

Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) state:

Parallel mixed designs are designs with at least two parallel and relatively independent strands: one with qualitative questions, data collection, and analysis
techniques and the other with quantitative questions, data collection, and analysis
techniques. The qualitative and quantitative strands are planned and implemented
to answer related aspects of the same overarching mixed methods research
question. Inferences based on the results from each strand are integrated to form
meta-inferences at the end of the study. A meta-inference is a conclusion
generated through an integration of the inferences that have been obtained from
the results of the qualitative and quantitative strands of a mixed methods study. A
major advantage of mixed methods research is that it enables researchers to
simultaneously ask confirmatory and exploratory questions, thus verifying and
generating theory in the same study. (p. 152)

This study used quantitative methods to pinpoint and describe leadership
behaviors and characteristics of three heads of school. The three heads of school,
development directors and the major donors will completed the Multifactor Leadership
Questionnaire. The heads of school rated themselves whereas the directors and donors
rated the leadership behaviors of their respective head of school. Three major donors
were interviewed, along with the three heads of school as well as the two development
directors. The major donors were chosen based on the recommendation of the respective
head of school. The heads of school, along with the development directors, were chosen
based on the participating schools. All in all, eight different interviews were conducted
and eight questionnaires were completed. A table is provided on the data, which
summarizes all of the results for every question (See Table 5). Qualitative methods were
used to unravel how leadership style influences a head of school’s ability to raise funds
and to successfully run a capital development campaign. The quantitative questionnaire utilized the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Qualitative data were collected that included in-depth, on-site interviews. In concert, these data collection methods represent a multiple methods investigation. The following list summarizes the multiple methods approach to data collection related to this study.

1. Individual interviews with the heads of school.
2. A questionnaire was issued to each head of school to ascertain each individual’s leadership style.
3. The following individuals associated with the school and familiar with the head of school were also interviewed in order to provide layers of knowledge: a major donor at each respective school and the director of development at each respective school.

Common themes were extrapolated from the interview data and the individual heads of school were placed into categories based on their leadership style. Patterned regularities were identified as described by Wolcott (2008). These categories included transformational, transformative, transactional, and distributive. Other categories emerged as the leaders’ styles were analyzed. The emergent patterns and themes were contextualized with the literature serving as a framework including the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Finally, emergent patterns and themes were displayed in charts, diagrams, tables and figures.

Several data analysis strategies for case studies are recommended by Creswell (2013). The data should be organized by creating and organizing files for the data. Text
transcribed from the interviews should be read through and margin notes should be made. Emergent patterns and themes should then describe the case and its context. The data from the interviews and from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire should be categorized to establish patterns or themes. In order to interpret the data, Creswell (2013) recommended the use of natural generalizations of what was learned. Finally, an in-depth picture of the case (Creswell, 2013) will be presented using narrative, tables, and figures. The data also was coded. Saldana (2012) provided a good resource that was used to coordinate coding data. Saldana’s descriptive coding technique was utilized in which each paragraph was distilled into a word or phrase deduced from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. I created category lists by which I coded the data (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). I also color coded the data from the generalized categories. Creswell (2013) recommended five or six categories with shorthand labels (codes). Ultimately, I reduced the coding to five or six themes from which I wrote my narrative in Chapter 4.

The Simsbury School

The Simsbury School has a long tradition and a varied past. The school was previously known as the Simsbury Military Institute, and is located in a city in Appalachia. The school enrolled about 450 students in grades 5-12 and served as both a boarding as well as a day school. Simsbury’s student body was diverse, with a wide variety of international students from Finland, China, Japan and Canada. A major capital campaign was underway in honor of the 200th anniversary of Simsbury. The purpose of the campaign, entitled Forward and No Return, was for building an addition to Barnes Hall, upgrading other facilities, and curriculum resources and innovations. The board of
trustees was comprised of sixteen individuals, many of whom were alumni. There were 155 middle school students and 295 upper school students. Three hundred and forty-five of the students were day students, while 105 were considered boarding students.

Simsbury is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools as well as the Independent Schools Association of the Central States. According to the school’s website, Simsbury is driven by their mission and states its independent school status. Simsbury is independent in its ability to define their own unique mission, to choose their own teachers and select their own students.

The Raymond School

The Raymond School was also located within southern Appalachia and had a very strong academic program at its core coupled with a unique Appalachian Mountain setting linked with a Presbyterian heritage. The school’s motto was “Work-Study-Reflect.” The Raymond School offered a strong liberal arts curriculum coupled with rich and vibrant cultural activities on campus and in the surrounding area. The arts were critical at the Raymond School, including a unique Cirque program. Sports were also an integral part of the school and every student was encouraged to participate. The Raymond School also had a student life team, which helps students to experience The Raymond School outside of the academic day.

The Raymond School had a twelve to one average student to teacher ratio. Approximately 70% of Raymond School students received financial aid, scholarships and grants totaling over four million dollars. One hundred percent of their graduates were accepted to some of the nation’s finest colleges and universities, such as Amherst
College, Emory University, Johns Hopkins University, and Yale University. The Raymond School served over 425 students with different cultural backgrounds representing a variety of countries around the globe.

The school was both a day as well as a boarding school. According to the school’s website, The Raymond School had prospered since its founding in 1903. Also according to their website, in the earliest years of the school, philanthropists such as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, and George Woodruff supported the school. The Raymond School had a well-established endowment fund that provided long-term financial security that ensures The Raymond School could serve future generations. According to the school’s website, “Gifts to the Raymond School endowment help to maintain our school’s mission of educating young people for lives of purpose and service, by providing an annual income for financial aid, teacher salaries, and campus facilities.”

The Raymond School had an advancement team of six full time employees, including a hospitality coordinator, a director of annual giving, a director of communication, an advancement services coordinator, the assistant head of school for advancement, and the director of planned giving. These individuals served the school in a full time capacity in addition to countless other volunteers including parents, grandparents, alumni, faculty, staff, and friends who all supported the mission of the school. Their Fund for Excellence reduced the cost of tuition to attend The Raymond School. The Fund for Excellence also supported technology, arts, athletics, and faculty salaries in addition to providing financial aid. Faculty and staff also make generous contributions to the Fund for Excellence. According to the school’s website, “High parent participation is an
advantage to securing other key gifts from donors and foundations that support the school.”

**Whitman Friends School**

Whitman Friends School was located in a rural, Appalachian community. Whitman Friends School was a Quaker boarding and day school enrolling about 40 students. Whitman Friends was in its 178th year, and the school was founded by the Quakers in 1837. Whitman Friends School was part of the National Association of Independent Schools and enrolled students from around the world. According to the school’s website, the graduating class of 2014 has students from 6 states including Ohio, California, Washington, Oregon, Maryland, and Virginia. A variety of countries are represented at Whitman Friends as well, including China, Ethiopia, South Korea, Ecuador, and Vietnam. A great deal of emphasis was placed on student directed learning including earning Whitman letters for credits, as well as Endeavor Hours. Endeavors were part of Whitman’s hands-on curricula, which was project-based. Students were also expected to participate in a full co-curricular schedule. These included washing dishes and cleaning every day. Students also participated in religious activities, physical education, and sports on a regular basis. Farm life was an integral part of the daily operations at Whitman Friends School on the large 350-acre school farm. According to the school’s website, Whitman Friends School’s students came from a very diverse, international background and were diverse socioeconomically. Whitman Friends was part of the National Association of Independent Schools and The Association of Boarding Schools. Although the school was no longer tied directly to the Quakers, it was run by a
Board of Trustees, mostly alumni of Whitman Friends. The Board of Trustees, like the current day students, represented a diverse group of individuals living across the United States.

The three heads of school who agreed to participate in this research study had a number of criteria in common that made them good candidates to participate in the study. These criteria included their willingness to participate in the research study; heads of school had to work at an independent school in the Appalachian region of the United States; and they had to be a current head of school and lead an independent school with a growing endowment. The heads of school were initially contacted by email explaining the purpose of the research endeavor. Subsequent contact by e-mail included a letter explaining their time commitment, a copy of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, and several interview questions. Several follow up emails were sent to the three heads of school along with a follow-up phone call to make sure that the independent school head wanted to participate in the study. Letters of support from each head of school confirmed their willingness to participate in the study. Each participant was told the purpose of the study. Participants knew up front that their data would be used to analyze patterns and themes in regards to their individual leadership styles related to philanthropy. From the beginning, confidentiality was underscored by the researcher when communicating with the three heads of school.

The three heads of school, two development officers, and three major donors participating in the investigation were:

The Raymond School:
1. Andrew, Head of School, The Raymond School
   a. Penelope, Director of Development
   b. Mary Ann, Major Donor

The Simsbury School
1. Jason, Head of School
   a. Maxwell, Director of Development
   b. Dom, Major Donor

Whitman Friends School
1. Kyle, Head of School
   a. Robert, Major Donor

**Survey Instrument and Analysis**

This study made use of a research based questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio (2015) entitled the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). The study is also based on previous work done by Nicholson (2006) in higher education administration. (See Appendix A). The purpose of this questionnaire was to try to quantify transformational and transactional leadership behaviors and characteristics. For the purpose of this study, these leadership styles were thought to be related to the ability of leaders to raise funds. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (both leader and rater; see Appendix A) was used to collect data from three P-12 heads of school, two directors of development, and three major donors. The head of school’s profile was given first using average rater aggregate scores. The scores were aggregated based on the average of the director of development’s rating and the major donor’s rating. Then
response data were broken into separate rater groups along with the head of school’s own self rating. Then a comparison to known standards of leadership was carried out to analyze the leadership against research based optimum standards. The MLQ results helped the researcher identify a range of leadership behaviors from laissez-faire to idealized influence. The MLQ report resulted in descriptors of leadership behaviors and characteristics of the three heads of school that motivate donors to give set amounts to the school. These descriptors quantified the three heads of schools’ leadership behaviors and characteristics and built a basis for beginning to understand how each of these heads of school related to his philanthropic work. These descriptors provided a basis for understanding how these leadership behaviors play a role in attracting donor philanthropy and in fundraising abilities.

The MLQ was a good instrument to use in this research study because it measured a wide range of leadership styles and characteristics. Bass and Avolio (2004) developed the questionnaire to understand a range of leadership styles in practice. The MLQ has a total of 45 items with four descriptors and/or characteristics related to each of 9 leadership styles. In general, the MLQ has 45 statements that each relate to and measure leadership behaviors of successful organizational leaders. The nine leadership styles ranging from idealized influence to laissez-faire are quantified by four correlated descriptors that have little to do with the other possible leadership styles. The nine possible leadership styles are listed as follows including the psychometrics of the scale.
The observed heads of school leadership behaviors were rated using a five-point scale. The anchors that were utilized to measure the MLQ factors are as follows: 0 = Not at all; 1 = Once in a while; 2 = Sometimes; 3 = Fairly Often; and 4 = Frequently, if not always. It was expected that it would take each of the 8 participants about 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The MLQ was chosen to measure heads of schools’ behavioral characteristics specifically related to leadership style. The questionnaire has 45 statements that identify and measure leader behaviors. These behaviors are closely linked to successful individuals and organizations. The questionnaire consisted of 45 items related to leadership with 9 leadership outcomes having 4 components each. The nine outcomes are listed as follows:

1. Idealized Influence (attributed).
   a. Instills pride in others for being associated with the leader.
   b. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group.
   c. Acts in ways that builds others’ respect for the leaders.
   d. Displays a sense of power and confidence.

2. Idealized Influence (behavior).
   a. Talks about most important values and beliefs.
   b. Specifies the importance of having a strong sense of purpose.
   c. Considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.
   d. Emphasizes the importance of having a collective sense of mission.

3. Inspirational Motivation.
   a. Talks optimistically about the future.
b. Talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.

c. Articulates a compelling vision of the future.

d. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved.

4. Intellectual Stimulation.

   a. Re-examines critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate.
   
   b. Seeks different perspectives when problem solving.
   
   c. Gets others to look at problems from many different angles.
   
   d. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.

5. Individual Consideration.

   a. Spends time teaching and coaching.
   
   b. Treats others as individuals rather than just a member of a group.
   
   c. Considers each individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.
   
   d. Helps others to develop their strengths.

Transactional components along with an associated list of behaviors and characteristics,

6. Contingent Reward.

   a. Provides others with support in exchange for their efforts.
   
   b. Discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.
   
   c. Makes clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.
d. Expresses satisfaction when others meet expectation.

7. Management by Exception (action).
   a. Focuses attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards.
   b. Concentrates full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints and failures.
   c. Keeps track of all mistakes.
   d. Directs attention towards failure to meet standards.

8. Management by Exception (passive).
   a. Fail to interfere when negatives become serious.
   b. Wait for things to go wrong before taking action.
   c. Shows a firm belief in “if it ain’t broke don’t fix it.”
   d. Demonstrates that problems must become chronic before taking action.

   a. Avoids getting involved when important issues arise.
   b. Absent when needed.
   c. Avoids making decisions.
   d. Delay responding to urgent questions.

The nine leadership styles above also measure extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction. The MLQ rater provided the data for the two development directors and for the three major donor’s beliefs about their respective head of school’s leadership.
Interviews

After all participants completed the MLQ, the investigator interviewed the three heads of school, three development directors and three major donors on their school campuses using the Interview Protocol (see Appendix B). It was believed that face-to-face, in-person interviews would relay relevant and detailed information that could not otherwise have been obtained from off-site interviews conducted by phone or Skype.

This qualitative method provided richer, more in-depth, detailed insight that served to build on the MLQ behaviors that were identified related to the head of school’s ability to successfully raise funds. From these different data sources, obtained through multiple methods, this researcher was then able to construct a complete picture of the head of school’s individual leadership behaviors, characteristics, and leadership style as it related to his efforts to successfully raise funds for his respective school.

The interviews that were conducted with the three heads of school, the three development directors, and the three major donors centered on how the identified leadership behaviors were brought forth in a head of school’s fundraising endeavors. The interviews each lasted between 45 minutes and 1 hour, depending on the pace of the conversation. All interviews were conducted in person at the respective schools. The interviews were audio recorded, and the transcriptions were hired out and transcribed by Landmark and Associates. However, I listened to the audio recordings repetitively. The questions were given to the president, development director, and the major donor in advance of the interview. Although the interviews were open-ended, an interview protocol was utilized during each interview (see Appendix B).
Data Analysis

During the data analysis phase, I tried to make sense of all of the interviews of the heads of school. The qualitative data from the interviews was then coded based on the categories of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire.

Interview data were transcribed and coded using Saldana’s (2013) descriptive coding technique (see Appendix E). Codes were determined using the themes of the subscales of the MLQ. These include builds trust--idealized Influence: attributes (IIA); acts with integrity idealized influence: behaviors (IIB), encourages others: inspirational motivation (IM), encourages innovative thinking: intellectual stimulation) (IS), coaches and develops people: individualized consideration (IC), rewards achievement: contingent reward) (CR), monitors deviations and mistakes: management-by-exception: active (MBEA), and fights fires-management-by-exception: passive (MBEP). Themes also emerged from the interviews, which included distributed leadership (DL), challenges, (CH), and opportunities (O).

The main focus of the data analysis in this investigation centered on the transcripts that resulted from the interviews conducted with the three heads of school, the two development directors, and the three major donors. After conducting the 8 interviews, analysis of all interview transcript data were placed into the following leadership categories: transformational, transactional, transformative, and distributive leadership. According to Zhang and Wildemuth (2009)

Qualitative content analysis involves a process designed to condense raw data into categories or themes based on valid inference and interpretation. This process
uses inductive reasoning, by which themes and categories emerge from the data through the researcher’s careful examination and constant comparison. (p.2)

Patton (2002) believes that qualitative data analysis may also include deductive reasoning. Berg (2001) reports that generating concepts or themes from theory or previous studies is beneficial in qualitative research, especially when one is in the early stages of data analysis. Marshall and Rossman (2011) report that

Patton (2002) describes the processes of inductive analysis as “discovering patterns, themes, and categories in one’s data,” in contrast with deductive analysis, where the analytic categories are stipulated beforehand “according to an existing framework” (p. 453). The researcher may generate “indigenous typologies” (p. 457) or “analyst-constructed typologies” (p. 458) to reflect the understandings expressed by the participants. Indigenous typologies are those created and expressed by participants and are generated through analyses of the local use of language. (p. 214)

This study involves quantitative research which uses a deductive reasoning going from the general to the particular (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). “The deductive model is employed by quantitative researchers involving the a priori deduction of hypotheses from a theory or conceptual framework and the testing of those hypotheses using numerical data and statistical analyses” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 23). The quantitative research in this investigation involved deductive logic. Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) state “formal research starts from a general theory or conceptual framework and may involve hypotheses from which their observable consequences are deduced” (p. 41).
However, the deductive logic involved in this investigation was less formal. I was “interested in finding relationships among variables and predicting future behaviors” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 42). Teddlie & Tashakkori (2009) add

Mixed methodologists believe that much if not most research is inherently mixed. They believe that the inductive-deductive cycle of research is an accurate description of how research is conducted; that is, one moves between perspectives and logics in an iterative fashion. The use of a specific type of research logic depends on where the researcher is in the cycle. (p. 79)

Hammersly (1992) also felt that research is a continual cycle of winnowing between inductive reasoning and deductive reasoning depending on which aspect of the research the investigator is working on at the time. Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) “believe that research on any given question at any point in time falls somewhere within the inductive-deductive research cycle” (p. 87). Some investigators start from conceptual frameworks whereas others start from detailed interviews (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). This researcher used both deductive and inductive reasoning simultaneously. In this way the inferences between the quantitative survey and the qualitative data provided by the interviews were intertwined. Thus a richer, fuller perspective was gleaned. “Pragmatists and transformative scholars recognize explicitly that they can choose to use both inductive and deductive logic to address their research questions” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 89).

Color-coding was employed during analysis to code the data. Each head of school was assigned a particular color during the data analysis phase. Color-coding the
data were a good way to organize the research during the data analysis phase (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Saldana, 2012). Coding by color can also help to keep track of transcripts (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Saldana, 2012). Each head of school and their respective school were assigned a particular color throughout the research study and this color coding was repeated throughout the study.

After each interview transcript was read, categories formed based on the head of school, development director, and the major donor and important sections were marked and placed into categories. These categories included transformational, transactional, transformative, and distributive. Total immersion in the data were employed in order to ascertain key aspects; particular items were marked that captured the researcher’s interest.

Next, the transcripts were reviewed by category and the categories were examined for emerging themes (Saldana, 2012). The key aspects of each transcript were elicited and sorted into categories (Creswell, 2013). This continued as themes began to emerge (Saldana, 2012). Next, labels were created for each part of the transcript (Creswell, 2013). The themes were given labels and placed into one of four categories: transformational, transactional, transformative and distributive. The themes were derived from the MLQ report, and through transcript data obtained from the interviews (Creswell, 2013; Saldana, 2012). The major categories, were then examined for emerging themes. Themes emerged from these categories, and these themes provided organization for reporting the data based on the interviews.
Saturation of the data is the point at which the researcher has heard the range of new ideas and there is no new information being generated (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Saturation in sampling techniques occurs when no new information can be used in theme development (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). “Saturation is the general rule used for purposive sampling, whereas representativeness is the general rule for probability sampling” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 184). Thus, when no new themes emerged from the data, this researcher knew that saturation had occurred.

For case study research, Creswell (2013) recommended no more than four or five case studies in a single study. This researcher investigated three heads of school in three different school settings. Themes and cross-case theme analysis can be emergent if less than five school sites are chosen (Creswell, 2013). The level of detail becomes diluted when additional cases are chosen (Wolcott, 2008). Purposeful sampling is used in qualitative investigations (Creswell, 2013). The three heads of school and the three independent schools that this researcher chose to study purposefully informed an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study. That is the heads of school explained their leadership characteristics in the greater context of donor philanthropy. Decisions need to be made regarding who needs to be sampled and the sites that need to be sampled (Creswell, 2013). This investigator chose to sample the head of school, the development director, as well as a major donor to that particular school. It is also important to understand that the sampling strategy may need to change during the course of the research study. Varying layers of the sample should also be understood such as the site, event, or the participant level (Creswell, 2013).
Reliability and Trustworthiness of the Data

This research study made use of both qualitative and quantitative methods. Taken together, each method supported the other and made for an overall stronger study, especially if the data are congruent. Qualitative research is a great way to uncover the context of the situation and can uncover and indeed reveal themes and meanings that may not be uncovered if only quantitative research is utilized. However, some issues with credibility continue to be debated in regards to qualitative research. Therefore, credibility and validity of qualitative data and the ability to demonstrate reliability and validity are often criticized.

Reliability of the Data

According to Marshall and Rossman (2011), credibility and validity are the criteria against which a qualitative study is authenticated. Although reliability, validity, and generalizability are respected by scholars (Marshall & Rossman, 2011), a number of ways to achieve validity have emerged. Marshall and Rossman (2011) stated that, “Determining reliability and validity remains the qualitative researcher’s goal” (p. 41).

Trustworthiness of the Data

The credibility of this research study was strengthened and enhanced by coupling both qualitative and quantitative data. The quantitative data described the leadership behaviors and characteristics of each head of school in a numerical fashion such that a greater sense of validity resulted. The qualitative research adds a richness, breadth and sense of completeness to the underlying quantitative data. Table 1 illustrates the
relationship between the purpose, the fundamental questions being asked and the major criteria for validity in establishing trustworthiness in qualitative studies.

Marshall and Rossman (2011) suggested that the following procedures help to ensure the rigor and trustworthiness of a qualitative study: searching for disconfirming evidence, prolonged engagement in the field, collaboration, and peer debriefing. Lincoln and Guba (1985) offered these procedures in order to ensure that there are standards of trustworthiness. These criteria will help to make sure that the data and their interpretations are both believable and sound (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Zhang and Wildemuth (2009) discuss trustworthiness in qualitative research in the following way.

Validity, reliability, and objectivity are criteria used to evaluate the quality of research in the conventional positivist research paradigm. Credibility refers to the “adequate representation of the constructions of the social world under study” (Bradley, 1993, p.436). Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommended a set of activities that would help improve the credibility of your research results: prolonged engagement in the field, persistent observation, triangulation, negative case analysis, checking interpretations against raw data, peer debriefing, and member checking. To improve the credibility of qualitative content analysis, researchers not only need to design data collection strategies that are able to adequately solicit the representations, but also to design transparent processes for coding and drawing conclusions from the raw data. Coders’ knowledge and experience have significant impact on the credibility of research results. It is necessary to provide coders precise coding definitions and clear coding procedures. (p. 6)
Transferability refers to the extent to which the researcher’s working hypothesis can be applied to another context. He or she is responsible for providing data sets and descriptions that are rich enough so that other researchers are able to make judgments about the findings’ transferability to different settings or contexts. The major technique for establishing dependability and confirmability is through audits of the research processes and findings. Dependability is determined by checking the consistency of the study processes, and confirmability is determined by checking the internal coherence of the research product, namely, the data, the findings, the interpretations, and the recommendations. (p.6)

Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) believe that trustworthiness is a global term used by some qualitative researchers as a substitute for quantitative validity issues. Transferability is also a consideration in mixed-methods research in which inferences made from the research can be applied to other settings and locations. Credibility techniques include prolonged engagement, persistent observation, and triangulation. p. 26

The results of social science research whether qualitative or quantitative must be useful to someone or some organization (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). “Transferability of the findings to a future time in the lives of the individuals under investigation is always an important consideration” (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009, p. 311). Therefore, inferences and recommendations are transferable to other individuals and organizations and is dependent upon the specific context (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Again, Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009) state
The reader should understand that mixed methods studies enjoy a dual advantage in terms of inference transferability. From one point of view, larger and more representative samples in your quantitative strand might provide greater confidence in generalizing your findings to other samples, settings, or populations. From another point of view, the rich and inclusive understandings that you obtain from our qualitative strand may provide the details necessary for a comprehensive assessment of the conditions from which the inferences were made and to which the recommendations may be transferred. (p. 311)

It is the integration of inference quality and transferability which, according to Teddlie and Tashakkori (2009), “consists of design quality and interpretive rigor” (p. 312). The design quality includes the quality of the data, research design, and the ways in which the data are analyzed (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Interpretive rigor describes the inference making process based upon the investigation (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). Through this integration of the quantitative and qualitative methods the design quality and interpretive rigor go hand-in-hand to provide an increased level of trustworthiness.
Table 1

Establishing Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Fundamental Question</th>
<th>Major Validity Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truth seeking</td>
<td>What is the correct answer?</td>
<td>Triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thick description</td>
<td>How do the people being studied interpret phenomena?</td>
<td>Triangulated, descriptive data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>How does the organization change?</td>
<td>Rich archives, triangulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal essay</td>
<td>What is the researcher’s personal experience?</td>
<td>Self-assessment of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>How can we change organizations?</td>
<td>Redefinition of the status quo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from the following sources: (Cho & Trent, 2006, p. 326; Donmoyer, 2001, p. 175-189; Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 43)

**Limitations**

There are a number of limitations to this study. Case studies have certain limitations inherent in their research design, especially when compared to other approaches. Some additional limitations stem from my decisions as a researcher. Case studies cannot be generalized to other populations. Case studies have a limited population and sample size. The cases examined are similar in context and therefore limits the variability rather than choosing vastly different cases. The schools chosen for this investigation – were not chosen randomly and do not represent a large sample population. Each school is vastly different and had its own unique context and setting.

While this investigation examined three independent school heads of school in as many different contexts, the sample size was still small and may not be generalized for all
independent schools. One school might have had more history with successful capital campaigns whereas another school may have had limited experience in running a successful capital campaign.
Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion of Data

“As we look ahead into the next century, leaders will be those who empower others.”

--- Bill Gates as quoted in Pritchard, 2016, p. 24

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to explore how leadership style, whether it be transformational, transactional, transformative or distributive influences fundraising and donor philanthropy in three independent schools. The results of this research study are organized around the eight participants’ view on leadership as well as the three research questions. The results are presented in this chapter. The data were coded, categorized and organized using the following method as described by Nicholson (2006).

When I analyzed the data, I sought to make constant comparisons. I attempted to make sense of the interviews and sought correlations. I began with a particular incident from an interview and then compared it with another incident in the same interview or in another interview. These comparisons lead to categories that were also compared to each other. Continuous comparisons were made repeatedly within sets of data and between the data.

The fundamental basis of the data analysis in this study was based on the transcripts of interviews conducted with the heads of school, the development directors and the major donors. After all interviews were conducted and transcribed, I read the transcripts and categorized them based on the heads of school respective school.

During the data collection and analysis each head of school, development director, and major donor were assigned a particular color that was maintained throughout the analysis.
After the transcripts were read and categorized by individual heads of school, development director and major donor, I marked particularly intriguing and insightful sections. I marked the sections according to leadership style which included transactional, transformational, transformative and distributive leadership. Particular care was taken to ascertain each section’s particular significance. Seidman (2006) stated the following when analyzing transcript data:

Mark what is of interest to you as you read. Do not ponder about the passage.

If it captures your attention, mark it. Trust yourself as a reader. If you are going
To err, err on the side of inclusion. (pp. 90-91)

Complete and total immersion in the data is key.

Next, I reviewed the transcripts by category and identified emerging themes. The transcript data is constantly highlighted and sorted into categories. This sifting back and forth between categories was continued as emerging themes continued to emerge.

Labels were given to the emerging themes that fell into the major categories: transformational, transactional, transformative, and distributive leadership. The themes were, and they were obtained from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire report and from the interviews. Sections that were highlighted the same were placed under that label. This process is known as the constant comparison method (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Upon completion of dividing the interview transcripts by label, leftover categories were consolidated into other categories. The major categories were studies for emerging themes. I was then able to write my narrative based on the key themes that emerged from
the major categories. The narrative was subsequently organized around these major
categories and significant themes.

Participants

The Multi-Leadership Questionnaire was sent out in May 2016 to three heads of
school, two directors of development and to three major donors. Each of these
individuals received an email requesting them to complete the questionnaire. Of those e-
mails sent, all eight of the individuals completed the questionnaire, yielding a successful
response rate of 100%. The heads of school were originally invited to complete the
questionnaire and each head of school provided the names and contact emails for the
director of development and for the major donors.

Each of the individuals was also invited to participate in interviews. The three
schools studied represented a wide range of fundraising success from financially
struggling, average financial success, to a school with a strong and well-established
endowment. Through the use of purposeful extreme case sampling (Creswell, 2009), the
researcher interviewed three heads of school representing a school struggling financially
to stay afloat to a heavily endowed school, as well as one school experiencing middle of
the road financial success. This allowed the researcher to obtain the perspectives of
heads of school who represented each extreme, as well as a school experiencing some
financial success. Through this use of purposeful extreme case sampling, the researcher
wanted to identify a cross-sectional representation of the sample across outstanding
schools as well as one school experiencing middle-of-the-road financial success.

Interviewing all eight participants allowed the researcher at three different schools to gain
a cross sectional perspective of schools experiencing various levels of financial success through their fundraising efforts.

The eight participants led fascinating lives and have intriguing backgrounds that connect them with their respective schools. Andrew is the head of school at the Raymond School. Penelope works with Andrew and serves as the associate head of school and the director of development. Mary Ann, a major donor to the Raymond School, leads a major corporation for much of her working years.

Andrew comes from a long standing background in independent schools coupled with a background in politics. Andrew served in many different roles in his former school. He was primarily in charge of external relations and traveled with the head of school a great deal of the time. Andrew attended an independent school during his formative years and his mother was the head of two different independent schools. Andrew also worked in the office of the governor where he learned the world of politics. Another interesting aspect about Andrew was his work as a deacon in the Episcopal Church. In this role, he served in various roles as a pastoral counselor. Andrew wished that he had more pastoral counseling training in his background.

Penelope’s background was mostly in public education. She earned degrees to become an English teacher, completing her student teaching in a high school English class. She quickly learned that she wanted to work in a school, but a career in teaching was not for her. She found work in several different colleges, universities, and medical schools, working in development and fundraising. After a number of years working in higher education, she longed for home and was given an opportunity to work in
development in the K-12 setting at the Raymond School, which was close to her family. Penelope was a southern belle who was quick-witted and sharp as a tack. Many of the major donors to the school enjoyed working with Penelope. One major donor in his nineties loved to work with Penelope. She traveled to major southern cities to meet with donors, often having coffee or lunch with them. Penelope was revered by Mary Ann, another major donor, as well.

Mary Ann had a fascinating career in business. She directed a large staff of subordinates at a major company representing a nationally known American product around the world. After working in business for many years, she relocated with her husband, a college professor, to a rural mountain community. There she continued to serve on various community boards and programs. She attended public school for most of her life, including college. However, her grandfather taught at the Raymond School and she traveled to the Raymond School often as a child and teenager. One day she happened to be involved in a conversation with another Raymond trustee who found out her background and story. The board of trustees invited her to join the board, and she, not only served as the Chairman of the Board of Trustees, but was also a major donor to the school. Mary Ann had a genuine passion for the school and had seen the school transition from an isolated mountain school to a world class learning institution that serves students from around the world.

Jason served as the head of school at the Simsbury School. Jason attended an independent Midwestern military school, but later attended public university. However, he completed his student teaching in a parochial school, which motivated him to begin
teaching at an independent boarding school. He later moved to another state where he assumed positions in residential life, and in external affairs. He also completed an internship in an aspiring heads of school program. During that time, he worked on a large data project, which he still utilizes today in his first headship. Jason brought with him experiences from other schools, which served him well in his first head of school position. Jason also had a young family who were enrolled at an elementary independent school, which was a feeder school to Simsbury. Together with his wife, they lived on campus and became an active part of the campus and the community.

Dom was quite a character. He was more than ninety years old, and highly independent. He was still practicing medicine at a free help community clinic. He was a graduate of Simsbury and the long-time chairman of the board. He hired and fired numerous heads of school at Simsbury. He was also a major donor to the school. Dom was also a graduate of Princeton University, earning a degree in chemistry and later went on to earn a medical degree from Columbia University. After many years in private practice as a cardiologist, he assumed a leadership role in a major Appalachian medical center. Dom could talk about any subject with a degree of confidence. Dom was a leading force in the school and was well known in the community.

Max was Dom’s son-in-law, married to the head of school at the neighboring elementary independent school. Max attended the school and had a strong background in athletics. In fact, he served as a high school hockey coach for many years. However, through the years, he moved into the role of director of development. He ran an office that included several individuals including the director of major gifts. Together, Max,

At Whitman Friends two individuals were interviewed. They included Kyle, the head of school, and Robert, a major donor. Kyle was a graduate of Whitman Friends School. He was in his second head of school position, after serving a western independent school for many years. Kyle attended public school in early childhood while his father was a professor at a major Midwestern university. For a time, Kyle also lived in Central America as a child and later lived in Europe as an adult. Kyle had seen many peoples and cultures and believed that was one of his strengths. Kyle was a very humble individual who did not seek the limelight. His office seemed very secluded when I visited him at Whitman Friends. Kyle was a quiet leader, yet he described himself as a transformational leader. He was a grandfather and very proud of that fact. Kyle had been away from Appalachia since he was a student at Whitman Friends. He served as head of school previously at a school located in a community with a very high level of education. He was amazed at the low level of education and literacy in the community that surrounds Whitman Friends. Kyle was a change agent. He was changing the school in transformational ways including turning the curriculum upside down. During his first year as head of school, this was where he has placed his emphasis in addition to student recruitment.

Robert, was a major donor to the school. He previously served as head of school, and thus offers a unique perspective. Robert came across as very well spoken, but laid back at the same time. He had no formal training in educational leadership, but believed
that he is a natural leader. He did hold a college degree, however. He was a business
owner of a construction firm. Robert was an athlete and participated in marathons around
the country. He was very physically fit and placed a high degree of importance on proper
nutrition and was extremely physically active. He was also highly involved in promoting
and protecting local wildlife and nature preserves. Robert’s wife was also highly
involved in fundraising when Robert was head of school. Thus, Robert offers a unique
perspective on the current state of affairs at Whitman Friends and knows what Kyle had
accomplished at the school thus far. Robert had walked in Kyle’s shoes, and understood
the critical role of fundraising.

The lowest, highest, and middle-of-the-road perspectives were thus represented
through these three cases. This also allowed the researcher to make comparisons between
the three heads of school leadership styles to examine similarities and differences in their
individual style of leadership.

The Multifactor Leadership feedback report measures leadership styles under
three broad categories: transformational, transactional, and passive-avoidant behaviors.
The scores reported are the averages of the two raters, namely the director of
development and the major donor in terms of how they collectively perceive the
frequency of the leadership behaviors exhibited by each head of school. Aggregate
ratings are presented in the following paragraph in terms of transformational and
transactional leadership of each head of school. The ratings are reported in terms of the
frequency of the raters’ ratings. Frequencies include: 0 = not at all; 1 = once in a while;
2 = sometimes; 3 = fairly often; and 4 = frequently, if not always.
Jason’s responses yielded the lowest transformational leadership rating of 3.0 out of a possible 4.0 aggregate score on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. A 3.0 represents a frequency of fairly often. According to the research validated benchmark, the ideal frequency of all five transformational behaviors should be a fairly often rating of 3.0. His school was situated in medium-sized city in Appalachia with an average student population. His school was in an area with average poverty. Andrew’s transformational leadership score was the highest at 3.5. A 3.5 rating fall above a frequency rating of fairly often, but below the highest aggregate score of 4.0 which indicates a frequency of frequently, if not always. His school was located in a rural setting in Appalachia with a large student population. Andrew’s school was located in a resort area where the household income is low, however, there were numerous vacation (second) homes in the area, which were very expensive. Kyle’s score in the area of transformational leadership was also 3.1 out of a 4.0 rating scale indicating that his raters rated him slightly above fairly often, but not always transformational. His school was located in a rural setting on the outskirts of a small Appalachian town with a very low student population. The school was located in a community with a great deal of poverty and low household income.

In the area of transactional leadership, however, Andrew scored a 3.4 in terms of rewarding achievement and a 0.0 in monitoring deviations and mistakes on a 4.0 scale. The research validated benchmark on rewarding achievement is between 2.0 and 3.0 which means that most leaders fall in the frequency of sometimes to fairly often. Clearly Andrew scored higher than the benchmark. The benchmark for monitoring deviations and mistakes is between 1.0 and 2.0, meaning once in a while and sometimes. Andrew
was well below this benchmark. Jason scored in the middle range with a score of 3.1 in terms of rewarding achievement and a 1.0 on monitoring deviations and mistakes. Kyle, however, had average frequencies of 3.0 for rewarding achievement and 2.5 for monitoring deviations and mistakes. Overall, Kyle had the highest combined average frequencies in transactional leadership.

Interviews lasted approximately 1 hour 30 minutes and were carried out during April, May, and June of 2016 at each interviewee’s school during the school day. Participants were not informed of their overall MLQ score at any time during the research study. They were made aware that the three schools studied were all located within Appalachia. The researcher contacted Kevin after the interview to obtain an alternative individual to complete the MLQ questionnaire. The researcher did not need to contact any other participants after the interviews for any follow-up questions after completing the interviews. Interview data were transcribed and coded using Saldana’s (2013) descriptive coding technique (see Appendix E). Codes were determined using the themes of the subscales of the MLQ (builds trust – idealized Influence: attributes (IIA), acts with integrity (idealized influence: behaviors) (IIB), encourages others: inspirational motivation (IM), encourages innovative thinking: intellectual stimulation) (IS), coaches and develops people: individualized consideration (IC), rewards achievement: contingent reward) (CR), monitors deviations and mistakes: management-by-exception: active (MBEA), and fights fires-management-by-exception: passive (MBEP). Themes also emerged from the interviews, which included distributed leadership (DL), challenges, (CH), and opportunities (O).
According to the data collected from the participants, 6 were male and 2 were female. The same number of males (6) and females (2) completed the questionnaire and the interviews.

The participants’ years of experience in the position of head of school spanned from one year to five years. Two of the heads of school, Andrew and Kevin were in their first year as head of their respective schools. Kevin previously served as head of school at another school for 10 years. Jason and Andrew are in their first head of school positions.

The data were organized by research question, by participant, and finally broken down further into themes. The first research question looked to answer how leadership attracts donor philanthropy and supports fundraising. The second question asked how heads of school leadership style affects the success of a capital campaign. The third question looked at opportunities and challenges to fundraising at the respective schools. In presenting the first research question, each section begins with an overview of the results of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire in which each leaders’ ability to be transformational and transactional were quantified based on raters’ responses to the questionnaire in addition to a self-rating. Research question number one is further broken down by individual participant and further analyzed by themes based on the individual leader’s behaviors and unique characteristics. The second and third questions were analyzed and are presented by individual participant.
**Research Question 1**

What role does leadership play in attracting donor philanthropy, supporting fundraising, and running a capital development campaign?

**Andrew**

Andrew was in his sixth year as head of a major Appalachian independent day and boarding school. Andrew came from a background of independent school education as he was a product of an independent boarding school education. Andrew was in his first headship, but had served in a wide variety of roles at his previous school where he served in leadership roles for eleven years. Andrew also had teaching experience in a higher education setting. Andrew had political skills that he developed while working in the governor’s office. Andrew’s mother also served as the head of two independent schools. Andrew believed very strongly in the power of relationships and that fundraising is about that—building relationships with people. Andrew exuded positive enthusiasm and greatly enjoyed helping others to reach their full potential.

The results of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Andrew in the area of transformational leadership as reported by Andrew’s raters were an average frequency of 3.5 out of a 4.0 scale. Andrew rated the highest of the three heads of school in transformational leadership. Transactional leadership was broken down into two categories including rewards achievement and monitors deviations and mistakes. Andrew scored an average frequency of 3.4 as rated by his raters for rewarding achievement while he scored an average frequency of 0.0 for monitoring deviations and mistakes. When compared with the other two heads of school that participated in this
study, Andrew rated the highest in the area of transformational leadership with an average transformational score of 3.5 out of 4.0. Andrew rated the lowest in comparison to the other leaders in the area of transactional leadership with an average scores of 3.4 and 0.0 for rewarding achievement and monitoring deviations and mistakes, respectively. The data resulting from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Andrew is summarized in Table 2 below.
Table 2

*Andrew: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>All Raters Average</th>
<th>Research Validated Benchmark</th>
<th>Universal Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational (overall)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized attributes</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized behaviors</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual consideration</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>&gt; 2.0 to &lt; 3.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-exception: active</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>&gt; 1.0 to &lt; 2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-exception: passive</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>&gt; 0 to &lt; 1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>&gt; 0 to &lt; 1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra effort</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>&gt; 3.5 to &lt; 4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>&gt; 3.5 to &lt; 4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with leadership</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>&gt; 3.5 to &lt; 4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transformational leadership.** Andrew was highly charismatic and believed in the power of relationships. He led with a clear mission and vision. He motivated and inspired others based on my observations of Andrew in action. He brought out the best in others and allowed them to be leaders in their own right. Andrew embodied the very heart of transformational leadership by his innate ability to inspire others to go above and beyond their perfunctory duties. In his interview Andrew stated,
I am transformational. I have the ability to communicate a vision, and the ability to talk about where I think we can go with the school, where I think about how I can get people engaged with me around that.

In this quote, Andrew discussed some of the main tenants of transformational leadership including communicating a vision. For example, he talked about where the school can go. He also spoke about his ability to engage others to achieve the vision. This engagement of others was based on building trust.

**Idealized influence: Builds trust.** Andrew worked very hard to build trust with everyone he encounters. At the same time, it came rather naturally for him. Andrew was an Episcopalian deacon and held leadership roles in his local community church. He operated with a pastoral care philosophy. He built a lot of his community relationships through his weekly work at his church. Because of this, his reputation was stellar in the local community. Andrew also took a great deal of his personal time to travel around the world to meet with families. He traveled to Africa, China, Eastern Europe, Mexico, South America and to Great Britain on a routine basis. By doing so, Andrew was able to build social capital and trustworthy relationships. He took the time necessary to connect with people and to relate his vision of his school back to the original mission and vision of the school albeit in more current times. And Andrew regularly entertained guests at his home on the school campus. He opened up his home to individuals with whom he connected around the world and in the local community. During the interview, Andrew stated,
I would have to say the external relations piece was the most helpful part of my background since it is the most applicable now. Most of my time is spent around the external pieces now, traveling, admissions, development, board relations, community relations, that kind of stuff. I believe in fundraising that is highly relational, that you’ve got to establish trust with the donor, and that is not intentional. So if you go into a relationship with someone with the pure idea that you are going to raise money from this person, you will not be successful. If you go into with the idea of you really want to get to know the person, or you want them to know you and the school, you will win, and so – and it may take a long time, depending on what that personal relationship is. It may take three, four, or five years. But, that’s what it’s all about. I mean if you get to be friends with them, they like the school and they like you and they feel comfortable in your leadership, they’re gonna give, and it doesn’t take a whole lot of asking.

In the previous quote, Andrew spoke to the importance of building trust with potential donors. He believed that it is so important to simply be friends with them and to go into the relationship to get to know them and be friends. Andrew indicated that with the trust building and friend-making, the donations would come at a later time. But the donations would only come if those firm relational foundations are built first. Andrew continued to discuss the importance of building trust in the following discussion:

I’m at every event, every game. You gotta be highly visible. Otherwise, they’re going to think you’re gone all the time. It’s not easy. I have three young children and a wife who isn’t terribly happy all the time when I am coming back from, you
In the previous paragraph, Andrew pointed out several ways that he was engaged in the school. This engagement lent itself to building trust in his constituents. He discussed being highly visible at school events such as theatrical productions and athletic events. Andrew also spoke to his visibility off campus at fundraising events in other parts of the world coupled with professional networking with other heads of school. All of these endeavors created visibility, whether on or off campus. Not only was he highly visible, but that visibility also lent itself to being fully engaged in community and school events that took place off campus as well. From his engagement and visibility, Andrew was true to himself, and as such, built integrity through an inferred sense of wholeness and completeness.

**Idealized influence: Acts with integrity.** Andrew built on his personal integrity by telling donors truthful stories about students who came to his school and were forever changed. These stories were captivating ones about students from around the world interacting with students, rich and poor, from Appalachia. This storytelling aspect of integrity plaid out in Andrew’s narrative in this manner:

I travel all over the world – Asia, Europe, South America, Central America. This year, I’ll do Africa in the fall as well as Europe. I’ll do Mexico again in the fall. We have 40 countries representing our student body, and they make up about 25
percent of our students. That’s where we’re going to be in the future. Donors hear that constantly, and one of the things I do is tell the stories to the kids. Tell the stories of kids who we bring in to board who’ve lived in shacks. We talk about kids who come from great wealth, who come here and are changed by the experience of interacting with kids from Appalachia who are just hungry – hungry for opportunity and are brilliant, or kids from Africa and girls from Nigeria who are running from the Boko Haram who come here and find solace, love, open arms.

Andrew built on his integrity which he developed throughout his career in working in external relations, working alongside other school heads, coaching, teaching, working in residential life, as well as in student recruitment and even in higher education. Likewise, this extended into a worldview that was supported by his travels and the truths that he shared in his stories. This could also be seen in the way that he, as a leader and a fundraiser, encouraged others.

**Inspirational motivation: Encourages others.** Andrew had a gift in that he was able to make people believe in what they are doing. He enabled them to believe in the greater cause, mission and vision of the organization. He gave an overarching goal and then allowed individuals to accomplish that goal without micromanaging them. Andrew was all about relationships with people and those relationships pay-offs in the long run. Encouraging others was manifested in a number of his actions and his approaches to those actions. As Andrew succinctly elucidated,
I spend an enormous amount of time building up personal capital with people, working with them on a relational basis, making them know that I want them to be successful. I’m not going to micromanage, but I want to do what I can to make them successful. I am highly relational. I’m very verbal. I have the ability to persuade people, that we’re in the right direction.

So Andrew believed strongly in the power of encouraging others. He built relationships with them, he was highly verbal with them and he had a keen ability to persuade them that they were heading in the right direction. Ultimately, he wanted them to not only feel successful, but to be successful. Andrew was also a big proponent of the power of innovative thinking.

**Intellectual stimulation: Encourages innovative thinking.** Andrew was faced with a decision early in his headship in which a major gift and project was to construct a new middle school. Everything was in place to make that happen. Suddenly, a local public school became vacant which adjoins the school property. Instead, Andrew decided to change course and go back to the donors to find another use for the money. This change was after the project had already been changed several times before. But when an opportunity came along to use those funds for another project, Andrew had an innovative vision to utilize an existing, available school for the new middle school facility. Andrew reported,

We have summer programming for day students and we rent the facilities out. We will probably start self-performing with English language learners, here from China in the next few years, that’s kind of our next big thing, during the summer.
We’ve got a relationship with someone who wants to use our facilities this summer to do Chinese--English language learning for Chinese students. We are really excited about the fact that we have 40 countries, so no one country dominates. If you have to go all in to increase a country’s revenue, you’re pretty much going to be running a school of Chinese students because that’s where the wealth is. We’re always amending the strategic plan in the same way we’re always amending the development plans. If somebody comes in here tomorrow and says, “Here’s twenty million dollars,” and you’ve written your strategic plan two years ago and you’re not going to write it for another three, then you’ve wasted your chance. Everything changes.

In the previous interview excerpt, Andrew pointed to ways in which he had encouraged innovative thinking. Particularly striking was his willingness to change—to change the strategic plan if a major donation necessitates that change. He also demonstrated his willingness to change his thinking, on several occasions, about a capital campaign project in which an extant facility became available which created sudden innovative thinking. As with his ability to encourage innovative thinking, Andrew also was a big believer in coaching and developing people.

**Individualized consideration: Coaches and develops people.** Andrew gave his development director, Penelope, complete free-range to do her work. He met with her to discuss potential donors, some major donors. He told her that he would do whatever she wanted him to do. He also told her that if she preferred to work with the major donor herself, he was fine with that, as well. He led by example, traveling extensively to work
with potential donors around the world. Some major donors were highly attracted to the development director and Andrew knew to allow her to handle those situations. In describing his collaborative relationship with Penelope, Andrew emphasized the following:

I’m a big fan of helping people--my view on leadership in a school is that every person in the school should--you should be working to help them find a job, everyone in the senior leadership, at another school as a head of school. You should be setting up situations where they take on more responsibility than they have. I push the staff to take responsibility all the time and that I’m hands-off. I’m a consultant. I’m here, call me if you need me. I’ll do anything I can to make you successful. You need some extra training, we’ll do it, but I’m not going to manage your job. We are the gateway out of Appalachian poverty for a lot of kids--a lot of really bright kids. We’re giving them the opportunity to get out.

This was not only about collaboration and leading by example, it was also about coaching and developing colleagues, subordinates, and protégés. Andrew mentored Penelope and brought her in on discussions about these donors. They have a respect for one another that allowed for maximum fundraising to be achieved. Sometimes, however, transactional leadership must be employed in order to carry-out routine tasks.

**Transactional leadership.** Andrew rated the lowest in transactional leadership. However, he clearly understood that transactional leadership must be utilized at times. There were routine procedures that must be carried out in his role as chief fundraiser. While Andrew routinely shared the school’s story with potential donors, he was reminded
that fundraising was just a part of what he needed to do to raise the capital necessary to continue the mission and vision of the school. Andrew elaborated,

I think unsuccessful heads typically go in and want to change the institution to meet their needs or they just have no understanding and connection to the fact that there’s a fundamental culture, there are problems where that you might have to change. Most schools that I have been involved with are old. So if you think that you’re going to come in and change that culture, you will be unsuccessful. I’ll lose my job if we don’t fundraise. In this model, I have to be seriously engaged in fundraising because it’s what keeps us going. We’re not generating that in tuition revenue numbers like many other schools. Fundraising will always be important if we want to keep our current school model. Every donor we talk to, we come forward and say ‘1903, Andy Richard created this school to serve his kids.’ We are still committed to serving students who might otherwise not have this opportunity.

Andrew clearly believed that in addition to transformational leadership, there were times when he utilized transactional leadership. Fundraising is a routine expectation in independent schools. It must be done. Every time he talked with a potential donor, he reminded them of the school’s foundational story. Just as Andrew rated low in transactional leadership on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire, he also rated low in the area of monitoring deviations and mistakes.

**Active management-by-exception: Monitors deviations and mistakes.**

Andrew rated very low in monitoring deviations and mistakes on the Multifactor
Leadership Questionnaire. However, Andrew gave people the ability to carry out their work to the best of their ability. Andrew did monitor his school closely, however, in order to keep the eye on the mission, vision and story of the school. Andrew defined this duty to monitor in these words:

My biggest fear is that they will begin to shift toward increasing net tuition revenues away from fundraising and endowment growth, which would then mean you’re bringing in more fully paying kids, which means you’re bringing in either very wealthy international students, and in boarding schools, the number of domestic full pay borders is dropping because people, people are just not sending their kids to boarding schools as much. It would be horrible if we had to stop serving the kids from the mountains, and the hills, and the hollers.

Andrew’s commitment to monitoring the school hinged on a commitment to the mission. As this quote demonstrates he realized that the focus of the mission depended on “serving the kids” from all regions and classes. For Andrew this is a deliberate and sober undertaking. Rather than monitoring staff mistakes, he offered professional development if employees needed to develop a skill. He offered support if subordinates asked for it. Likewise, this meant that if subordinates were not up to the task, he suggested that they find work elsewhere. Thus, Andrew utilized a combination of transactional and transformational leadership in a transformative approach to leadership.

**Transformative leadership.** Andrew knew when to use both transformational and transactional leadership. He really did not spend much time thinking about his leadership style. He concentrated on relationships with people, and then finding ways
they might be interested in supporting the school. One thing that echoed throughout conversations with Andrew was his passion for people. Andrew was absolutely a people person who thrived on genuine relationships with them. He then served as the critical link between the individual and sharing the school’s story.

Good heads use a combination of approaches depending on the setting of the situation, but I don’t ever--think there’s one type of style that I use, and I don’t spend a whole lot of time thinking about my leadership style. I’m driven by relations and life situations, and if there’s one thing I feel good about that I can do is I can read people and situations really well, having spent a lot of time in politics. (Andrew)

Another approach, which seems to be tantamount in successful fundraising is distributive leadership. Distributive leadership results when heads of school collaborate with their development directors and others in a synergistic approach to fundraising.

**Distributive leadership.** The organizational structure at Andrew’s school was such that there were teams of people in place that served in concert with one another. Andrew placed people in positions so that he was free to leave the campus and travel throughout the world in order to develop relationships. From Andrew’s perspective on distributive leadership was inherently connected to his vision of development as well as collegiality and collaboration with others. He stated,

I have a real vision of where we’re going, and what we’re going to do that’s been created in conjunction with the board. My view on development is that I am 100 percent in if needed. I’m not going to sit and manage that program because I
think as a head if you do that, you get in the way. Your development director needs to know and be empowered to be the chief developer and executor of your development plan, and for the head to get involved becomes very distracting to their work. I think the head is called in when you make the final ask and you want to get with a major donor. We have a donor right now that we’re working with who’s the largest donor we have in our donor base, and she’s very interested in a major project, probably a three to six million dollar project.

Again, Andrew referred to his collegial relationship with his development director, Penelope. Andrew clearly had a very high regard and trusting relationship with Penelope. Together their synergy was contagious. Penelope and Andrew had a high regard for each other’s professionalism and trusted each other’s decision-making ability. Theirs was a mutual relationship based in trust and respect. Andrew observed,

Penelope has done the bulk of the work. Penelope does constant interaction with her, but I said to Penelope, ‘You tell me what you want me to do. I will do whatever it is you want. If you want me in the meeting, great, if you don’t want me in the meeting, fine.’ There is a development team in place. We have an inner fund person and we’ve got a major gifts officer. We have a communications person, got a person doing planned giving and service giving, got a database manager, so there is a team and Penelope completely handles that herself.” Penelope and I have been, we’re in the process right now of doing a campaign layout. You know, my role is one, to identify needs, so what is it going to look like? And two, to figure out how we’re going to go about doing this
project. In other words, what are we going to look at? I think the biggest issue, one of the biggest issues I alluded to earlier, is the issue of helping heads. Heads need to be comfortable leaving their school in order to do fundraising, and for many heads, you come into, if you come into a school, you have to make an assessment of where personnel are and where the school is in terms of its stability. Too many heads spend too much time on campus, and it’s very easy to do that, and it’ll kill you, actually.

So Andrew relied heavily on his associate head of school, Penelope, who directed the development team, allowing Andrew to travel the world to make connections with donors as well as to attend to external relations within the local community.

**Penelope**

Penelope completed student teaching to become a high school English teacher. However, she found employment at an institution of higher education, eventually landing a position in development. She worked in fundraising and development for many years at two institutions of higher education. However, family pulled her to the area where she served as director of development and associate head of school. She clearly loved what she did and understood the role that leadership plays in fundraising in the independent school world in addition to higher education.

**Transformational leadership.** Penelope believed in the power of transformational leadership and described Andrew as a transformational leader. One of the key indicators for her that a leader was transformational was if she saw a head of school at a major fundraising conference. Penelope states,
I would categorize Andrew as transformational – very inspirational, very vision-oriented, very ‘This is where we’re headed. Let’s all see the destination, that’s what it looks like, that’s where we’re headed, that’s what we’re gonna be and here are some obstacles in our way. Go figure it out.’ He is as effective as anyone I’ve worked with in presenting a vision and presenting the inspirational message related to our institution’s mission. That inspires donors. He’s also a very effective communicator. He’s a good listener. The pastoral side of him that affirms whoever is across from him – that he’s very interaction – inter-relational that way, with a donor, makes a big difference. I think that Andrew is an effective communicator for whom his body language becomes very natural, and I think that that’s a key part of it as well.

Andrew does communicate vision. I think one area that’s worth noting about Andrew is that he has seized as many occasions as he can to be the voice of the school. He is very comfortable not only presenting his vision but receiving questions and answering them. He’s very transparent. I think he’s presented the vision of the school consistently. (Penelope)

Penelope clearly saw Andrew as a transformational leader since he communicated with his stakeholders and shared his vision to carry out the mission of the school. This is very inspiring to donors and serves also to build trust.

**Idealized influence: Builds trust.** Penelope admired transformational leaders. For her, trust was often built when she attended conferences and saw heads of school that value development so much that they also attend the national development conferences.
Penelope understood that the key to unlocking the vision is development work and fundraising. For Penelope, heads of school who understood the importance of development were highly trustworthy to her. As Penelope stated,

I am drawn to the leaders who are transformational. I cannot speak to what I think would be the, the largest representation. I will tell you that as someone who comes up the ranks of development, when I’m at national conferences and there are heads of schools who have decided to be at a development conference when they could be at a conference on a myriad of topics they have decided that they are going to CASE-NAIS, for example – they’re transformational leaders. That’s generally who I see. Those are the heads of schools that value development as a way to achieve their vision, and I think that a lot of times – and whether that is reflective of the full cadre of independent school heads or whether that is a subset who self-selects to go to those types of conferences, which are naturally tilted towards external relations, and I don’t know, but that’s my observation.

Penelope spoke passionately about school leaders who chose to attend conferences on development. It set a tone of sorts in her mind. More importantly, these leaders saw development as a means to an end. That is, they had their vision at the forefront of everything that they did, including development. For it was through development that they were able to achieve their vision. Not only did these leaders lead with a vision in mind, they also acted with integrity.

**Idealized influence: Acts with integrity.** Penelope believed that Andrew led with integrity. He was highly respected and trustworthy in the minds of the community.
Penelope also believed that Andrew had built a strong reputation from his previous work in all areas of independent school life in addition to his career in politics and higher education. Penelope said,

I think that we have benefited greatly that Andrew, our head of school, has been in the classroom, in the dorm, in development, in communications, and, quite honestly, in the working world. I think the head of school of today has so many areas that they need to be knowledgeable about, but they need to have unbelievable executive function skills.

Andrew is very involved in the community through his work in the church, but in the first two years, especially, he really prioritized getting out in the community so his reputation locally is really impeccable in terms of being a leader of integrity, a person who cares not only about the success of this institution but also the success of the community. I think that’s a really, for private schools, sometimes that’s hard to, to get that reputation that you care about the community in which you live and he definitely has that reputation.

Penelope felt very strongly that being involved in the community allowed Andrew to be seen with integrity. Penelope described Andrew as being very pastoral which is a bridge between community and supporting others. Through his community work and work in his local church, he also was highly encouraging of others.

**Inspirational motivation: Encourages others.** Penelope underscored that relationship building was among Andrew’s strongest behaviors and characteristics as a leader. She also spoke to the fact that Andrew was hands-on when called to be hands-on.
Talking about the capital campaign, Penelope described Andrew’s ability to encourage others in the following statement:

We finished up a capital campaign his first year, and he was great. I mean he was great helping us finish it up, we’re in the process right now of gearing up for a new one, so I haven’t had what I would say with Andrew, the experience yet where we’re constantly on the road together, doing development calls, but I think that what we have been doing is laying the foundation and I think he’s been doing a superb job with that, and I think he’s been seizing opportunities when a development prospect pops up, even though we’re not yet ready to move forward with some of these capital projects. He’s seizing that opportunity.

Penelope discussed Andrew’s ability to seize opportunity. She and Andrew were not in a new capital campaign yet. However, Penelope believed that Andrew did an outstanding job in completing the capital campaign that he inherited and took every opportunity to check out all development prospects that came his way. Even more important, Andrew was setting the stage and laying the groundwork for the next capital campaign. Penelope went on to say,

He’s an excellent relationship builder, excellent at telling the school story with consistency. As we all know, that is 90 percent of fundraising. Ten percent is making the ask, and I think when he has been called to make the ask, he’s done so very successfully. He’s very willing to make the ask, and he is willing to wait for the right time to make the ask.
In the previous excerpt, Penelope described Andrew’s ability to build relationships. While building relationships was very important, making the ask encouraged others to take action. This is the critical juncture in securing the funds that are needed. Andrew’s ability to build the relationship coupled with the ability to encourage others led to securing the capital that was being sought. This was an important point to make in that this intersection between the relationship and the ability to encourage a person to actually donate to the school was tantamount. That relationship building was carried over to his ability to also encourage innovative thinking.

**Intellectual stimulation: Encourages innovative thinking.** Penelope highlighted the importance of innovative thinking. She described the need to think outside of the box when communicating with potential donors from other countries such as China.

I mean, their understanding of philanthropy is NGO’s. They don’t have an understanding of supporting schools, so when we do our international development, it’s not just about asking for money. It’s about educating about what philanthropy does for schools. In China, private schools are for profit organizations. People make a lot of money in private schools, and they don’t need philanthropy. So in China, explaining how private schools here are different is, a bit of a challenge. (Penelope)

Penelope went on to say,

I felt the need to clarify that because I think it does tilt the way that we look at campaigns because for us, campaigns – our top donor will likely be an individual,
but the next two top gifts will come from historic foundations that we have a partnership with, so Andrew is just as likely to be calling on a foundation as he is an individual.

Clearly, thinking outside of the box and thinking creatively about approaches to fundraising and philanthropy was critical. International development opportunities necessitated thinking about their approach in innovative ways. Certainly, Andrew and Penelope spent a great deal of time strategizing. At the same time, Andrew was a big proponent of coaching and developing others.

**Individualized consideration: Coaches and develops people.** One of the things that both Penelope and Andrew confirmed during the interviews was that Andrew had a high regard for pastoral care and counseling. Penelope echoed Andrew’s comments about his strong desire and passion to care for and help people. Andrew even commented during the interviews that he wished that he had a degree in pastoral care and counseling if he had things to do over again. Penelope certainly affirmed that stating,

> I think collegially, he is very affirming and the other think I would say about his leadership – he’s very pastoral. I mean, there, there’s a really shepherding of not just the institution, but of the person, and I think there’s also a shepherding of care, you feel cared for. This is a vocation as much as it is a profession and, so I think that affirmation coming from the head of school that is very pastoral in nature, is a really unique quality that I think has served our institution very well with ambitions change. I don’t know that without that, that we as a community could have been as willing to sustain as much change as we have been through.
Okay, so, in Andrew’s case, I think Andrew is—he’s very transformational with me. His leadership style with me, I feel is very transformational. I feel that he is keenly aware of the importance of development and is always exploring ways that we can tell the story about the school. He is, he is at brilliant external relations, gets the story out there, builds the relationships, all of that. That is his thing. He’s great at that.

Penelope went on to say that Andrew coached and developed others in this way.

Some he promoted from within. It’s been a combination that I actually think is really good. I think if you, sometimes it’s good that you have had to inherit some people who have institutional knowledge. They may not be somebody you hired but they have an institutional knowledge that’s really valuable for the head of school to have access to. If all you do is hire our own team, and you’re new, you’ve lost a lot of institutional knowledge. So I think it’s a good blend.

Andrew took time to coach and to develop others. He worked with those that were at the school prior to his arrival and hired several new administrators. Andrew mentioned that he hired several former superintendents who serve in leadership roles at the school overseeing major divisions such as the high school and the middle school. Andrew elaborated that those individuals enjoyed their work in curriculum and instruction, which gave him time to leave campus in order to fundraise. So in this instance, coaching and developing others allowed Andrew to carry out his philanthropic work for the school.

Over the course of several years, he has opened the door for this donor who will likely be a seven-figure bequest for our school. She has become just kind of an
adopted grandparent of the school. It began with a genuine interest in that person and then that person developed a genuine interest in Andrew and through that genuine interest, they recognized the shared value of the mission of this institution, so I think that’s a great example of a person who was not on our radar screen and someone who locally he was able to really develop a relationship with and a shared value for the institution’s success. (Penelope)

This is yet another example of how Andrew took time to coach and develop others. The individual that he had gotten to know lived locally in the community and Andrew formed a close relationship with her at his church. She had become an adopted grandparent to his children and to the school. He coached her about his vision for the school and worked to develop their mutual respect for one another. This type of coaching and developing goes a long way in relationship building necessary in fundraising.

Transactional leadership. Penelope appreciated Andrew’s giving so freely of his time. It was just routine for Andrew to be an active, vibrant part of fundraising. Andrew clearly considered fundraising an integral, expected, and routine part of his responsibilities as head of school. Penelope stated:

The other thing I would say is that one thing that makes a head a good fundraiser is that the head values fundraising and sees it as part of their responsibility. He makes time for it and he sees it as part of his responsibility. It is, there’s never been an occasion where I’ve asked for his time related to development that he has said no, and that’s not always the case.
Apparently, Andrew valued his contributions to fundraising and saw fundraising as a major component of his role as head of school. Andrew was confident in his leadership and thus was able to distribute various leadership roles to other members of his organizational team. This is a key component in successful fundraising.

**Distributive leadership.** Penelope described Andrew’s ability to allow distributive leadership to happen. He set the organizational structure such that he was available to anyone and everyone who needed his expertise. However, Andrew expected the director of development and her team to carry-out the work of fundraising, philanthropy, and advancement of the school. Penelope said that Andrew accomplishes this,

By not micromanaging at the different levels. He empowers other levels on campus to guide and direct their departments. Now, he will be happy to present an overarching goal, an overarching objective, but how you get there, the implementation, the ownership of that, he really lets rest in the department level, and I’ve worked under leaders who don’t do that, and I think that Andrew has a good balance of providing direction but allowing departments to chart their course.

Andrew did not micromanage. He believed in the team that he had put into place and expected them to get the job done. He met with them and coached them to new heights. However, Andrew was too busy meeting with members of the community and potential donors, forming relationships, around the world to be involved in
micromanagement. He set the tone and the course. Then he expected his department leaders to carry out the work. Penelope stated,

> It’s not just enough to be a good mission. It’s not just enough to be a good capital project. Is it a good investment in the sustainability of the institution? I think that, being able to answer that question convincingly with business acumen and financial expertise is an increasingly important part of not just the head of school job, but also for the development director, too.

In the previous quote, Penelope pointed to the fact that heads of school as well as the development director must be able to convince donors that their donation will be well invested for the long term. She advocated that the head of school and the director of development must be able to explain how the donation would support the long range plans of the school in terms of long range stability. This was among Andrew’s top reasons for traveling all over the world. He communicated this long range planning and stability to his potential major donors so that they would know first-hand how their donation would benefit students and the school for years to come. This was especially important to a major donor, such as Mary Ann, who may bequeath their estate and life’s investments to the school.

**Mary Ann**

**Transformational leadership.** Mary Ann clearly saw Andrew’s leadership as transformational. During the course of the interview, she referenced a situation when Andrew first came to the school and a new opportunity was presented. Andrew quickly
created a new, inspiring vision that made the major donors to the capital project even more committed than before. As Mary Ann elaborated,

Yeah, I mean this was our third time going back to some donors and some foundations and saying we’ve changed our minds again, and if Andrew had not been effective in showing the vision of how the dorm would have been great, but that was based on the economic times and now we have this wonderful opportunity, we would have had donors who said, ‘You know, this is the third time you’ve changed your mind. I’m really – I’m out.’ Instead Andrew was not only able to preserve gifts, but in many cases, get them to be even more committed than they had been. You know, ‘This is the third time we’re coming to you on this but I want to tell you what we’ll be able to do with this school that we would not have been able to do in a renovated dorm,’ and really get people engaged. There are other examples, but I would say coming on, being here only a year and having to change gears like that on a project where we’d already raised some money, and we were changing it enough that some of the donors could have walked away was very significant.

Mary Ann spoke of this unique opportunity and situation several times. This project to convert an existing dorm into the new middle school became a lightning rod of sorts in her mind. This was one of the best examples that Mary Ann provided that suggested that Andrew’s leadership was highly transformational. Even though the school changed its mind several times about the project, Andrew was able to heighten excitement about the project when an existing school became available. He was able to
heighten the donor motivation so much so that the donors gave even more than they previously agreed to give. Andrew was able to communicate his vision of a new middle school, in light of a changing situation. Mary Ann saw this as highly transformational, especially since donors gave even more in several cases. In order to get donors to give freely, relationships based on trust must be built.

**Idealized influence: Builds trust.** Repeatedly, throughout the interviews, it was apparent that Andrew considered relationship building to be at the very top of his work. He liked to get to know people before asking for major gifts to the school. He formed a close relationship with the individual that always kept the vision and mission of the school at the heart of the relationship. Mary Ann spoke about Andrew’s ability to build trust in the following conversation. Mary Ann reported,

Andrew is a highly effective fundraiser. It’s not transactional for him. It’s relationship building. I mean you don’t walk into somebody who can give us a million dollars potentially day one and say, ‘We’d like a million dollars from you.’ But it’s a very genuine relationship building. You don’t have a sense that he’s just coming to see you because he knows he should build a relationship with you before you give a million dollars. It’s very genuine relationship building – what can the school do for you so that you feel engaged, knowledgeable about the school and you want to write that check for a million dollars, hopefully.

I think as it relates to fundraising, it’s that commitment to relationship building with your donor. If you come to a donor in tough financial times, and you’ve never been to them before, they’re gonna be less likely to give to you than if
you’ve had a relationship in good times and in bad. I think relationship
fundraising is critically important, certainly for your large donors.

Repeatedly, it was very evident that Andrew believed in the power of relationship
building. Mary Ann stated that it was even more critical with very large donors. Another
point that was brought out during this phase of the interview was that during hard
economic times, relationship fundraising is especially important. In order to accomplish
relationship fundraising and trust building, Andrew also led with great integrity.

**Idealized influence: Acts with integrity.** Andrew not only talked the talk, but he
also walked the walk. He was very engaged and involved in capital projects and in
working with donors to the school. He was very genuine in his ability to connect with
people and form relationships. Andrew was highly involved and committed to
relationship building both in the local community as well as internationally. Andrew was
very much hands-on but did this in concert with Penelope.

I mean, our alumni-giving is nothing to our peer schools even in this area. So the
head of school has to be very involved. It doesn’t mean it’s not collaborative and
you don’t have the ability to delegate a lot, but he’s still got to play a very large
role with some key donors and does. (Mary Ann)

Mary Ann was saying that Andrew was highly involved in working with major
donors. He got to know them on a personal level. She reinforced that Andrew acted to
distribute his leadership. But he was still highly involved on a personal level, especially
with major donors. Mary Ann went on to say,
‘Gosh I’ve got an idea,’ and use her as a sounding board. You know, ‘This is how I’m thinking about this donor that I am going to go see,’ but wants her input and I think that filters down through her organization. Small organization. They have to delegate, and they do. That doesn’t mean there isn’t a real collaborative sense of ‘Where are our departmental goals and how do we execute that and who’s the right person to do the various roles?’ But I believe that is very much a distributed down through the organization with everybody taking their appropriate role and not stepping on each other’s toes.

Mary Ann really hit the nail on the head regarding the genuine distribution of leadership that occurred between not only Andrew and Penelope, but Penelope’s entire development and advancement team. The goals and big picture were developed by Andrew and Penelope and then distributed to various individuals that worked within Penelope’s development office. Mary Ann elaborated on the cohesiveness of the team distribution. Mary Ann stated,

You know, if Andrew is calling on a certain donor, then Penelope makes sure that she stays out of that other than when Andrew comes back and does a debrief with her. She’s capturing the information so that we have institutional knowledge about that donor. There is a development team in place.

The previous examples provided examples of how Andrew acted with integrity through his relationships. He formed strong, lasting relationships with donors as well as with his organizational team. He and Penelope had a relationship such that when one met with a potential donor and subsequently returned to the school, a meeting was held
between Andrew and Penelope to deduce the elements of the meeting. Andrew was able to lead his team and woo potential donors by acting with integrity. He also encourages his team to think innovatively.

**Intellectual stimulation: Encourages innovative thinking.** Andrew promoted innovative thinking. The school was highly unique in that there were students from all over the world coming to a rural Appalachian community. This necessitated thinking outside of the box. There had recently been an influx of Hispanics into the local community. Therefore, Andrew was seeking opportunities to recruit Hispanic students to the school. Over the years, the programs at the school also had to change to reflect the times that require thinking about the mission and vision of the school in new ways. Mary Ann spoke about Andrew’s ability to encourage innovative thinking.

Appalachian students would never have had an opportunity like this, so we’ve had to, as we feel, the world has changed, and now we want to prepare students to be part of a global community when they leave here, we have extended our financial aid for local students to include a broader group, but it is still the same fundamental mission. We want to provide access to education to students who would not otherwise have access, but its foundation is in the Appalachian families and, as I said with the farm family program, a commitment to the whole family, not just children in education, but how do we raise the bar for whole families in this country?

Mary Ann spoke about Andrew’s ability to encourage innovative thinking in light of an emphasis on creating global citizens. There was a strong emphasis on world
cultures at the Raymond School. Flags were highly visible from each and every country represented by its student body. The flags were centrally located on the campus at an intersection where all sidewalks came together. It was truly a beautiful sight to behold. The cultural diversity was evident in the dining hall when all students gathered at lunch. This had profound impact on the fundraising needs in terms of providing financial aid to its students. As Mary Ann discussed, there was a renewed emphasis on providing access (financial aid) to local students who otherwise could not attend the Raymond School.

One such group included Hispanics who had settled in the local area surrounding the school. The fundamental mission remained, but the student clientele has become highly multicultural and culturally diverse. Mary Ann went on to say,

Andrew worked with Penelope, but Andrew was part of it, worked with a former trustee to set up a scholarship for Hispanic students because there’s been a big influx of Hispanic students into the school and the surrounding county, and so you know, to recognize, ‘Gosh, this is a group that should be represented here at the school because it’s represented in the broader community.’ So that ability to show how we’ve used resources effectively in our history is critical. Then I also think he’s one of the best that I’ve seen at stating the case for the current project. You know, middle school’s a perfect example. Our old middle school was two houses that were next door to each other that we converted into a middle school when we had 30 students.

Mary Ann described two situations in which Andrew encouraged innovative thinking. With the influx of Hispanic students in the local community, Andrew saw the
opportunity to extend an invitation to them to enroll in the school. What was really interesting about this was that this forethought tied directly to the original mission and story of the school. Mary Ann pointed to the middle school facility that had to be changed several times as evidence that Andrew encouraged donors, trustees, and his team to think innovatively and outside of the box.

So I think we’re gonna have to figure out how to target programs and technology to the right people. I was one of the younger people in this group of neighbors that were getting together, and I was less offended by the use of emails than many of the older ones. (Mary Ann)

Mary Ann believed that Andrew encouraged innovative thinking. He had maintained the fundamental mission of the school to serve underrepresented students and families. Today, however, these students come from culturally diverse backgrounds both locally and internationally. This cultural diversity required creative fundraising, especially in terms of how the fundamental need was explained to international students. Still, the fundamental mission of the school was maintained by serving underrepresented students and families. The usage of email to communicate the school’s story and to follow up or even to solicit donors had to be thought about innovatively as well. Mary Ann went on to describe Andrew in terms of times that he appeared to be a transactional leader.

**Transactional leadership.** Mary Ann highlighted Andrew’s ability to be transactional in his leadership as well. There were routine tasks that must be performed
on a regular basis. Writing thank you letters and creating video clips that were sent out to annual donors was just part of what Andrew did on a routine, transactional basis.

I mean there are certainly transactional donors, annual fund donors who write a small check every year that are still critical, but you need to find ways to touch them too. You’re not going to call on every $100 donor, but it may be a letter from the head of school that’s very genuine and thoughtful in terms of thanking them, for their annual fund donation.

Mary Ann described the fact that there were times that Andrew acted in a transactional fashion. For example, he could not possibly interact with each and every donor on a personal level. So he used other ways to communicate with them such as Facebook, email, and personal correspondence.

**Transformative leadership.** Mary Ann provided an example from a previous head of school whom she believed utilized transformative leadership. However, she discussed during the interview that most leaders utilized different forms of leadership depending on the times and the situation. Rarely if ever did only a single leadership style exist. Mary Ann remarked,

I would say that I have seen all different styles. I think most effective ones are the ones that can adapt and sort of have elements of all, but one may be more dominant than another at certain times. The example that I can give of that is our previous head of school came to the school before the economic crisis and had a very specific set of issues that the board had said, ‘Go out and do this. Start doing some fundraising. We need to do some campus enhancements and look at
building some new buildings.’ Then the economic crisis hit, and he had to go from very much an outward focus, traveling a lot to do fundraising, making connections with donors to, ‘How are we going to survive in an environment where we don’t know whether we’re going to get the boarding students that we used to get?’

Mary Ann spoke to a number of issues related to transformative leadership. She believed that most successful heads of school utilized various forms of leadership at different times. Mary Ann felt that particular situations called for particular leadership, especially during varying economic times. She also highlighted something very interesting that was brought out much earlier in this work. Enrollment in boarding schools and independent schools is down nationwide. So Andrew was going international to recruit students as well as to fund raise. Traveling to various locations in order to fund raise is transactional; however, communicating the story, mission and vision of the school leading an international donor to give to the school requires both distributive leadership in addition to transformational leadership. Mary Ann spoke specifically about Andrew’s ability to distribute leadership in the following section.

**Distributive leadership.** Mary Ann discussed during the interview that Penelope and Andrew were very much a partnership. She discusses the collaborative nature of their work as well as their team approach to fundraising.

So our heads of schools, I think, historically, but certainly Andrew, has had to keep a significant role in fundraising and development. Now, we have a fabulous director of development in Penelope so it’s very much a partnership.
Mary Ann really believed very strongly in the powerful relationship between Penelope and Andrew. Mary Ann felt strongly that they operated as a cohesive team and set the tone for the rest of the organization. Together Penelope and Andrew set the goals and communicated those goals to the team.

I don’t think he’s saying, ‘This is how we’ll do it and so go execute my plan.’ It’s still very collaborative with Penelope, but then it’s ‘Okay here’s what I’ll do to support the role,’ by Andrew and Penelope saying, ‘Here’s what I’ll do and here’s what I’ll have my department doing,’ so it’s critical for the school.

I think it’s that collaborative approach, but taking responsibility where he can play the right role with a donor. We’ve got a very large donor right now who is very attached to Penelope, just very attached, and it’s a significant donor.

Andrew has been able to say, ‘You know, Penelope, you need to take the lead on this.’ And then Penelope has been able to say to this donor, ‘Okay, you’re on campus meeting with me, I think Andrew might be available. Should I see if he can join us for this tour?’ And, you know, get Andrew involved then at the appropriate time, without losing that real connection that she has. It’s very collaborative, and I think that makes it more effective. He knows when to step out and when to step in. (Mary Ann)

Mary Ann brought out an extremely important point about distributive leadership. She believed that the relationship that Andrew had with Penelope and that Penelope had with Andrew made their fundraising program the success that it was. They work collaboratively in concert with one another. Mary Ann felt very strongly that this
collaborative, distributive approach to fundraising was imperative to running a fundraising program that was most successful.

Jason

Jason was in his second year as a head of school. He came from a background in independent school education, however. He served in a variety of roles leading up to his appointment as head of school. Jason’s school had a former military school background and Jason was also educated at a military school in the Midwest. Jason admittedly was still learning his way as a new school head. Jason was in an interesting situation in which the previous head of school was still present in the role of Director of Major Gifts. As such, the former head of school, legendary in the school’s history and a stalwart figure in the community, did much of the fundraising for the school. Admittedly, at times, this was an awkward situation for Jason. For example, when they travel to fundraising events in New York or Washington, D.C., the former head of school introduced Jason as the new head of school. This organizational structure had been put into place by the existing board of trustees, who had reverence for the former head of school. Immediately after the former head retired, the former head was named president. It was only recently that the title was changed to Director of Major Gifts. Jason, however, was comfortable in his role as the new head of school.

The results of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Jason in the area of transformational leadership as reported by Jason’s raters were a 3.0 out of a 4.0 scale, meaning that his raters believed that his transformational leadership frequency occurred fairly often. However, it should be noted that Jason’s transformational frequency score
was the lowest of the three heads of school. Transactional leadership was broken down into two categories including rewards achievement and monitors deviations and mistakes. Jason scored 3.1 as rated by his raters for rewarding achievement while he rated 1.0 for monitoring deviations and mistakes. Although Jason did reward achievement slightly more than fairly often, he also monitored deviations and mistakes once in a while. Jason’s average frequency score of rewarding achievement was slightly above the research validated benchmark whereas Jason’s average score of 1.0 for monitoring deviations and mistakes is within the research validated benchmark. Still, monitoring mistakes for Jason was higher than for Andrew but lower than Kyle. When compared with the other two heads of school who participated in this study, Jason rated the lowest in the area of transformational leadership with an average transformational score of 3.0 out of 4.0, meaning fairly often. Jason rated in the middle in comparison to the other leaders in the area of transactional leadership with scores of 3.1 and 1.0 as previously described meaning slightly more than fairly often and once in a while, respectively. The data resulting from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Jason is summarized in Table 3 below.
Table 3

*Jason: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>All Raters Average</th>
<th>Research Validated Benchmark</th>
<th>Universal Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational (overall)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized attributes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized behaviors</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>&gt; 2.0 to &lt; 3.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-exception: active</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>&gt; 1.0 to &lt; 2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-exception: passive</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>&gt; 0 to &lt; 1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>&gt; 0 to &lt; 1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra effort</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>&gt; 3.5 to &lt; 4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>&gt; 3.5 to &lt; 4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the leadership</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>&gt; 3.5 to &lt; 4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transformational leadership.** Here, Jason described a time that he felt that he was transformational. He discusses how he empowered another individual at the school to think differently about a situation, and then that person was inspired to do even more. In Jason’s words,

And through those conversations, we started to then think about--it was opening up things that he just hadn’t thought about. And so through those conversations now we start to think about, okay, so if there’s any truth to this, then how do we
And so expanding the conversation, getting more people involved, you know, the next thing you know, we’re doing is we’re forming a committee to think about residential life programs on campus and, getting some students involved and then we’re going to visit some other schools, and now I have him who’s coming to me, with ideas, and proposals, and it’s hard for me to keep up.

In this scenario, there was evidence that Jason is transformational. He was inspiring others to do even more. In fact, he inspired them so much that he said he cannot keep up with the ideas they brought to him. These ideas were stimulated through conversations with Jason’s staff. There was also evidence inherent from this quote that he encouraged others and encouraged innovative thinking, which is behavioral characteristics associated with transformational thinking. There is much more to being transformational, however, including building trust.

**Idealized influence: Builds trust.** Jason underscored the importance of taking time to get to know people first. It is difficult to ask people for large sums of money if there is not a mutual understanding and respect established first. Jason understood that he had to connect with all donors. Jason said that,

I found that most of our donors – and I hate to be – to categorize them all so generally, but I think most of our donors, are alumni. They want to feel a connection. They want to know that somebody that’s in my position at our school cares about what their experience was like. They want to know that the values that they got from the school are still important today.
Here Jason described the importance of getting to know people and to let them know that someone at the school still cared about them. Jason believed in communicating that the values that the alumni cared about were still in place today. It was especially important for the head of school to communicate that those values were still in place today that alumni cherished many years ago. Listening to alumni and hearing about past traditions went a long way to build trust with alumni who were often major donors.

And through my style, which is really, try to approach people as individuals and get to know them, to learn about their experiences, thus far has been moderately successful, I would say, and I think been received well – I think it’s working. I think they would be turned off by somebody that was very aggressive, and very matter of fact and direct in terms of asks or demands. (Jason)

Jason also highlighted the importance of getting to know people as individuals and finding out about their experiences was critical in forming relationships in order to build trust. Jason did not believe in being aggressive or strategic when asking donors for money. This approach went a long way not only to build trust but also demonstrated Jason’s ability to act with integrity.

**Idealized influence: Acts with integrity.** Acting in genuine ways was very important to Jason. He liked to initiate conversations that led to genuine relationships that connected the individual with the school’s story. In Jason’s words,

Finding opportunities to connect with them, as often as possible, one-on-one, or individually. Oftentimes, it’s a get to know you letter that starts with had a
conversation today, learned of your experiences, would like to learn more about what it is you’re doing. As head of school this is important to me. Then hopefully that initiates a conversation. Then from there, I tend to focus on the individual. What is it that connected you to the school originally, and how do we think about maintaining that connection?

A key component here was relationship building and getting to know the individual. A real critical piece was how Jason found out about the person’s connection with the school originally and then figured out a way to reconnect the potential major donor to what was happening at the school today. Jason went on to say.

Our fundraising campaigns usually comes out of needs assessments and strategic planning, strategic thinking, and so I am on the front side of fundraising projects, first identifying needs, goals with projects or program development areas, and then really communicating those things. When I sit down to talk to alumni who are part of the military era of the school, I can say, ‘Oh, that’s really interesting. Tell me about it, because I also went to a military school.’

Jason was on the front lines of fundraising. He was out there talking with potential donors, constantly connecting the story of the school with the donor’s background and story. Being out there, connecting with donors and alumni, went a long way toward building personal and professional integrity. Jason also played a critical role in encouraging others.

**Inspirational motivation: Encourages others.** Jason encouraged others to think in new, creative ways. He felt that his development team needed to think about things in
new and different ways. He did not believe in doing something just because it had always been done that way. As Jason explains,

This was our fifth year. My contributions were limited, but I put a team in place to help organize, think about, research. You know, what were other schools doing similarly in terms of parent auctions, fundraisers? So kind of encouraging my alumni development office to take a new approach or a different mindset into this. Let’s not just do it this way because we’ve always done it.

Jason encouraged others to think about things in new and different ways. He encouraged others to take charge and believed in looking at new approaches and ways of doing things. He encouraged his team to find out what other schools were doing. Jason discusses that,

I kick it over to the development office, and really push a lot of that then down to them to say, okay. Where are the donor lists? Where are we--who are we going to talk to? Who are we going to--who could be a lead donor for this project that might inspire other people to also donate to this cause?

And then we can compare experiences, and notes, and ideas. Then it gives me an opportunity to say, ‘You know, I went to a military school and I think as much as we’re different today, that still happens in this way.’ And it’s been fun to have those conversations and to maybe get some alumni to think about how, as different as it is today, it’s actually not all that different.

Jason encouraged his development office to analyze the donor lists and to figure out who they were going to talk to. He encouraged them to think about who else might
be inspired to donate to a particular project. Jason also encouraged others, including alumni, by letting them know that he went to a military school as well. He also let alumni donors know that although the school had changed, the core values were still very much in place. While Jason encouraged others, he also encouraged innovative thinking.

**Intellectual stimulation: Encourages innovative thinking.** Jason spent a lot of time strategically thinking about what it would take to inspire new donors both long term and short term. In Jason’s words,

> We felt like we had a lot of work to do there. So I kind of spent a lot of time strategizing, asking questions, trying to understand what they had done, what their approach had been, where they were going, and who else was out there that maybe could help us get to the goals of the campaign. Also, at the same time, thinking about with my alumni and development office, how do we inspire new donors, for both the campaign and the annual fund, which were both extremely important. We couldn’t do one without the other, and we needed to remember that along the way. So trying to energize those processes was important to me.

Jason encouraged innovative thinking in a collaborative approach. He worked with his development director to figure out way to inspire new donors. He also wanted to put energy into new innovative ways. Jason adds,

> So I did that by finding a lot of connections, taking my experiences from the two previous schools that I’ve been at, and finding ways to insert ideas, new ideas, different ideas into the conversation in a way that wasn’t threatening to my staff,
but also in a way that would give us some opportunities to maybe think about moving forward in a different direction.

Jason drew from his past in order to encourage innovative thinking. He used experiences from his previous schools to find ways to encourage others. Jason remarked, I ask the department chairs to think about an idea, think about a project, or think about how can we do this differently? So we’ve done that. I encourage department chairs to ask in terms of teaching science or math or physical education and health – and that each teacher have a role in that, and then I demand of them that they come to the table and they bring ideas.

This was critical testimony by Jason because it demonstrated that not only did he encourage innovative thinking, but he also used a distributive approach in his leadership. He encouraged his department chairs to come to the table with innovative ideas about how they can do things differently. But like most leaders, he also used transactional leadership.

**Transactional leadership.** Jason utilized transactional leadership as described below. Jason described a data management project that he began prior to becoming head of school. He continued monitoring data in an attempt to quantify decisions about all areas of school leadership including fundraising and working with donors. Jason advocated that,

Probably one of the things that I did as a result of an aspiring heads program was more or less a project where I was asked to do something for my school to help learn more about a different area of life. And I did a data management project for
our school where I was looking at quantifiable numbers, whether that was in the academic area, student life area, finance and investment, development, and fundraising, and trying to come up with metrics to watch progress or lack thereof in each of these different categories, and that was an experience that I think about often as I look at our development and fundraising efforts here, and also the trends that I tend to focus on and watch.

Jason felt that a project that he completed during his training to become head of school carried over with him. He used his data management project to monitor fundraising efforts at the school. Monitoring data for fundraising was an important endeavor. However, it was not inspirational towards others nor did it build relationships. Monitoring data were highly transactional in that it could lead to rewards or possible punishments. It was also a form of monitoring deviations and mistakes. Moreover, this time might be better spent forming relationships and cultivating major donors. Additionally, this responsibility could be delegated to his development team. Perhaps this task was a function of where Jason stood – in the first two years of his first headship.

It’s given me a broader perspective of a comparison point. But just knowing which numbers to really watch and to track, coming into this process and going through the process of saying, okay, well, what numbers are most important for us to really watch, because that’s what I kind of spent time figuring out at a previous school, and that’s been very helpful coming here. (Jason)

Monitoring data is important. But donors do not care about data. They want a personal connection. Donors want a story. They want to see the passion in the leader.
Monitoring data is a highly transactional task that needs to be delegated to someone else. Jason might make better use of this time by traveling to meet some alumni and connecting with them in some way. Going out to lunch or having dinner would be an example. Jason stated,

So I think I would best be described as a steady, calm, quiet leader. I am introspective. I take my time, in the perspective of I try to be very thoughtful and considerate of different opinions, different thoughts. I really view my job as a motivator or somebody that inspires people to think maybe a little bit differently about how can they individually improve, or how can we collectively improve as an organization to meet the needs of our kids, and for me – a lot of it focuses on what will it take for me to make sure that my faculty and staff is either educated or aware or understanding of the best practices, the best pedagogy out there to meet the needs of the current students that we have at our school.

Focusing on individual improvement seems akin to contingent rewards, a key component of transactional leadership. Jason also described that he spends a lot of time thinking about how his learning organization could improve and how he could get faculty and staff to understand best practices. These seemed rather transactional in nature. It also seemed that these tasks would be better suited for department chairs. He could present an overarching goal to his chairs and distribute his leadership in such a way that best practices and curricular matters were handled by the directors and department chairs. Jason added,
We all agree that change is warranted or maybe we don’t all agree that change is warranted, but here’s what we’ve talked about. Here are the reasons for change, and here’s why we’re gonna go in this direction. So that’s how I try to lead and motivate and inspire people more or less.

Like most leaders, Jason had some transactional behaviors. For example, when he implemented organizational change, one thing that he did was explicitly state the reasons that the change was needed. He also outlined his reasons why the change would occur. Monitoring deviations and mistakes was a key characteristic of transactional leadership.

**Active management-by-exception: Monitors deviations and mistakes.** Jason discussed the importance that he places on the school’s mission and vision. At the same time, he discussed monitoring all school communications with donors and alumni. He personally checked each item that went out to the school’s donor base including parents and alumni. He placed emphasis on communicating the school’s mission and vision in every document whether it was electronic or print-based literature. Jason stated,

> So we talk a lot about mission and vision. We have to do a better job of communicating our vision. I would tell you that up front. As head, I look at every publication, whether it’s an electronic newsletter, or a letter, or a mailing that goes out to our external community, so I’ll include alumni that are past, students into those categories. Students that may be left, after eighth grade to go to another school or something like that, I’ll put them in that category, also, but I think every piece of communication that they get from us or see is important for
us. In some ways we’re communicating with them, something about our vision, something about where we’re going.

Monitoring deviations and mistakes is a classic behavioral characteristic of transactional leadership. Jason monitored every publication that was produced for the school. He monitored them for the message of mission and vision of the school, which were transformational behavioral characteristics. Jason personally checked items that go out to alumni and to the donor base. This took up a great deal of his time, energy and effort. Monitoring these publications was important, however, as the donor base was not fond of missed messages, and did want to know that their story was still being represented.

**Transformative leadership.** Jason believed that different situations, different meetings, and different occasions required different leadership styles. Jason affirmed that he made use of a variety of leadership styles when he led meetings or worked with a potential new family at the school. Jason explained, “Without a doubt, a combination of leadership approaches probably different approaches within different meetings – different sessions that we have throughout the course of a day.”

Jason felt certain that different situations required different leadership styles. He monitored deviations and mistakes at times, but he also inspired others to think creatively, he built trust and acted with integrity. There were also indications that he used a distributive leadership approach to fundraising. His distribution, may not yet be fully developed.
Distributive leadership. Jason described several ways that he used distributive leadership. During the interview, he described several situations where he had a team of ten individuals in place that helped him lead different areas of the school. In particular, Jason noted his involvement of others in strategic planning. Being new to the school and seeing that change was needed immediately, Jason knew that he needed to help immediately in order to set new directions for the school. Jason elaborated,

I have a group of ten administrators that includes an assistant head of school who is also our business manager. I have an upper school dean, a middle school dean, a director of admissions, a director of public relations and communications, a director of college counseling, director of buildings and grounds, director of alumni and relations and development. So those are the ten people that sit on my administrative team. So one of the things that I think I have to do in order to help the school function and the kids to have the experience that they need is to help these people feel supported, but also feel like they have enough authority to do what needs to be done on a daily basis. So that if I’m not here, everything that needs to happen can still go on. I often think about that from that approach. So with that mindset comes – how do I distribute some of these assignments, some of the work that we’re all doing together? I think one of the best examples that I can give is with the strategic planning process. Last year at this time we just kind of started the strategic thinking process, and I did not want a process that would take us several years. I knew I had about a year to get some real solid conversations
going on within our community, and then start to make some changes with the
direction that we’re headed as a school. I knew I couldn’t do that alone.

Clearly, Jason believed in the power of distributive leadership. He involved the
school community in the strategic planning process because he knew that he could not do
it alone. He also had a clear administrative team in place, consisting of at least ten
individuals, who could run the school when he was not around. As Jason further
develops his role as chief fundraiser, he will need to be away from the school on a much
more frequent basis. He needs to connect with those donors and alumni that are across
the country and around the world. Jason went on to say that,

I sit down with my board in the summer before our annual cycle of meetings and
I work out with them my areas of focus, my areas of concentration. Of course I
have to keep everything running, but there are always four or five things that I sit
down with them and say, here are some things that I’m really gonna focus on and
we’re gonna try to work on. I would say for our school for the last two years’
admissions and alumni and development has been part of those plans.

So collectively I spend a lot of my time working with the alumni
development office. Usually it’s a collaborative in that we are strategizing on
projects that we’re working on. (Jason)

Jason’s words reveal that distributive leadership was in place at the Simsbury
School. There was a team that took care of development. There was a development
director, a director of major gifts, as well as additional support staff. Jason had a
leadership team in place consisting of ten individuals. However, when he and the
development team went on trips together, the director of major gifts was the one connecting with the major donors and alumni. Jason was there as well, but was introduced as the head of school. More opportunities will arise as time passes for Jason to connect with major donors. There may need to be a stronger emphasis on Jason as the chief fundraiser. He needs to be the one leading the conversation and connecting with the major donors and alumni base. He and his development director along with the director of major gifts seemed a bit awkward. More harmony needs to exist amongst the three so that Jason is leading the story and driving the core mission, vision and history of the school home to his major donors and alumni base. Dom is one such major donor.

**Dom**

Dom was a ninety-something year old physician who graduated from the school and went on to graduate from Princeton University and subsequently received his medical degree from Columbia University. Although Dom was well into his nineties, he was sharp as a tack. Dom returned to the area in order to practice medicine before assuming a major role in hospital administration for many years. Dom had been chairman of the board of trustees for many years and had seen heads of school come and go. Dom had been part of the school since the 1950’s. Over the years, Dom had many encounters with heads of school. In particular, he hired and fired numerous heads of school in his long time role as chairman of the board of trustees. He retired from that role, but continued to serve as a major donor.

**Idealized influence: Builds trust.** During the conversation with Dom, it came out that there was a former head of school currently serving in the role as director of
major gifts. Jason made an effort to travel with the former head of school when meeting with potential donors and on official fundraising calls. Dom believed that Jason worked well with the former head of school. By going with the former, revered head of school, Jason built trust with the major donors as he was able to update them on the current mission, vision, and story of the school.

We’d be very foolish not to continue using the former head of school because he came in 1980, and the 1980’s are now ready to make some gifts. And so, Jason is not intimidated by the former head of school.

That’s not true in the school in this area. But he is involved in--I mean, he goes to the alumni events, goes on calls with our major donors with the former head, and works well. (Dom)

It was difficult for Jason to build complete trust with his donor constituents and alumni alike when the director of major gifts and the former head of school were at his side wooing donors. Jason was then in his second year as the head of school. It could prove to be risky, but Jason needed to be the clear head of school who traveled across the country to meet with alumni and potential donors. He did not need to be introduced by the former head of school, now the director of major gifts. Jason could build much trust by telling stories and connecting what is going on at the school today with potential donors and alumni. New relationships needed to be forged in order for the school to grow even more. Some trips could warrant traveling together or separately, depending on the individual donor or alumni-donor. Some donors may connect with Jason even more
than the former head of school. This connection would increase exponentially as Jason continues to act with integrity.

**Idealized influence: Acts with integrity.** Dom worked with many heads of school over the years in his role as chairman of the board emeritus. However, Dom believed that Jason was acting with integrity. Jason brought a young family to the school and had two young children of his own who would attend the school in the near future. Jason lived on campus with his wife and family who attend numerous school functions and events. Dom spoke repeatedly about the necessity to produce a quality product, which was highly reflective of the leadership of the head of school. Dom affirmed that a quality project would make alumni and other donors donate to the school. Jason was delivering a quality product through his leadership and, as a result, his integrity was growing with alumni, the school community, and major donors. Dom added,

That’s tough for a headmaster because he’s gotta try to balance the budget. And, he’s also gotta realize that people give to schools that are successful, and the success of the school is largely dependent on the leadership of the headmaster. So, he’s gotta be a part of the fundraising, but he can’t use if I smoke this kid, you know, there might be a big check in the mail.

In Dom’s opinion, “Heads of school have certainly become more involved in fundraising. But again, they have to run a good school. They have to have a product to sell, to raise funds.” Dom went on to elaborate,

If you’ve got your headmaster sleeping with a woman, you know, 90 miles away, people are not going to give to that. And, consequently, the character of the
headmaster, his image, and his ability to meet people, all very important in fundraising. So, it’s integral. He has to be a fundraiser, but he’s gonna have to be in the detail of it. He has to prove the way fundraising is being conducted. Has to certainly be interested because he has to balance the budget as best he can.

As Dom’s words revealed, not only was image of the school important, but the image of the head of school was equally important. The character of the head of school was critical in terms of how donor constituents, alumni and parents viewed the head of school. Heads of school need to have an impeccable reputation. In turn, the school must be producing a high quality product in terms of the programs and curricula that it offers. So the head of school must integrate himself into the fabric of the school such that major donors see great things happening at the school and that the head of school is a person with great integrity leading the school. Simultaneously, the head of school should be highly encouraging of others.

**Inspirational motivation: Encourages others.** Dom discussed the importance of being enthusiastic in order to support fundraising. During the interview, Dom did not indicate Jason’s level of enthusiasm. Dom felt that Jason was very new to the school. Dom stated,

You gotta be enthusiastic. You gotta run the product that you’re selling. You won’t raise a dime if you don’t, in fundraising. And secondly, you won’t have anybody behind you, following, if you’re not enthusiastic. You know, if you talk to people about, you know, we need to do a better job. You know, you gotta drink the bourbon.
Dom believed that it is very important for the head of school to encourage others by being enthusiastic. Dom felt that in order for people to get behind you and to believe in donating to the school, the head of school must show tremendous enthusiasm. This could be done by telling the story of the school with passion. Having lunch or dinner with alumni or potential major donors was the opportune time to be enthusiastic. Enthusiasm about the school, its vision and mission, would go a long way with potential donors. If the head of school was not enthusiastic about what was happening at Simsbury, for example, why should anyone else be encouraged to donate large sums of money to the school? Dom strongly felt that it is important to believe in the product that the head of school is producing and to communicate that belief with tremendous pride and enthusiasm. One way that a great product could be delivered was through innovative thinking.

**Intellectual stimulation: Encourages innovative thinking.** During the conversation with Dom, he indicated several items to consider in order to produce results in fundraising. He placed importance on letting your imagination run wild and considering all possibilities when fundraising. It appeared that Jason did encourage innovative thinking with the teams that he had in place.

In Dom’s words, “You have to let your imagination run wild. We sometimes get in boxes, and, we don’t think outta the box. And a leader has to be thinking out of the box.” As someone that encourages innovative thinking, the leader has to reflect on possibilities, on alternatives, and cannot get caught in routine thinking. As someone encouraging alternatives to the usual, school leaders as fundraisers must redefine the box
and extend options to the donors and those aiding in the fundraising process. For example, Jason designed a one day of giving campaign in which he involved the students in fundraising. As a part of this Jason designed a day, in which students give one dollar to dress casually, wearing Simsbury-themed clothing. It was highly popular and all students participated. On this day, which was called “Giving Tuesday” students donated one dollar to dress casually and then signed a Giving Tuesday banner. Jason also designed a day to coincide with Cyber Monday, which occurs the Monday after the Thanksgiving holiday break. On Cyber Monday, parents, alumni, and donors were invited to participate in the annual one day of giving. Just as someone would shop online, Jason set this day as an annual day of giving where people make online donations to the school. Jason stated that this initiative had been a highly successful endeavor to date.

**Transformative leadership.** Transformative leadership was important at the Simsbury School. Dom believed that Jason was involved in all aspects of school leadership and that he employed different styles based on the particular context and situation. Dom said,

I think you have to be a jack of all trades. If they have to use different times, different kinds of leadership, with different things that go on in a school. I think it also depends upon the school. You know, if you’re a headmaster of Georgetown Prep, of a thousand students, then and if you’re at Andover or Exeter, you probably don’t even know where the English class meets. You’re on the road, raising money. If you’re at this school, you’re primarily with the students, the
faculty, and parents, and you use different styles of leadership with all those groups.

Yes, I believe that heads of schools use combinations of approaches of styles.

**Distributive leadership.** A really revealing and interesting came out during the course of the interview with Dom. Jason and the former head of school worked together in concert in regards to fundraising. The former head of school was previously given the title of president of the school, but that changed to Director of Major Gifts. He and Jason traveled a great deal together to larger urban centers to meet with major donors, alumni, and potential donors. A collaborative relationship had been forged. During subsequent interviews, however, another individual revealed that there were awkward moments at times. This potentially could have an impact on the school-donor relationship. Dom, however, believed that it helped to foster the relationships with the major donors and alumni base. Dom commented,

And I think that Jason made a wise decision. He’s got this contact. Why would we wanna say, no, he can’t go see that anymore? So I think from that standpoint, that told me a lot about him, that he wasn’t afraid of the former headmaster. He had, you know, his own convictions, but he would appreciate the help that he could get, by his raising money.

Dom’s reverence for the former head of school came out here. Unfortunately, the former head of school was a temporary fix. Jason needed to be the one that took the lead on fundraising. However, this put Jason in a more positive light with Dom, so it was a
trade-off of sorts. Still, Jason needed to represent the school fully and completely, not partially.

Yes, the former head of school is still involved in fundraising and outreach. We’re trying to wrap up the campaign. And he’s involved in wrapping up some of those major gifts. The former head and Jason and I have talked, and I think Jason will probably want him to just stay on and you know go to alumni events in Washington and Pittsburgh and so forth. (Dom)

In the above statement by Dom, it was evident that Jason was willing to distribute leadership to Rory, the former head of school as well as to Max, his development director. What was more clandestine in this relationship, however, was that Dom, the former chairman of the board and major donor was in awe of Rory. Dom was very powerful, still, in the school organization. There was evidence that Jason was willing to distribute leadership, but it was not entirely clear if Jason was trying to keep Dom happy or if he was really genuine in wanting Rory involved in the fundraising efforts. As Jason develops more as a head of school, he will likely connect more with donors by traveling to meet with them personally. Dom continues this line of thinking in following quote.

I was a little concerned that a strong leader like the former head of school could’ve knocked into that sort of subsidiary role. But I think that Jason has handled it very well, and used him well. Yes, the former head of school has an office here, a small office. He comes in maybe two, three hours, three or four days a week. And, you know, dictates letters to the secretary just to keep people
sends emails to our big donors and so forth. Always copies Jason so people know it’s a team, not a power struggle. (Dom)

At some point, Rory, the former head of school, needs to step away altogether. The position of Director of Major gifts needs to exist. This represents additional collaboration and a distribution of leadership. However, Rory is not the right person to fulfill this role. Jason needs to hire a new Director of Major Gifts to work in concert with him and Max, the Director of Development.

**Max**

Max was the director of development for the Simsbury School. He graduated from the school during the 1980’s. His background was non-academic. However, he had been involved in other organizations and served as the hockey coach for many years. Thus, he was heavily involved in school life, but came to the school from a background rich in community service and external affairs. He was also Dom’s son-in-law. Max’s wife, Dom’s daughter, served as the head of an elementary school located near the Simsbury School. Max and his wife participated in numerous community events for charity as well as monthly fundraising events held for the Simsbury School. Max was very much an extrovert who loved the limelight. Max provided much rich insight during the interview with him as well as numerous print materials related to fundraising at Simsbury. First Max described Jason as a transformational leader at times.

**Transformational leadership.** Max described Jason’s continual use of the mission and vision of the school. Jason continually reminded his audiences whether they are school community, alumni, major donors or parents, of the *Forward and No Retreat*
motto of the school. This represented the brand that Dom previously discussed. Max believed that Jason’s leadership was transformational largely due to Jason’s focus on mission, vision, and the school’s brand, Forward and No Retreat. As Max stated in his interview,

I think he does. I think we’ve always done that, from a fundraising standpoint. Jason goes back from a traditional standpoint of stating what is traditional. You know, with the respect, the doing the right thing, the never, never quitting. Those are all kinda like pillars of our culture of what we represent here. And he definitely uses that in the fundraising – in the appeal, in the, you know sounds corny, but our you know, Forward and No Retreat. I mean, that was our funding motto. For our 200th anniversary in 2014, that was we used Forward and No Retreat as our year-long theme. I think he does a very good job of incorporating that, although he’s only been here for two years outta 200. The way, I look at it is there no one’s been here for the majority of the 200 years.

Certainly, a big part of transformational leadership is communication a clear mission and vision of the school. Jason was doing this, according to Max, with major donors, parents, and alumni with whom he met. Max referenced the Forward and No Retreat brand message that Jason referenced in his communications with potential donors and alumni. Other aspects of transformational leadership remained to be uncovered, however. One additional behavioral characteristic of transformational leadership is the leader’s ability to build trust with his constituents, especially alumni and major donors.
**Idealized influence: Builds trust.** Max felt that Jason built trust through being visible and attending alumni, parent, and fundraising events. Through his attendance at these events, he was building relationships that Max felt were critical to recruiting donors and fundraising. Max gave the following key insight,

I would say that Jason would feel the same way. We have a couple of events coming up here, within the next month. We have one in Washington, D.C. We’re trying to get places where he can meet some of these donors.

And our relationships with our students are – I mean, with our constituents, who are donors, are either that of a trustee or alumni. You can only have 30 trustees. Well, then it’s an alumni. It’s a current parent. It’s a current grandparent. Certainly, we have foundations and friends, but the core, even amongst the board, the core of our board members are either past parents, current parents, and even more commonly, alumni. (Max)

Jason was working to build trust with his constituents. He was traveling some with Max and with Rory, the Director of Major Gifts. He was visible in the school community. His children and wife attended events with him. But at the same time, Jason was still somewhat new to the school and was overshadowed at times by Rory, the former revered head of school. Jason was visible at athletic events and school events. He was beginning to meet more often with alumni and major donors. As time continued, however, Jason would need to completely take the lead in meeting with alumni and major donors. He needs to be seen as the visible, clear leader of the school, not the former
revered head of school. Building that trust would be critical in the long term fundraising success of the school as is the ability to act with integrity.

**Idealized influence: Acts with integrity.** Max described the way in which Jason built his integrity. Jason had a young family that was highly visible. Although Jason’s children were not at Simsbury due to their age, they were enrolled in the feeder independent elementary school. Jason, his wife, and his children made themselves available to the school community. This built integrity and credibility. Max also spoke of Jason’s ability to communicate with people.

Character, credibility, integrity and vision – if you have those four, you can be good at almost anything. I think one thing that Jason has brought right off the bat, as soon as he started here, was a sense of family and commitment. He came here with two kids. His oldest is a fifth grader. So he’s a parent along with our other families. He’s a communicator, from a standpoint he will listen, and he doesn’t just listen to you, to make you feel good. You know, he’ll come back a week later and he doesn’t forget. I think that it’s helpful to have somebody who can relate to the boarding department. I should’ve mentioned this earlier. He comes from a background where he was at two other boarding schools. The one thing about a lot of us here, is that we don’t have another experience, necessarily, to draw from. Jason clearly had a great deal of personal integrity. A lot of this stemmed from the fact that his wife and children were actively involved and highly visible in the school and community. He built on his integrity by being a good listener. He also served in a variety of capacities and leadership roles at other boarding schools, which gave him a
rich perspective. Jason was able to say with integrity and authority that at my former school, we did this in this way and it really worked or flopped. This professional background did much to build his professional integrity by giving him a background perspective to current situations at Simsbury.

The kids are coming in, some with you know, five dollars. But, we had three or four volunteers there. They’re putting the cash in the box. And Jason was in front of the school, shaking every kid’s hand. Parents got a kick out of it.

Jason was a leader of integrity. His wife and children added to that integrity since they were all highly visible in the school community. They lived on campus and attended school events together. They opened their home for fundraising activities and events. He was highly visible. For example, when he designed and coordinated the student giving day in which students were asked to pay one dollar to dress casually for the day, Jason was in front of the school where day students would be dropped off, greeting each student and shaking their hand as they arrived and donated to the school. That went a long way with parents who saw him interacting with students highlighting the importance of giving. Another positive quality that Jason had was his ability to coach and develop people.

**Individualized consideration: Coaches and develops people.** Jason worked closely with each of his upper and middle school deans. Together they shaped the mission, vision, and direction of the school. Jason set the tone for that vision, but expected his academic deans and department chairs to carry out his goals. It was
interesting to note, as well, that two long time deans retired after Jason’s first year. Jason did have his own ideas about leadership that he expected his deans to execute.

Max commented,

When he started here, he had one year of two deans of our school, our upper school and our lower school, who were here for 30 years. They both retired after Jason’s first year. But, he’s working with two new people who are in administrative positions. They wanna hear from the head, rather than the head’s henchman. I also think that it’s a responsibility for a headmaster. You know, a headmaster’s not a teacher. A headmaster’s an administrator. And a headmaster is the is the head coach, per se.

Jason did indeed coach and develop others. He was working with two new school directors including a new upper and middle school director. Jason hired them from public school and was coaching them in the dynamics of independent school education. Jason also coached his ten-member organizational team, communicating his goals and the direction that he wanted the school to go in. Max felt, however, that Jason must be directly involved in the administrative tasks of the school. This was important, but it points to a greater issue in that Jason needed to be freed from some administrative responsibilities so that he is comfortable in leaving the school for several days or weeks at a time to work on student recruitment and alumni relations, especially as it related to traveling to meet with major donors. Most of the administrative tasks, including the day-to-day running of the school could be left to Jason’s organizational team, which were largely transactional in nature.
**Transactional leadership.** An example of transactional leadership that Max described came across in Jason’s strategic planning committees. Jason assigned each faculty and staff member to a committee that met regularly. In fact, they met on a weekly basis. Forming committees to work on the strategic plan was an example of transactional leadership, especially since Jason assigned each committee member. It very well could be that some of those assigned members did not wish to be on those particular committees. In fact, they may not have wanted to be on a committee at all. Speaking to this issue, Max articulated,

> Jason is becoming more involved in fundraising because we know that Rory’s not gonna be here forever. With that said, Jason, and it’s only his second year here, he has a lot of issues he’s addressing. He’s really trying to do some things from the admissions standpoint, an enrollment standpoint.

> I think he’s a great listener. I think he comes across as very level-headed, and honest. Jason’s still learning who people are. You know he’s developing his own relationships. And I feel bad for him, a lot of times, because he may hear something about someone or be introduced to somebody in the wrong light, and I don’t mean it’s a negative light, but it would be more fair for him if we didn’t necessarily have a Rory here. He’s just getting into that role because he’s--he really is from a day-to-day operation standpoint, assembling his team. (Max)

What Max’s words revealed was that Jason utilized elements of transactional leadership by assigning committees and holding those serving on the committees accountable for their participation. Jason expected them to actively engage by bringing
ideas to the meetings. This was juxtaposed against transformational leadership since individuals were not going above and beyond on their own to serve. Rather, they were assigned to serve on the committees. Max continued his explanation stating,

We’re currently in a strategic plan now. We have multiple committees that meet, on a weekly basis in the fall semester. And now there’s a whole other round of committees. I was not on one in the fall, but I’m on one this spring. Jason assigned all the faculty members assigned the administrators who oversee the committees. By assigning these committees, Jason can really monitor deviations and mistakes by keeping close tabs or even participating in those committee meetings.

Everyone did not necessarily want to participate on the committee assignments. The committee assignments gave subordinates the chance to share their views; however, the committees were assigned and attendance at the weekly meeting was mandatory. In the discussion of transactional leadership, it also became clear that Jason was still learning the ropes, working to build those necessary relationships, and working with Rory to bridge those relationships as well as monitoring deviations and mistakes.

**Active management-by-exception: Monitors deviations and mistakes.** Jason was able to keep tight control over the strategic plan by attending and participating in committee meetings. In this way, he knew who the naysayers were and the supporters. Jason was able to then monitor deviations in his mission and vision as well as potential mistakes that a committee may be leaning toward. Max described some of those committee meetings in the following way. Max stated,
Jason also assigned with help those committees. We meet every Wednesday morning for an hour. He’s collecting information and really overseeing everyone. It’s an educational process for him, as well. But it gives voices to everybody at least at a committee level, where you can say, well, I’m dead set against this, or in my opinion, we need to do this. From a standpoint of what’s gonna happen with the strategic plan, and how we’re gonna move forward, that remains to be seen.

Jason’s transactional leadership was evident through his active monitoring of deviations and mistakes. Jason held weekly meetings on Wednesday mornings where all faculty, staff, and administration were assigned to a meeting location. Jason attended as many of the meetings as he could and listened to each member’s commentary. He expected people to bring ideas to the table. In doing so, everyone had a voice, but at the same time, he was listening for possible deviations from his vision and goals for the school that could ultimately lead to mistakes.

So Jason knows that. Jason knows that we need to have the money for scholarships. He also knows that there are some things that he wants to see improved here. I said, we just raised more money in the school history, but I’m well aware that tomorrow, we could launch another one, and that Jason has a laundry list of things that he could spend the money on. It’s not like, yeah, we raised more than we expected.

What Max’s words disclosed about the way Jason monitored mistakes was that he did monitors those mistakes in a collaborative fashion. He held a weekly meeting on Wednesday mornings to find out what members or each committee was thinking. He
could grasp whether there was buy in or not for particular initiatives. This platform was a way in which individuals at the school could voice their opinions and concerns while at the same time Jason could monitor deviations from his goals for the school as they relate to the strategic plan, for example. Jason also monitored incoming donations and compared them with needs for the school. One such example was the incoming cash flow for scholarships. Jason monitored the money needed for scholarships and the amount of money actually coming in to fund those scholarships. By monitoring this closely, he could then gauge what needed to be done differently, both in terms of fundraising for scholarships as well as in making progress toward the strategic plan. To accomplish this monitoring, a transformative approach is used.

**Transformative leadership.** Max believed that Jason utilized both transformational and transactional leadership styles depending on the situation. Max set Jason’s transformative leadership in the context of two former heads of school, stating:

> From a communication standpoint, you know, now we’re already in Jason’s second year here. And certainly, Jason is different than both. I think he’s actually a little more in the middle, from a leadership standpoint. I think he has qualities from both styles. I think that Jason is in the middle. He does both. (Max)

Jason, like many heads of school, utilized a transformative approach to leadership. That is to say, that at times he acted as a transactional leader and other times he moved into a more transformational role. Max believed that Jason was not as transformational as Rory, the previous head of school now serving as the Director of Major Gifts, but may be more transformational than some other heads of school that he had witnessed at
Simsbury. At times, however, Jason also used a distributive approach to leadership as evidenced in the team approach to fundraising that is evident at the Simsbury School.

**Distributive leadership.** There was clearly a team in place to fundraise at Simsbury. There was a distributive approach to fundraising with Jason, Max, and Rory. They all traveled to events together. However, the question arose was this distribution of leadership set by Jason himself or was it an expectation from the board of trustees? Was Jason driving the distribution or was the distribution something less genuine? Max, the director of development states the following:

I work with Rory every day, too, as he’s really, the chief fundraiser. Rory is in this office with us. He’s the heavy, and I’m the flag-waiver and I’m responsible with two other people here of organizing all the social events. Even though Rory was the previous head, he was also the chief fundraiser even though there were development directors. That’s kind of a team thing with me. You know, Rory and I were like this. Chuck and I were like this and Jason certainly is. You know, we’re all in this together. But certainly, he has, as the boss, I think he’s done a terrific job of involving everybody. And, we have the time set for that hour every week.

There was evidence that distributive leadership was in place at Simsbury School. Jason had weekly meetings with in which everyone at the school had a voice. He met with his organizational team of ten members and set the tone and goals for the school. He traveled with Rory and Max on fundraising trips, working in concert with the development office. There was a development team in place that ran the fundraising and
philanthropy programs for the school. There was that awkward situation, however, of the former head of school, Rory, having the role of Director of Major Gifts. This role may need to be more closely scrutinized in such a way that allows Jason to become the chief fundraiser who travels to meet with alumni and potential major donors. Jason understood that he cannot do it alone. Jason arranged his organizational structure as such to allow for distributive leadership to occur. There seemed to be room for a greater distribution of leadership, however, especially as it relates to Jason himself taking on a greater role in fundraising.

Kyle

Kyle was in his second head of school position. He was previously head of school in the Midwestern United States. Kyle was not from Appalachia, although he did attend Whitman Friends School as a high school student. He had that connection as well as his personal religious beliefs that connected him to the school. Kyle’s religious beliefs have a profound effect on his leadership style. Kyle is a servant leader who was asked to come to the school to rescue the school from financial disaster. Kyle had his own ideas about running the school, transformational leadership, especially as it related to the school’s curriculum and student recruitment. Kyle did much to transform the school’s grading system, assessment, and overall curriculum. His focus on this transformed curriculum, however, took time away from fundraising and philanthropy efforts.

The results of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Kyle in the area of transformational leadership as reported by Kyle’s raters’ average frequency was a 3.1 out of a 4.0 scale, meaning that Kyle was more than fairly often but less than frequently, if
not always. This score falls within the research validated benchmark which is above 3.0. Kyle rated between Andrew (highest) and Jason (lowest) of the three heads of school in transformational leadership. Transactional leadership was broken down into two categories including rewards achievement and monitors deviations and mistakes. Kyle scored 3.0 as rated by his raters for rewarding achievement while he rated 2.5 for monitoring deviations and mistakes. The research validated benchmark for rewarding achievement is between 2.0 and 3.0. However, the score for monitoring deviations and mistakes is particularly noteworthy since it falls outside of the research validated benchmark which is between 1.0 and 2.0. When compared with the other two heads of school who participated in this study, Kyle rated the second highest in the area of transformational leadership with an average transformational score of 3.1 out of 4.0. Kyle rated the highest in comparison to the other leaders in the area of transactional leadership with an average rater score of 3.0 for rewarding achievement and 2.5 for monitoring deviations and mistakes. These average rater scores are particularly noteworthy since his score is the lowest in rewarding achievement and highest in monitoring deviations and mistakes. The data resulting from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire for Kyle is summarized in Table 4 below.
Table 4

Kyle: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>All Raters Average</th>
<th>Research Validated Benchmark</th>
<th>Universal Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformational (overall)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized attributes</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized behaviors</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Consideration</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>&gt; 3.0 to &lt; 3.75</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>&gt; 2.0 to &lt; 3.25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-exception: active</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>&gt; 1.0 to &lt; 2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-exception: passive</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>&gt; 0 to &lt; 1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>&gt; 0 to &lt; 1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra effort</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>&gt; 3.5 to &lt; 4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>&gt; 3.5 to &lt; 4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with the leadership</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>&gt; 3.5 to &lt; 4.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transformational leadership.** Kyle stated that he was a transformational leader. He transformed the school, especially in terms of the curriculum, grading, and assessment, and the manner in which students earn credit for those courses. This transformation may extend into the school culture as well; however, in terms of external relations, especially in the role of chief fundraiser, the transformational process is much less clear. In Kyle’s own words, he affirmed,
Well, in simple terms, there’s not much doubt that I’m a transformational leader, but that’s also what the school was looking for. The reason I was interested in this job is because I wanted to look at the school in a new way which involved rethinking a lot what the school does and how it represents itself. You can tell from my background that I’ve had a lot of different experiences in my education and seen it in different cultures. I didn’t mention it earlier, but I also lived in Sweden, when I was older, and I’ve just seen a lot of different ways that societies function. The school was looking for someone who was a visionary leader. And that’s the part of the job that interested me. That’s not entirely what I’ve done coming in at this time. In other words, this curriculum, I just said, ‘We’re gonna do it.’ I mean I didn’t come in and say, ‘What can we do differently?’ You know, as a new leader, visionary leader, ‘We’re gonna try something quite different.’ On the other hand, that’s exactly what I’m doing, and so I told them I am going to break my own rule--because in some ways I wasn’t new. You know? And on the other hand – and also the school needed action quickly.

There are elements of transformational leadership as seen in Kyle. He knew that the school needed quick change upon his arrival. He met with several former heads of school to find out just how much change he could bring to the school. Kyle knew that the school’s two top problems were student recruitment and fundraising. He focused on and transformed the curriculum in ways in which students earn credit. Kyle transformed the school’s website. What he had not transformed were the two top issues at the school.
This was a serious problem in the minds of several including a major donor and former development director. This could prove differently in building trust.

**Idealized influence: Builds trust.** Kyle’s school was a Quaker affiliated school. The previous head of school was not a Quaker, nor was the previous director of development. Kyle affirmed that he built trust with the school community since he was a practicing Quaker who also happened to attend the school as a student. According to Kyle,

> The fact that a lot of the donors of the school are Quakers and I’m a Quaker helps. Our last development director was not a Quaker, or head of school – was not a Quaker. And although certainly the Religious Society of Friends is a very open and accepting group, it also helps to have somebody who is applied to the school who people know is committed to that part of the school and the history of the school. So it’s an appropriate role for me to play. It has not been my focus this year because of all the internal changes that I’ve brought, but it’s going to be a major focus in the year ahead.

Thus, there was that immediate credibility, authenticity, and sense of genuineness. Perhaps this authenticity will extend into the role of chief fundraiser at some point in the future. That point, however, remains to be seen. As Kyle mentioned, it had not been his focus and the internal changes he made will certainly bring about new demands as he moves forward.
Additionally, Kyle stated, “Well I think fundraising is predicated on having good relationships and having people feel valued and included before there’s any mention of money or any kind of solicitation of money.”

As Kyle mentioned, making people feel valued and included is fundamental to good fund raising efforts. The relationship must be firmly in place prior to making the ask. Often, the ask occurs several years after the relationship has developed, which is one reason, that fund raising must be ongoing, deliberate, and carried out with a plan in mind. However, good fundraisers know that these efforts must be carried out with a great deal of personal and professional integrity.

Idealized influence: Acts with integrity. Kyle had been a head of school before. He was a graduate of the school and was known throughout the Quaker community. Kyle said that he was successful as a school leader in his previous position. Taken together, these characteristics helped to build Kyle’s integrity.

We’ll talk more about this in terms of development. I alluded to it earlier – I’m a known commodity. They regard me as a successful head of school very similar to this, and the school has been interested in having me work here for a number of years. Part of the reason for that is because they know I’m committed to the values. And when people don’t doubt that, it’s easier to make change.

Kyle spoke at length here to address the internal changes he made at the school, especially in terms of teaching and learning and in student responsibility and learner motivation. Hence, there is great emphasis on internal cultural changes at the school in
Kyle’s first year as head of school at Whitman Friends School. Kyle spoke further about how he went about acting with genuine integrity.

Quakers have a big belief that the process is as important as the end. So how we live our lives, how we interact with people, how we empower people is important. So I think students now feel their voices are heard much more. For example, it used to be that we started the day with ten minutes of silence. That used to be broken by the head of school, who did announcements. I ask questions like, why does the head of school need to break silence?

Kyle was a Quaker and was seen as a Quaker. This brought him much integrity immediately in terms of alumni and major donors who might also be Quaker. By participating in the ten minutes of silence himself, as the head of school, Kyle acted with integrity.

Two other things I would say big changes to the school have been that the curriculum. It’s a lot to talk about with the curriculum. But we basically created a new curriculum structure where we developed this. We asked the faculty to break their four-year high school curriculum into small pieces. So instead of a teacher saying, ‘I teach a year of biology,’ it’s now 16 pieces of biology, like photosynthesis, or watersheds or mitosis and meiosis, or cell structure. So it’s kind of the things that were originally taught in biology, but as a yearlong course. We broke those into pieces. We call them school letters. There’s a book in the hallway that you passed by. It’s the book of school letters. Students can look at what they need to know about each of those things, and at any time they want
demonstrate that they know. So there’s no longer tests on any given day for anybody at the school. It’s more like merit badges. When you’re ready to show that you know something, then step forward.

Kyle was able to accomplish profound changes in the school curriculum by acting with integrity. He came from a longstanding tradition as a head of school. He implemented these changes at a previous independent school. By following through with making changes to the curriculum and having success with that enabled Kyle to be viewed as acting with integrity. Kyle remarked,

I’m a big believer that we should be teaching problem-solving skills, creative thinking, having people know how to work together as a team. Everybody’s walking around with super computers in their pocket. We have great access unprecedented access to information. There’s a lot of problems that need solving in the world, even right here at the school. So why aren’t we structuring our curriculum around what really needs to be solved? And so textbooks disappear for the most part. We do these endeavors. They don’t earn any academic credit, though. The letters are a credit, and it’s the dovetailing of the endeavors and the letters that result in our daily schedule.

Kyle was acting with integrity since he set about to change the curriculum and to overhaul the school’s technical core. Kyle acted with integrity by communicating with his faculty the changes that he wanted to implement and then followed through with that implementation. This was not an easy change for many faculty. There was tremendous turn-over in terms of faculty at Whitman Friends School.
It’s a lot of discussions with parents, too, because you’ve gotta let kids struggle and realize, ‘Oh crap, I really need to motivate myself more.’ And so we have created ways for kids to know themselves as learners much more. And relationships. In the best Quaker decision making processes, it’s the group--you let the group make the decision and trust in the group. It’s always for the greater good, the good of the community. Quakers have a way of in the best kind of Quaker decision making, which is a unique kind of thing, is to put out what you think, what you feel, and then you kind of let go of it because you sort of hold the group hold that.

Here, Kyle spoke about relationships, especially with parents. He also spoke about communicating with parents. Kyle also spoke in overtones about distributive leadership. Clear communication, relationships, and building trust, along with allowing a team of individuals to participate in making decisions all contributed to Kyle’s ability to lead and act with a sense of integrity and to encourage others.

**Inspirational motivation: Encourages others.** Clearly, Kyle got involved at the prima-fascia level of fundraising. He encouraged his students past, present, and future to get involved in fundraising by sponsoring a phone-a-thon. He participated alongside them in order to encourage the students to participate. Kyle revealed,

At my former school, the students did a phone-a-thon. The students called, and I was always involved with that. A lot down there, encouraging the students and helping them, getting them to sign up and that kind of thing. I’d like to do that here. It’s a nice thing for students to talk.
Kyle’s statement demonstrated that in encouraging others, he was valuing them in the process and the work that it requires to make fundraising possible. This not only provided students with an opportunity to collaborate and hold conversation, but also provided them a sense of the efforts that it takes to make their school experience possible. Another leadership style that is frequently used in fundraising is transactional leadership.

**Transactional leadership.** Kyle described a software program that he was using to write an instruction manual on running the school. The program was entitled Basecamp and is elaborated on further below. Kyle also redesigned the school’s website. It was interesting to note that he was doing these things himself. These activities may be transforming the image of the school as well as the school’s culture, but they did not necessarily allow time for fundraising and relationship building. In Kyle’s narrative, he stated,

I’ll go to some websites and the first thing you see is the head of school talking about how great their school is. I want people to come to our website and say, ‘They’re doing cool things.’ And sharing what we do is critical. That’s why having people come is important. We had a prospective family, parents, just come from a major metropolitan city, and we went and talked with the parents. And he was talking about he got up. He went down and had breakfast. He was having coffee, talking with people, talking to the students, walking down to the farm. He was like, ‘I hope that was okay,’ and I’m like, ‘Yeah, just walk around.’ I mean just--you know, it’s not like ‘Go on a tour,’ or ‘We’ll help you see what you should see--and hid everything else.’
Utilizing computer software and expecting people to tour the school on their own is an example of how tasks at Whitman Friends were carried out in routine ways that were transactional in nature rather than involving others or inspiring others to achieve great things. Kyle also said,

I’m using Basecamp as a way to codify what the school does, and that includes fundraising. So in other words, if you create protocols like, how do you handle visitors on campus? What’s the best way? If someone gives a gift, how--what’s best practice in dealing with it? That’s all in Basecamp now. So we could all disappear tomorrow and someone could come in and say, ‘Oh, this is how--’ I mean, effectively, we’re writing a manual in how to run a school.

It appears that using computer software to write an instruction manual of sorts did not inspire others or demonstrate any sort of a vision. Rather, it seemed to be rather boilerplate. Still, most leaders use a variety of leadership styles. Combining transactional and transformational leadership styles is said to be transformative.

**Transformative leadership.** Kyle was a strong believer in transformative leadership. In other words, he believed it was necessary for leadership to adapt to the situation. Kyle spoke about transformative leadership in a big picture sense rather than on a day-to-day basis or even a situational basis. Kyle was interested in coming to this school because it was on the verge of collapse and he saw himself as a transformational leader. He further believed that the school needs to be transformed in order to survive. This belief was illustrated in Kyle’s following statement:
And this was a point I wanted to make, I’m a big believer that different leadership styles and different personalities are required at different times for different schools in terms of where a school is. If this school had been doing really well and thriving, I wouldn’t have been interested in the job. I’d say, ‘It’s good.’ You know? They wouldn’t need change.

Different times and circumstances call for different leadership styles. Kyle was a big believer that he used different leadership styles, although he believed that his leadership was highly transformational. Next we turn our attention to Kyle’s beliefs and ideas about distributive leadership.

**Distributive leadership.** Kyle believed strongly in being involved in each and every situation himself. He especially pointed to student recruitment and fundraising as critical elements at the school. In fact, he stated that fundraising and student recruitment are the top two priorities. It was extremely revealing in that Kyle was not only involved in these himself; he also did not have a development director and was not able to find the right person for that. Thus, Kyle took on that role himself in addition to all of the other facets of school leadership—in a school that was on the verge of collapse. There did not seem to be much distributed leadership or future plans to distribute that leadership. This could have potentially huge implications for the school. In his interview Kyle told me, They’ve either been too forceful or not forceful enough in terms of leadership. I’ve seen them fail because they just let others--they delegated too much. My predecessor here at this school, basically said, you know, ‘The schools biggest issues are development and admissions, so I’m going to hire a director of
advancement and let that person deal with it.’ And that person didn’t deal with it very well. And, you know, it just kinda became one of the most critical things. You look at me. I’m like, ‘I need to be the development director. I mean I need to be involved in admissions,’ which I am huge, because it’s the number one issue. You know, it’s the dual pipeline of success for this school, donations and students.

Here was a point of major concern. Kyle was stating that he did not really buy into distributive leadership. He said that he needed to be the development director. He needed to be involved in admissions. He said that the former head of school tried to hire for these positions and failed. The key was to find the right person for those roles. The head of school cannot be the admissions director, the development director, and the head of school. It was an impossible task that set the head of school up for failure in his own right. He may not fail because he hired the wrong individual. Rather, he may fail because one person cannot assume all of these roles. Successful heads of school know this and have teams of people in place to handle advancement, admissions, student recruitment, and capital campaigns. Kyle’s words were extremely revealing. He was unwilling to turn things over to other individuals. In fact, he was even writing a training manual on how to run the school. A successful head of school needs to be traveling and meeting with major donors and potential donors. The successful head of school needs to be out in the community holding talks with community members, alumni, and potential donors.
We have two new board members who are involved in fundraising. In fact, I have a conference call this Thursday with the development committee. Everybody wants to be helpful. It’s just a question of how. People say, ‘Kyle, what can we do? What can we do? It’s like, ‘Well, you know, it’s – It boils down to very specific things like, Well, you can name people who have money or who are appropriate to ask for money.’ Who should I ask? What are the associations? Should they make the ask? Should someone else? But it takes a lot of planning which hasn’t been very well in place. That’s part of Donor Pro, which Leigh Ann is going to start using this week.

There was not a great deal of distributive leadership going on at the Whitman Friends School. Kyle ran the school the way he thought best. He went through two development directors since he arrived at Whitman Friends, and neither worked out. Kyle described himself as a transformational leader in terms of revamping the curriculum and the way in which students earn credits. Robert, now a major donor, as well as a former head of school peeled back the layers of Kyle in his first year as head of school at Whitman Friends. The challenge for Kyle in terms of distributing his leadership was that he had taken on so many varied and important roles. He was head of school, did not have a development director, and was working in student recruitment. He believed that student recruitment was the number one problem for the school. Therefore, he believed that was where he should be spending his time. He also stated that fundraising was one of the top two priorities. He did travel to the West Coast on a fundraising trip. However, he spent much time at the school and seemed to have made transforming the curriculum a top
priority. Robert has a number of ideas about Kyle’s leadership style since becoming head of Whitman Friends School. Robert, a major donor, and former head of school continued his involvement in the school. On occasion he advised Kyle when Kyle asked for his input. Robert was very open and honest during his interview.

Robert

Transformational leadership. Robert believed that Kyle was a transformational leader as well. He spoke to the immediate big changes made in terms of the curriculum. Robert described Kyle as an agent of change in all areas of the school. Robert was unclear, however, in the role that Kyle might play in fundraising after hearing Kyle speak about his future leadership plans and focus for the school. Robert heard Kyle speak about fundraising, but did not see how Kyle was going to be involved in fundraising. Speaking to this matter, Robert disclosed,

I’m confident I mean I heard him. We just had commencement and alumni meeting and so I heard him speak more that I had the whole year. He was clear about the fundraising role, the need for fundraising, and the work that the school would be doing to that end. So I’m confident that it’s very much in his mind as he puts together his team for this next year. What I don’t know is how he sees himself. He knows he’s much a part of it. I just don’t know how he’s gonna put it all together.

As evidenced from the interview with Robert, he felt that fundraising was important and a high priority for Kyle. But, Robert had not been able to determine how Kyle would put the fundraising initiative into practice.
Kyle stepped in knowing that without some – being very decisive and determined and engaging, the school was on the edge again, and it might not survive. He did consult the two former heads of school and asked, ‘How much change can I push for, and act in my first year without really monkey-wrenching the progress here?’

He could see that changes needed to take place pretty quickly. The question was, ‘How fast and how hard can I do this?’ He turned the curriculum upside down. Huge – huge change. But he felt it was the right direction, and needed to happen, and perhaps even that distinctive – that significant change would be a better method of turning around. So Kyle’s definitely a transformational leader.

There’s a fair amount of staff turnover. Doing that and a number of things he’s pushed for, so I’d say transformational. (Robert)

Without a doubt, Robert believed that Kyle was a transformational leader as he stated during the interview. Kyle turned the curriculum upside down and reinvented the way in which students earn credits. Kyle placed tremendous emphasis on this based on his experiences in other schools as well as his educational and cultural experiences around the world. One man, however, cannot do it alone. Kyle was also able to build significant trust with parents, students, and major donors being a Quaker himself. His Quakerism added much credibility to his leadership and his ability to build trust.

**Idealized influence: Builds trust.** Kyle was able to build trust since he was a Quaker and the school was a Quaker school. This affiliation built trust with those individuals that he contacted. He traveled to California on a West Coast trip where he
met with major donors and school alumni. This trip served to build trust with those constituents and major donors. As Robert stated,

I know that he has done a little travel. There are donors that we have in parts of the country where the school has pockets of alums that the head has traditionally visited every year, and he did the same this year and the reports I heard from both alums and from him that was very positive.

This was important commentary from Robert since it demonstrated Kyle’s ability and willingness to travel across the country in order to fundraise. Robert, who was very much involved in the school externally, heard positive things from alumni that indicated Kyle’s ability and willingness to reach out to them and build trust. Not only does this build trust, but it also demonstrated Kyle’s ability to act with integrity.

**Idealized influence: Acts with integrity.** Robert described mixed reviews about Kyle’s ability to act with integrity. On one hand, Kyle was an alumni of the school as well as a Quaker. He had a history with the school. That brought integrity to his leadership. On the other hand, Robert and his wife met with Kyle and the school’s farm director to work on a fundraising initiative for farm equipment and operation. However, Robert did not see those meetings continue or any other evidence that Kyle followed through on that specific fundraising endeavor. In my interview with Robert, he acknowledged Kyle’s style of integrity by stating,

I would say one of the things that Kyle has is a sense of confidence about – he, too, comes to this place as an alum. I mean he came here, graduated here. His family’s been involved. He was gone, and then he came back. He genuinely,
when he speaks, has a sense of love and devotion for the institution, and he has a sense of confidence about where his leadership is going with it. And that – that all serves him well as he speaks with anyone who is a potential supporter.

We had a meeting with Kyle about a specific small outreach to get equipment and funding for the farm operation here, and the farm director was involved in that. She’s a good friend of ours. We were brought in and met with him and thought something was going to come of it, and we did see--and assumed it was left in his lap to call further meetings, and nothing – we weren’t involved in anything further. And I haven’t seen any report or results. (Robert)

Robert felt that Kyle had integrity with potential donors because he demonstrated his genuine love for the school. Robert believed that Kyle was confident in his leadership and had a long standing stake in the school. However, with the farm equipment project, Robert did not follow through. It remains to be seen where Kyle’s priorities lie in terms of fundraising as he moves into his second year at Whitman Friends School. So far, Kyle’s leadership was transformational, but also appeared to be transactional.

Transactional leadership. Robert did not feel that Kyle had fully engaged in his role in fundraising for the school. While Robert went on a trip to California to fundraise, Robert did not believe that Kyle embraced the importance of fundraising. Perhaps fundraising will be a focus during Kyle’s second year at the school. Robert provided the following insights during his interview:

As a fundraiser, I haven’t seen much evidence that that’s been a high priority this past year in Kyle’s practice and his presence and his messages. I don’t feel like I
can answer much about that because I don’t know that he’s done a lot in terms of fundraising. I think at the same time, frankly it surprises me. There’s a bit of hesitancy about actual fundraising. And I understand it, and I’ve run into it over and over again, and I felt it initially myself, a sense of difficulty asking for money. What I learned was that, in fact, I enjoyed it, not because I was asking for money but I was asking for people to engage with us in this fantastic vision. And so I was excited about it and was eager.

Robert did not feel that Kyle had fully engaged in fundraising at Whitman Friends School. He felt that Kyle’s fundraising efforts were severely lacking and that Kyle was just going through the motions when he traveled away from campus. There was little relationship building and almost no information coming from the school about fundraising initiatives or future capital campaigns. In fact, Robert’s wife, the former director of development was very disappointed in the lack of information, effort, and initiative in regards to development, fundraising, and philanthropy, not to mention a capital campaign.

And in that process, it was financial support, but I think the concept of fundraising my perception is, that he hasn’t married it to fully yet. Everything else he does in the job in a way that will be most successful.

Robert’s interpretation was that Kyle was a transformational leader in some areas; however, in terms of fundraising during his first year at Whitman Friends, the effort had been rather transactional. He may have gone on the trip to the West Coast because that was an expectation of the board of trustees. Robert also described a sense of hesitancy
about Kyle’s interest in fundraising. Another piece that seemed to be missing from Kyle’s repertoire was his ability to involve others in the fundraising work. There was no team in place for distributive leadership.

**Distributive leadership.** There was little to no evidence that Kyle was distributing his leadership, especially in terms of fundraising. In comparison to the narratives of other participants, Kyle mentioned neither distributive leadership or characteristics of distributive leadership. Relatedly, Robert made note of this as well in his interview. Robert has not seen fundraising as a priority at the school during Kyle’s first year as head of school. There was no relationship with a team of individuals to work on fundraising. In fact, there was no one in the role of director of development. This part of Robert’s interview was particularly revealing, especially in terms of fundraising. Robert shared,

> It has to be integral to really work, I think. I mean that’s my perception, and that’s the way it worked for me. Some schools, and particularly bigger institutions. I mean the head is the spokesman and the development office does all the work, and then the head meets donors and shake hands and they bond or whatever.

But the actual fundraising work is carried on in consultation with the head. The burden of fundraising, in a sense, is there, but it’s a lot of the actual work is not done by the head. So I’m not sure how Kyle is reconfiguring his team. He lost the person who was supposedly in charge of development early in the year,
and he didn’t really replace her so this past year, it’s been a little hard to tell what role fundraising plays. (Robert)

But my wife, who, became development director was very disappointed because she hasn’t seen from outside, the messages coming out from the school and from Kyle to alums relating to fundraising. So the message we’ve seen is that it’s not as high – it appears that fundraising wasn’t the highest priority. (Robert)

There was a clear lack of distributive leadership at Whitman Friends School. The development director left several months ago. She was temporarily replaced by the individual in charge of the school business office. However, that did not work out either. Relationships became strained and there was clearly tension within the administrative offices when I visited Whitman Friends School. There was, evidently, also a lack of vision and communication of that vision in regards to fundraising. There was no real sense of direction as to where the school was headed in regards to fundraising. Robert added,

Well, from my experience and from observation, I would say, I think it’s critical. I think it’s almost impossible for much of fundraising to happen without the head being the central player and being an enthusiastic player. I guess I don’t know of institutions where it’s happened very successfully without that. I wouldn’t say that it hasn’t, but I just don’t – I haven’t seen it. Maybe if there’s a paid--maybe if there was – in some institutions, where you have extremely effective fundraisers who work in concert with the head, but still it has – the head has to be much involved.
Distributive leadership was severely lacking at Whitman Friends School, especially as it related to development and fundraising. There was a development director in place who abruptly left and who subsequently was not replaced. There were few if any messages coming out of the school about fundraising. There did not appear to be a brand or campaign motto. Rather, it appeared that other priorities existed in the school when the context was observed. It was also interesting to recall Kyle’s own words that spoke to his perception that distributing leadership had not worked in the past at Whitman Friends School and he did not seem to advocate for distributed leadership. Rather, he took on the role of head of school, curriculum leader, (albeit transformational), personnel director, as well as writing a manual to run the school. Little priority existed to fundraise, even though Kyle stated that it was among his top two priorities. There was even a hesitancy in regard to fundraising. Not only was there a hesitancy in regard to fundraising, there was an even bigger problem in distributing leadership to a development team that worked in harmony with each other. Distributive leadership appears to play a central role in schools whose development efforts are fruitful. Another area where leadership style is critical in fundraising is with the capital campaign.

**Research Question 2**

How do independent heads of schools’ leadership style affect the success in multi-year capital campaign fundraising?

In the following section, Andrew described a specific situation in which he worked with major donors on a capital campaign in which his leadership skills were
critically important. In this situation, Andrew’s purpose and vision were revealed in his ability to inspire others and get the donors on board—even as the vision changed.

Elaborating on this skill, Andrew purported,

Well, now we have eighty students and we’re still in the same two little buildings, you know, the case around that was so compelling, that’s why I think some of our donors stayed with us through three iterations of the project. And I think being able to then say, ‘Here’s how this project fits into our long term strategy,’ goes back to that point about, people who donate to the school have a confidence that what they’re committing to in a capital campaign or an endowment campaign, is going to last. And he can articulate that 20 or 25 years from now, this is where we see our school going and they’re confident that their gift is not a moment in time. It’s a lasting element of our future.

Another example of how Andrew’s transformational leadership style influenced a major donor’s ability to buy-in to his idea about constructing a new dorm from the old dining hall. Andrew spoke to this, stating

Absolutely. Absolutely, you know, how are we gonna repurpose that old dining hall? You know, we’ve talked about maybe it should be a student union, which we don’t have today. We have lots of little gathering places for kids but not one area, so yes. Our last new dorm was a dorm that was for seniors, it, we’re air conditioning most our dorms now, but at the time, it was the only air conditioning dorms. It was for seniors, very large donor did the whole project. She picked out the bathroom fixtures, so you know, it was very much a reason for a student to
say, ‘Gosh, this is a dorm that I could be in when I’m a senior and this is better than most college dorms. So yes, projects associated with capital campaigns have occurred here and they are used to attract new students.

At the Simsbury School, another example of how leadership style impacts the capital campaign was described by Max, the director of development. Max described the harmonious relationship between the director of major gifts and the head of school. What is particularly revealing about this is the vivid, rich example of distributive leadership. Max also said that by having the Director of Major Gifts in place, the head of school was free to run the school, without the constant burden of fundraising. According to Max, capital campaigns at independent schools are ongoing. Evidence of this is found in Max’s statement,

The capital campaign is something that really was Rory’s baby. Our largest capital campaign is ending this year. It was the most successful campaign in our school’s history. And it coincided with our bicentennial anniversary. So, we’re a very old school. But, Rory took that over when he decided that he was no longer gonna be the headmaster, he picked up the capital campaign. He was the – he was essentially the president of external affairs. And he – that was his campaigns, which gave the former headmaster the opportunity to be the headmaster, but not have to have the responsibility of the fundraising on his shoulders.

This was an interesting concept. Several of the heads of school discussed external relations and external affairs. Andrew talked a great deal about external relations and external affairs. In fact, at Andrew’s prior school he was in charge of external relations
including advancement, development and student recruitment. So the external affairs piece was critically important as stated by Andrew and Penelope. From an organizational theory point of view, the head of school needs to be the champion of external affairs. He is the face of the school and of the learning organization. It is highly important for the head of school to be directly involved in external affairs. At Simsbury, there seemed to be another person placed in charge of external affairs whether it was the president of the school or the Director of Major Gifts. It is extraordinarily important for the head of school to be directly involved in external relations and affairs to build relationships, to be seen as a person of integrity, and to build trust with alumni, parents, and potential major donors alike. Max went on to say,

The headmaster was really running – he was the internal head. He was he’s still the boss. He still reported to the board of trustees. But he didn’t have that responsibility. Still responsible – responsible for a budget, but didn’t have the responsibility of having – having necessarily to worry about the capital campaign and the end of the fund because he had both of us here. And you know, it’s all part when you’re looking to the future, the one thing about independent schools is you’re always running a campaign.

It is interesting to note that Max revealed here that when one capital campaign ends, in the independent school world, you basically start planning for the next campaign. At Simsbury School, the head of school was clearly not in charge of fundraising according to this testimony. Rather, the Director of Major Gifts, formerly the president, was in charge of working with major donors and running the capital campaign. This is a good
distribution of leadership; however, Jason must be sure to be out front working closely with major donors as well. Jason cannot stay back at the school and manage the faculty and the students and expect to raise serious money. This scenario might work for the short term, but it will not work in the long run.

So yeah, we’re finishing our campaign, but we could start another one tomorrow because there are needs and wants, and we’re going through a strategic plan right now. You know, there’s always not just capital improvements, but there are always projects, improvements that need to be made that cost money. The only way we get funds you know, we get no state or federal funding. Zero. We raise it.

Max described how Jason ran a weekly external affairs meeting in order to keep up with the director of development and director of major gifts. Through this weekly meeting, Jason is involving himself in fundraising and distributing his leadership to the team which includes the Director of Development, Max, as well as the Director of Major Gifts, Rory, and several other individuals including board members and administrative assistants. Max also commented, “Well, Jason has been he inherited what was essentially the third year of a five-year capital campaign, but he has been very involved. We have an external we have an external affairs meeting once a week.”

Max described an example in which it was important for the head of school to use data-driven decision making in terms of capital campaigns. This was another example of how Jason distributed his leadership to his team in order to fundraise. He relied on prior studies, as well as his development team’s work as they went about goal setting for the
capital campaign. The head of school’s ability to communicate with the board of trustees was also important to note here. Jason clearly communicated with his board of trustees on a regular basis, keeping them informed of all fundraising initiatives including the capital campaign. For example, Max said of Jason,

About six years ago, we had a feasibility study done. And the company came back. They interviewed us. Obviously, they looked at all of our data that we gave them. They picked, I believe, 30 of our major donors and interviewed them, and came back and told us that, for our 200th anniversary, that we could probably raise seven and a half million. We would be able to do with that, we would do two and a half million in annual funds. So for the five-year pledge period, $500,000 a year for annual fund, and 7.5 on top of that. So it would be a ten million dollar campaign, for the 200th anniversary. But really, if you wanted to break it down, technically it was only gonna be seven and a half capital. And our-we had some nice gifts early on, and our board, didn’t think that was real. They thought that we could not possibly raise less than ten million. So, it was gonna go for capital.

Other examples of how the head of school influences a multi-year capital campaign were included in the following comments by Max. It was important that Jason was part of the celebration to celebrate the highly successful capital campaign. It was critical for Jason to be seen embracing his team and the board of trustees in their ability to exceed the initial campaign amounts described earlier in the feasibility study. It is important for the head of school to give credit to his fundraising team and to the board of
trustees for their work in the capital campaign. In this section, Max also described Jason’s ability to influence the capital campaign by captivating the historical anniversary of the school. This allowed Jason to reach out to potential major donors to secure even more capital for capital projects. In this case, two very large gifts were solicited and achieved. Max added,

Essentially, we knew we wanted to put a new academic wing on. We wanted some money for the endowment. You know, when we looked at the things we wanted, we were short-changing ourselves. We had a couple older guys that 20 million for the 200th anniversary. I mean, we ended up embarking on a $12 and a half million campaign that was ten million capital, two and a half annual. As of right now, we’re at two and a half months left. We’re like 13.9 which is significantly more than the original feasibility study stated that we could raise. And now we ended up getting two of the largest gifts in school history. One was a $2 million foundation gift for scholarship, and one was an individual gave us $1.6 million. Obviously those are big nice successes. We’re going to celebrate them in May, a couple of weeks from now. But, in my mind, you know, our 200th anniversary was important, but it was also an important time for us to make sure that if we did come out and say we’re gonna have a $10 million campaign, and raised $8, that really would not have been a good situation.

Max later added, “I think there were definitely some people that were nervous that if we don’t hit our goal, you know, in spring 2016, what the heck are we gonna do? And fortunately, we don’t have to worry about that.”
Capital campaigns are usually earmarked for different initiatives. Some are earmarked for the endowment. Others are set aside for specific projects such as dining halls and dorms. Other campaigns might be earmarked for a new middle school or new sports facilities. Whatever the provisions, the head of school must convince donors and the board of trustees where the monies should go—where they would be best utilized based on the needs of the school at that time or into the future. Capital campaigns should also be reflected in the strategic planning process. Max further elaborated that,

It has fluctuated. Well, its increased over the years because our first two campaigns had components in it, like professional development for our faculty, and for scholarships, because you know, we actually had some trustees that thought this last campaign should all go to endowment, to ensure some really dark, dark, dark years, if they did happen.

Max went on to speak about the endowment.

The capital campaign, some of that money goes to endowment. Some of the money went to capital improvements. Essentially, when the capital campaign is essentially money that is not going to the accountants will tell you not going into your operating. So, the annual fund is essentially your operating – your checking account. The capital campaign, the components of that, scholarships, endowments, athletic improvements, a new wing that’s capital money. You don’t pay that outta your tuition and your current – the new academic wing is complete.

It was completed two years ago.
Another way that heads of school can influence a capital campaign is by learning what other schools are doing in their campaigns. At Simsbury, Jason had his faculty forward anything that they received from their alma maters that solicit fundraising. In this way, Jason, Max, and Rory could constantly look for new ideas and innovations in their campaigns. Discussing further, Max said,

Then we’ll have many campaigns here and there, for certain projects. Maybe for a sports team or a trip. And then, obviously, you have the bigger – the bigger elements, like anything that would be under the umbrella of a capital campaign. There are certainly certain things that I’ve received from my alma mater from some of our faculty members. Every once in a while, we ask our faculty members to forward anything that they’ve received.

**Sub-Question 1**

Is one leadership style better than another in attracting donor philanthropy?

According to Kyle,

And this was a point I wanted to make, I’m a big believer that different leadership styles and different personalities are required at different times for different schools in–in terms of where a school is. If this school had been doing really well and thriving, I wouldn’t have been interested in the job. I’d say, ‘It’s good.’ You know? They wouldn’t need change.

**Research Question 3**

How does school leadership approach opportunities and challenges within the capital campaign and in donor philanthropy?
The participants who were interviewed shared their approaches to opportunities and challenges within the capital campaign and in donor philanthropy.

**Andrew.** Andrew described the unique opportunities at the Raymond School where students received 80% scholarship and paid only 20% for tuition. This financial model presented both opportunities and challenges for school leadership. The opportunities included being able to provide a world class education to Appalachian children who otherwise would not receive such an education. The challenge was to continuously secure major donors in order to provide funding not only for the scholarships, but also for the annual fund and for the capital campaign. Providing some historical context, Andrew discussed the challenge in this way:

Well, that was the reason the school was started, yeah, in 1903 the school was started to serve the southern Appalachian Mountains because there were no schools here, and the founder went to Harvard, and convinced the Carnegies and the Rockefellers to finance the starting of the school.

This is a good example of how Andrew communicated the story of the school. With the challenge of finding major donors, Andrew could relate the story of the founding of the school and reference the Carnegies and the Rockefellers original philanthropy that made the school possible in the first place. This challenge also represented the vision that the founder went to Harvard and subsequently convinced wealthy industrialists at the time to donate money to start the school. This also illustrates the challenge that the Raymond School faced in constantly securing donors to support the 80%/20% model. Andrew went on to say
Today, our board is made up of predominantly non-alumni, non-parent philanthropists, so we only have one parent on the board, and we only have two alums, both of whom are quite successful. They’re warriors, so, three. I guess, the other one’s a farmer and has a bunch of money, but that, it’s a totally different. Appalachian influence has changed this--has influenced the school completely. (Andrew)

The place in which the Raymond School finds itself, Appalachia, has had an influence on the school. The fundraising model at the Raymond School was quite different in that it was 80% scholarship and 20% paid tuition. From the school’s inception of educating poor mountain children, there has been a constant need of fundraising and philanthropy. This tradition continued with board members who were not parents. Many of the members of the board of trustees were major donors to the school. One was a local farmer who was very wealthy. The board of trustees was comprised of individuals who were not parents and were not alumni. They were wealthy philanthropists who wanted to see the original vision and mission continue at the Raymond School. Andrew continued,

Oh, it’s totally, completely different. Yeah, we have a totally different financial model, most independent schools are 80 % full pay, 20 % scholarship. We’re 20 % full, 80 % scholarship just a completely different and it has been since the very beginning and it is completely driven by the fact that we are Appalachian and we are here to serve kids. The basic mission is we’re gonna serve kids in a setting and a program equal to the best boarding schools in the United States,
regardless of their ability to pay. Fifty percent of our kids are not Caucasian, I mean it’s a really different model.

The Appalachian influence is long lasting. Appalachia has influenced the very mission and vision of the school, which was to serve poor mountain children. Today, however, it has expanded to include international students from around the world who otherwise could not receive such an outstanding independent school, world class education.

It’s changed you know. Today, it’s all about college placement for these kids in the best colleges in the United States. Because that’s the next step, but it’s still a mission, and it still costs money. When you have kids who are really bright and come from an underserved area like the Appalachian region or foreign students they’re interesting. So colleges, if you’re really bright, and we got a few going to Vandy this year, and we’ve got lots going to Emory. Those kind of schools love it because they’ve got an interesting story. You’re not just another suburban kid whose dad is a financier, you know, you can say my grandmother lived without water, and today, you know, still lives in the same cabin.

Certainly, the ability to tell a unique story at a prestigious university presents a unique opportunity for school leadership to work with their students to find college placements in some of the finest universities in the United States. The importance of the head of school understanding the mission of the school is critically important when competing with other institutions who are all courting the same major donor. As Andrew pointed out:
I think that heads have begun to recognize that they’ve got to hone their skills of fundraising. They’ve got to be engaged with it. That donors have a lot of distractions. I mean, our donors are predominantly in Atlanta, and they’ve got the ballet, and they’ve got the symphony, and they’ve got, Emory and Georgia Tech, and all of that pulling at their pockets, and so I think heads of school have realized, you’ve got to give people, you’ve got to understand your mission and you’ve got to give people a reason to give, and you’ve got to constantly be engaged in that. People used to give because of obligation. They don’t do that anymore. They used to have a real sense of obligation.

One obstacle and challenge that Andrew faced was dealing with all of the competing interests. There were only so many major donors available. Many non-profit organizations all compete for the same donors. So communicating the vision and mission of the school and getting people to give based on the vision that Andrew communicated presented a real challenge that Andrew faced on a daily basis. Andrew said that people no longer give based on obligation. They donate because they feel compelled to do so, because they want to be part of the story. Andrew exclaimed,

I mean, it’s just people don’t, people feel like institutions have resources, they’ve got endowments, and they’ve got, you know, other things that are out there calling to them, and so consequently, you know, if you’re living, if you have wealth and you live in Atlanta you may say, you know, ‘The ballet needs me, the High Museum needs me, my church needs me, my kids’ schools need me.’ So consequently you begin to say, ‘Well, you know.’ It used to be people would
say, the Woodruffs or other families, ‘This is my school, I own it, I have an
obligation to take care of it.’ So there is a sense, and they, you know, we all go to
the same donors. I mean, we’re all the same donor base and, they’re looking for
the same people to give us to them as they give to us. (Andrew)

Another opportunity that heads of school must consider is the opportunity to reach
major donors either in person or through social media. The head of school only has so
much time and he can reach many smaller donors through electronic media such as
recording a message and sending it out. Major donors, however, typically require
personal contact with the head of school. Andrew discussed the matter in this manner,

You know we just had the Best Day Ever campaign. Which is one day of giving
for the annual fund, and they had me record a thank you, where I talked about my
best day at Raymond Academy, and then thanked them for giving, and posted it
on Facebook. So more and more your general donors, which is your bread and
butter, the annual fund, your daily donors, you’re connecting with electronically,
and that’s how they want to be connected, and they’re going to give you $100 or
$250, whatever, and the head of school has to find ways to get in front of them, to
be there, and it’s typically electronically. Once you reach a threshold, when you
get into the $5,000.00 or larger donor, they want to have at least some contact
with the head. It’s certainly when you get into $100,000 or more you’re going to
have, I think even younger people want to have that. It could be generational.
I’m not sure yet, we’ll see.
Here, Andrew pointed out the opportunity to make friends. Andrew made friends all the time. He also explained that heads of school needed to be comfortable leaving the school to go out and mingle with potential and major donors. According to Andrew, making friends and forming those relationships with donors was of utmost importance. He also cautioned about spending too much time on campus analyzing data or planning school events. It was absolutely imperative that heads of school not only get out of their offices, but travel to meet long time donors as well as new donors. Staying on campus to teach a class, or to plan school events or to analyze data metrics is a barrier that some heads of school cannot overcome. The successful ones do overcome this barrier, however, by meeting donors and telling the story of the school. Andrew further discussed opportunities and challenges.

So, you know, that fundraising piece, people have an understanding of, I think it scares some of them early on, but then they start to get comfortable with it. I’ve never heard of anyone being fired as a Head of School because they couldn’t raise. What they get fired for is they can’t make friends. So consequently, the problem is that they are awkward or introverted, highly academic, and so, consequently, the thought of getting on the road for two weeks and going out to dinner every night, and having lunch with somebody every day, and just shooting the shit with them is miserable. Because all they can think is that I am, should be back at school planning the PK3 day. I mean the big thing today I think is distracting as heads of schools is spending enormous amounts of time collecting data. Everything is data driven decision making, so we need to have people doing
research and collecting data around, and metrics around our kids’ performances.

Well, that’s important, but you’re not going to raise money by standing and holding data in front of a donor. You’re going to raise money from a donor by having dinner with them, telling them stories, getting them to like you, getting them to understand the school. Going out to play golf. It’s a personal thing, and I think that’s the hard thing for heads to get. I mean, I say this all the time. Just be yourself and go be friendly. Be friends with them.

As Andrew pointed out, being extroverted can be a tremendous help in wooing donors. It was essential to be able to leave the school—to have a team in place that could run things when the head is away—and to just be friendly with the donors. Being friendly can mean going to lunch, dinner, or simply telling them engaging stories about the school. Heads of school need to be able to let go of their academic introversion. To be sure, heads of school engaging in fundraising must be able to move between extroversion and introversion at the drop of a hat. That is no easy task and takes a highly skilled individual to accomplish such a feat. Andrew purported,

That’s the other thing they do. ‘Oh I’m going to teach a class.’ Well that’s great, teaching a class, great idea. Wonderful. You’re in a boarding school. That means you’re not going to leave campus. At least every other day, but typically every day, you’re going to be in class. Well, you’re not going to raise any money if you’re sitting in your office preparing a syllabus and grading papers. You may have the admiration of your faculty, but you sure the hell aren’t going to get a
donor engaged around that. So I think that’s the piece the heads have really got to understand. It’s a different world today than it was 50 years ago.

**Jason.** Jason described the increasing importance of fundraising in independent schools, especially in relation to the economy of the local area. Jason felt that there was added pressure on the development office to bring in major donations for scholarships and to look for other sources of revenue. In Jason’s opinion,

I think it’s becoming more and more important just given the economic conditions of our local area, but also kind of sustainability of schools. Our business model is very, very expensive, and just like colleges are having a conversation about pricing structure and how we continue to increase tuitions at the rates that we have and maintain a population norm? Well, this school’s in that same category of – and although our mean or median tuition on indexes is low in comparison to national averages and even regional averages within our local demographics, we’re twice the cost of the next closest tuition at a private school level. So that puts more pressure on our alumni development office to fund either scholarships for students who can’t afford it, but also to bring in other revenue sources to offset expenses. So successful fundraising is hugely important to our overall operation, to our overall success, and meeting our budget. We are relying on annual donations to help meet some of our budget goals. One of the things that really impressed me is I started to research the school and to learn more about it was how much they were able to do on what I would honestly call a shoestring budget.
Jason’s school was located in an economically disadvantaged area. One of the challenges that he continuously faces was educating people about the school and why they might want to consider sending their children to the school. This represented a unique problem with schools located in Appalachia. There may be a cultural mindset against paying for school when great public schools are available with transportation door to door. Sports such as Friday night football also played a role in the Appalachian mindset, which was another attraction to the local public school. These competing interests may be one of the reasons that independent school enrollment is declining.

The others are private or parochial. So we are a bit of an anomaly, and so we have to take a lot of time to explain who we are, why we’re different, how we’re different, and then convince people why you might think about this as an opportunity. So we have to work on education a lot, and most people culturally in this area won’t ever think about sending their child to an independent school unless there’s a real significant reason that somewhat fundamental to their beliefs.

So their cultural mindset on education, or an independent school education, and boarding school education was very different. This mindset was not all that different than what I encountered in another state, in terms of the regional affiliation. No thought of independent boarding school for sure. We had to convince them that the opportunities here were so good that your child needed to experience this. (Jason)

A major challenge to heads of school, especially in Appalachia, was high poverty in the local community. As such, the ability to attract students from the local community
was a challenge in itself. In turn, this put added pressure on the head of school to find additional resources to fund scholarships to the school. It also necessitated the ability of the head of school to communicate the vision, mission and story of the school. In other words, the head of school had to convince families that the educational opportunities were so great that they must consider sending their children to this school. This may be true in some other parts of the United States; however, it was a harsh reality in independent schools located in Appalachia. Jason continued to discuss challenges in Appalachia.

The financial aspect here is much tighter, though. That’s the difference is that I don’t see the rest of the kind of socioeconomic growth that some of those other areas have seen. This area has seen the opposite. So, as the steel industry’s moved out, as the coal industry struggled, our financial aid increases are being stretched further than they are in other locales.

And I think it’s going up across the board everywhere, but we’ve had to slow our income growth because of tuition. We simply couldn’t raise tuition as fast as some other schools. But even though we’ve raised it a smaller amount, there’s also been more demand for financial aid in our region than there has been in some of the other regions that I think you typically find independent schools in. Advances in technology have provided opportunities for heads of school in terms of fundraising. Heads of school today are able to reach donors through social and electronic media.
Two other issues arose through discussions about where the schools were located. It was believed that the Appalachian setting with high poverty necessitated a greater need for scholarships. Also, the independent schools cannot charge as much for tuition as other similar schools in higher wealth areas such as the Northeast. These challenges held true at all three schools in this study, especially when compared with similar schools in other geographic areas. However, technology today represents a unique opportunity to reach potential donors through email and social media.

There’s so many more and different approaches today because of social media and technology improvements. There’s more information available to us today. Because of those improvements with technology and social media – than there probably ever has been before. So I think you’re seeing a new generation of heads of schools, also. You’re seeing some that are coming with much more tech savvy backgrounds or understanding than the technology that’s available to help. Many opportunities exist for heads of school to attend professional development in fundraising and philanthropy. Also seeing what other heads of school are bringing to their respective schools provides added insight. Jason discussed several opportunities, I think what has brought to me is so looking at what is it that they bring to the positions or the schools that they end up at. And kind of watching and learning from those individuals has been a value-added I think for all independent schools, and some of the industry associations that we have.

I think the independent school industry has probably done a good job of providing the opportunities for people such as myself who have come into the
industry with a not a tremendous development background. There are workshops. There are lots of opportunities available to heads of schools, whether it’s conferences, workshops, and consultants. (Jason)

In the previous quotation, Jason described the fact that there were numerous professional development opportunities available for heads of school. Andrew also mentioned attending professional development and leading new heads of school seminars. Penelope discussed conferences that she attended such as CASE-NAIS. Kyle, however, did not mention attending any type of professional development. Appalachia is located within a day’s drive or less of most major cities in the Eastern United States. So the location of Appalachia also provides an opportunity to attend conferences that are within reasonable driving distance.

**Kyle.** Kyle spoke about the challenges of an independent boarding school located in an Appalachian community. The local community has not engaged as much as he would like in the school. Kyle believed that the educational level of the local community was one obstacle that prevents families from choosing Whitman Friends for their child’s education. The college matriculation rate in the local community was also very low.

Kyle elaborated that,

On a personal level, it’s been interesting for me because I moved here from Iowa City, Iowa, one of the highest educated, on a per capita basis, cities in the United States. And so coming here and just interacting with people in restaurants and the grocery store, you know, there’s a tangible difference to me in terms of the level of education, grammar. It’s just – you know that you’re in an area where the level
of education in a general sense is much lower. But in terms of what it means for
the school, I’m wanting to make this school available to families, and we are,
right now, making it available to families without a lot of money and who want to
have a college-bound high school program.

Both opportunities and challenges exist at the Whitman Friends School. Kyle
described the challenge of the local community in terms of educational level. This
sometimes made for challenges in understanding the overall mission of the school.
However, opportunities existed for students in the surrounding Appalachian community
to come to Whitman Friends on a potential scholarship. There were very unique
opportunities available at Whitman Friends School such as a focus on place-based
educational experience.

Kyle believed that the level of education in the surrounding community was very
low generally speaking. In that sense I think of Appalachia in some ways as
disadvantaged just in terms of educational opportunities. I know I’ve heard some
statistic about the number of kids in this community who go to college. It was
surprisingly low. Here our 13 seniors got accepted to 43 different colleges.

Another challenge that Kyle faced was communicating information about his
school. The school was unknown to most people. Getting the word out was very
important for the school’s success. To speak to this Kyle stated,

The student body is amazing. So this is a place where people want to be. It’s just
unknown. It’s unknown to most people. Even though it’s been in existence since
1837, people just down the street in this town – went up to someone and said,
‘You know, what--what’s that school out there? What’s the school about? They’re like, ‘I don’t really know.’ These are people who have lived there their whole life. ‘Oh yeah. I don’t know.’

And then there’s this school, which is, ‘You mean you don’t really have a big sports program?’ And there’s no – I mean people here are very diverse and it’s very inclusive. So you see guys with their arms around each other, and, you know, to the outside world it’s like, ‘What’s wrong with them?

To extend, Kyle added, “Or their child is particularly gifted or different kind of learner. I would say most of our day students are here because they wanted something different than the normal high school experience” (Kyle).

Here, Kyle spoke about the specific challenges with the school’s location in Appalachia. There were unique resources in Appalachia. But identifying and communicating those resources to prospective families was challenging. Kyle reported

Well, it does present unique barriers and challenges to fundraising. It should also be an opportunity, and that’s the dilemma. That’s the paradox because given the fact that we’re situated in – in an area where it’s typically economically depressed, distressed, lower economic incomes, there should be opportunities for resources that schools in a non-Appalachian area wouldn’t need and wouldn’t have. But finding those resources and identifying how--how they can play a part in the institution is not easy. People in Appalachia have been resourceful with very limited--this--one of the things that is very apparent is that parents mostly don’t want to send their students too far unless there’s some compelling culture
reason, just dynamite something that stands out, that says, ‘Wow! That would be worth sending you away.’ And this school does draw students from outside the U.S., without which it wouldn’t survive, because of the ability to get them into American colleges and the fact that there’s a very supportive environment.

Families see it as a place where they could send off adolescents and feel like it’s safe. But, the picture here generally is that domestic students’ parents want to be within a half-day’s drive or certainly no more than a day’s drive, but a half-day’s drive is acceptable. They’ll be able to see their students somewhat regularly, on weekends, so forth. So attracting students to this remote area means--is more difficult because you just don’t have the populations.

There were both opportunities and challenges with the location of the schools in this study. For foreign students, they get a much better chance to matriculate into an American college. The schools also offer a safe haven for learning for students from around the world. Often, these students are from dangerous locations around the world such as Africa and the Middle East. The beauty of Appalachia and the Appalachian Mountains also provides an opportunity in terms of aesthetics. And most locations within Appalachia are within one-half to a day’s drive from each of the representative schools.

Kyle offered, “The opportunity is 350 acres, organically certified campus, healthy, non-urban, and if that’s of value, then we have a unique setting.”

All three heads of school, their directors of development as well as the major donors all seem to agree on one thing. Heads of school utilize a combination of approaches in the day-to-day running of the school. The style of leadership usually
depends on the situation. When Kyle arrived at Whitman Friends School, he knew that change was needed immediately. He knew that he had to be transformational in his approach to leadership. He even asked the former heads of school including Robert how much change he could bring without disaster ensuing. Andrew, on the other hand, was a gifted, natural leader who was transformational in his own right. Jason, too, used both transformational and transactional leadership. Jason, while transformational at times, also was very transactional in his approach. Jason used weekly committee meetings in which he assigned each member of his staff to a particular committee. Transformational leadership seems to have an impact on fundraising, especially in terms of relationship building and being able to communicate a vision of the school’s future to all constituents including major donors. The head of schools’ ability to coach and develop others, to act with integrity, and build trust all contributed to their ability to be transformational. Relationships seemed to matter the most. One thing heard over and over again from Andrew, especially, and from Robert as well as Max was that relationships matter. Therefore, the ability to build trust and to act with integrity are critical factors in successful fundraising. Those leaders that are transformational also are encouraging and innovative in their thinking. But, above all, the ability to form relationships was critically important in terms of transformational leadership.

Those leaders who utilized distributive leadership seemed to have the most successful fundraising teams in place. Andrew and Penelope worked as a seamless team in their approach to fundraising. Jason and Max also worked very well together as a
fundraising team. Kyle, however, did not have a team in place and was trying to do everything himself. That approach to fundraising did not appear to be working very well. Those leaders who combined both distributive leadership along with transformational leadership achieved the most success in attracting major donors to donate to the school and to buy in to capital campaign project initiatives.

The manner in which school leaders approached challenges and opportunities also made a difference. Some leaders embraced technology and connected with donors either through social media or through face to face meetings. The heads of school that traveled to meet their major donors, especially worldwide travel, succeeded in attracting donors to their schools. In the concluding chapter five, I will interpret the data and draw conclusions based on the data obtained from both the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire as well as from the data obtained through interviews.

**Meta-Inference**

Two separate procedures were used for collecting the qualitative and quantitative data. The qualitative work consisted of interviews with the three heads of school, three major donors and two development directors. The quantitative work consisted of the Multifactor Leadership Survey which quantified transactional and transformational leadership behaviors and characteristics. The findings of the qualitative interviews were treated as an independent source of data and were integrated with the quantitative survey material only in the write-up phase of the study. The qualitative data did not inform the design or construction of the quantitative survey, which was done separately. These different data sources were especially helpful in providing a more accurate representation
of each head of schools’ leadership behaviors and characteristics as well as their ability to work together as a cohesive team in order to maximize fundraising success. The final report also benefited from a combined effort to place both the qualitative and quantitative findings in concert with one another. In the quantitative strand results of the Multifactor Leadership survey were revealed. Quantitative results indicated that Andrew scored the highest in terms of raters’ averages in transformational leadership followed by Kyle and Jason had the lowest transformational rater average. In terms of transactional leadership, Andrew also scored highest in terms of rewarding achievement, followed by Jason. Kyle scored the lowest in the transactional category of rewarding achievement. However in the other transactional category of monitoring deviations and mistakes Kyle scored the highest, followed by Jason and lastly Andrew rated the lowest in monitoring deviations and mistakes. Andrew rated highest in fighting fires, followed by Kyle and lastly Jason.

The qualitative component consisted of interviews with three heads of school, two directors of development and three major donors. The narrative data from these interviews were analyzed and yielded themes that indicated that while transformational and transactional leadership are important leadership styles in terms of fundraising, it is a distributive approach to leadership that plays an even more critical role in fundraising and garnering philanthropy in independent and public schools. The results were then integrated in the meta-inference phase of the study. I concluded that the mixed data demonstrated that a distributive approach to leadership is critical in terms of creating successful fundraising programs. It is also noteworthy that all three heads of school who participated in this study used a transformative approach to fundraising. That is, they
believed that both transformational and transactional behaviors were crucial at key moments in their leadership.

A key aspect of the study that linked the quantitative and the qualitative data and supported the qualitative inference that distributive leadership is key to the most successful fundraising programs was revealed by the quantitative survey results of rewarding achievement and monitoring deviations and mistakes. Leaders that were most distributive in the leadership practices also rated highest in terms of rewarding achievement yet lowest in monitoring deviations and mistakes. Also revealed in the qualitative data as it relates to the quantitative transformational characteristic is the behavior that distributed leaders are highly encouraging of others and support innovative thinking and ideas. Distributive leaders are not as concerned with monitoring deviations and mistakes. Rather they wish to be uplifting and encouraging of others who take on leadership roles. The additional quantitative measures and the qualitative interviews yielded a more detailed analysis of leadership behaviors and characteristics that are most supportive of a creating successful fundraising and philanthropic programs in independent schools. One additional piece of quantitative data that also supports the qualitative data is that Andrew also scored highest in terms of passive management-by-exception. Leaders who are more passive tend to not get involved unless there is a serious problem. Since Andrew was not looking for problems (monitoring deviations and mistakes), he saw no need to become involved in problems. For that matter, by encouraging others and believing in the power of transformational and distributed leadership, he had built a program that had little need for involvement in problem areas.
Indeed Andrew did believe in “if it ain’t broken, don’t fix it”, because the distributive approach to fundraising leadership was working well.

Table 5 presents the interview and questionnaire results for all the heads of school who participated in the study.

Table 5

*Summary of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire and Interview Findings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors and Characteristics</th>
<th>Andrew Interview</th>
<th>MLQ</th>
<th>Kyle Interview</th>
<th>MLQ</th>
<th>Jason Interview</th>
<th>MLQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Attributes</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builds Trust</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized Behaviors</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts with Integrity</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Others</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Stimulation</td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
<td>•</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages Innovative Thinking</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coaches &amp; Develops People</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individualized Consideration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contingent Reward         |   |   |   |
|                           |   |   |   |
| Management-by Exception:  |   |   |   |
| Active                    |   |   |   |
|                           |   |   |   |
| Monitors                  | 0.0 | 2.5 | 1.0 |
| Deviations & Mistakes     |   |   |   |

| Management-by Exception:  |   |   |   |
| Passive                  |   |   |   |
| Fights Fires             | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 |

| Laissez-Faire            |   |   |   |
|                         |   |   |   |
| Avoids                  | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 |
| Involvement              |   |   |   |

| Transformative           |   |   |   |
|                        |   |   |   |
| Distributive            |   |   |   |
Chapter 5: Summary and Reflection

“A culture of distributive leadership that grooms new leaders for the next phase must be established.”

--Michael Fullan, 2006, p. 31

Problem Statement

This investigation sought to illuminate the behaviors and characteristics that are critical to the successful fundraising and donor philanthropy efforts in independent schools. In order to better understand how leadership style influences fundraising and philanthropy, this research sought the perspectives of three independent heads of school all located within Appalachia, three major donors as well as their respective development directors by addressing the following overarching research question: What role does leadership play in attracting donor philanthropy, supporting fundraising, and running a capital development campaign? This question was explored through Bass and Avolio’s Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire to measure the following characteristics of leadership: (a) transformational leadership, (b) builds trust, (c) acts with integrity, (d) encourages others, (e) encourages innovative thinking, (f) coaches and develops people, (g) transactional leadership, (h) rewards achievement, (i) monitors deviations and mistakes, and (j) fights fires. In addition, this investigation addressed the following questions in order to determine how these additional factors might contribute to the practice of heads of school and contribute to capital campaigns, fundraising and donor philanthropy. How do independent heads of schools’ leadership style affect the success in multi-year capital campaign fundraising? Does one style of leadership
(transformational, transactional, transformative, or distributive) contribute more to fundraising? How does school leadership approach opportunities and challenges within the capital campaign and in donor philanthropy?

**Review of Methodology**

This study was conducted in two parts, using a multiple methods design (Creswell, 2009). The first phase of the research was qualitative in nature whereby heads of school were contacted via email to ascertain their willingness to participate in the study. Three heads of school agreed to participate, and their respective schools are all located geographically within the boundaries of Appalachia. The three heads of school then agreed to be interviewed. The interviews took place between April 2016 and June, 2016, based on the participant’s scheduling availability. Interviews had to be scheduled around the heads’ of schools travels, alumni events and spring commencement ceremonies. The first interview served as an inclusive pilot for this study, as this investigator ascertained that the foundational questions were acceptable, and it was therefore included with the results. The interviews each lasted one hour fifteen minutes to one hour thirty minutes and were conducted in each head of school’s respective office during the day. In addition to discussing their leadership practices as related to fundraising, Nicholson’s (2006) interview questions were used as a guide for the open-ended emergent interviews with the heads of school, development directors, and major donors. These questions led to the heads of schools’ emergent conversations to reveal themes about fundraising, philanthropy, donors, leadership styles, and their associated behaviors and characteristics. The interviewees also discussed capital development
campaigns and challenges as well as opportunities that exist in relationship to leadership style and their respective ability to fundraise.

Each interview was transcribed by a transcriptionist and subsequently sent to the participants for checking. There were no discrepancies that would have been corrected before beginning the coding process. This investigator read the transcriptions and identified themes based on Saldaña’s (2013) method for descriptive coding. The qualitative data codes were also based on the 10 categories of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire in order to synthesize the data into categories and themes to address the investigation’s questions and goals. The data were specifically analyzed, paragraph-by-paragraph, following Saldana’s (2013) elemental method for descriptive coding. Each paragraph was summarized into a word or phrase based on the topic of the paragraph. In addition to the 10 Multifactor Leadership subcategories, the additional emergent themes that became apparent in the interview data were challenges (CH), opportunities (OP), and capital campaign (CC). The interview data were combined with the findings from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire in order to build the strongest, richest description of each head of school to the fullest possible extent.

The second phase consisted of the collection and analysis of quantitative data via an email link containing the MultiFactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) developed by Bass and Avolio (2015) and forwarded to participants from Mind Garden. The email was sent to three heads of school, three major donors and two development directors at independent schools located within the boundaries of Appalachia having varying degrees of size, wealth, and student populations. All three heads of school were appointed heads
of school at Appalachian schools that are part of the National Association of Independent Schools network. One school was in an urban-setting, another was in a rural setting, while the third school had a suburban/rural location. Two heads of school were in their first headship, with one having two years of experience and the other had five years of experience. The third head of school was in his second headship, but in his first year as head of the current school. This researcher found independent schools on the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) website, and contacted ten independent schools heads asking for their willingness to participate in the research study. Out of the ten heads of school that were contacted, three responded that they were willing to participate in both the interview and the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Emails were sent to all three heads of school, two development directors, and three major donors. The emails contained a link to participate in the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. All individuals completed the survey and the results were returned to the investigator in the format of a leader’s report. Participants responded to assess the frequency with which they enact a behavior or characteristic associated with their leadership style. Each item on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire was rated on Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (frequently, if not always). The surveys were submitted electronically to Mind Garden who in turn generated a leader’s report to determine the frequency with which the heads of school and their respective raters, development directors and major donors) reported they perceived themselves with a particular behavior or characteristic.

The leader’s report compiled the data on each leader and ranked them in terms of their transformational and transactional leadership. Transformational was further
subdivided into five distinct categories: builds trust, acts with integrity, encourages others, encourages innovative thinking, and coaches and develops people. Transactional leadership was also reported in the leader’s report and was subdivided into: rewards achievement, and monitors deviations and mistakes. Passive/avoidant behaviors were also reported and were subdivided into: fights fires and avoids involvement.

Summary of Findings

The three heads of school were all male. The major donors were two men and one woman. The two directors’ of development were one man and one woman. The third school did not have a director of development. Overall, the heads’ of schools self-ratings for transformational leadership ranged from a high of 3.4 to a low of 2.8. Rater’s scores for the three leaders ranged from a high of 3.5 to a low of 3.0. An analysis of the scores for the 5 subcategories of transformational leadership behaviors on the MLQ, the behavior in which heads of school indicated they engage most frequently was that of transformational leadership. Contrarily, the behavior that yielded the lowest overall score in the heads’ of school behavior was that of monitors deviations and mistakes. Considering the individual items on the MLQ, in a Likert-type scale where 0=Not At All and 4=Frequently, if Not Always, heads of school indicated that the behavior in which they perceive themselves engaging most infrequently fell in the subcategory of monitors deviations and mistakes for two of the heads of school, while one head rated acts with integrity as the lowest. The behavior which heads of school reported they most frequently engage was in the subcategory of encouraging others with scores ranging from 2.8 to 3.8.
Heads of school indicated that they had varying levels of experience as heads of school, ranging from one year to more than eight years, with two of the heads being in their first headship. The heads of school who completed the MLQ have worked in their current positions from one years to five years.

Scores on the MLQ were rated on a Likert-type scale in which scores ranged from 0 to 4. Raters scored one head of school at 3.5. The same head of school rated himself at 3.0 in the area of transformational leadership. The raters ranked transactional leadership at 1.7 with subcategory behaviors of rewarding achievement at 3.4 and monitors deviations and mistakes at 0. Fights fires consistently received low ratings, in this head of school’s case as 0.3. The lowest score was received in the area of Avoids Involvement, which was rated 0.

The second head of school had a score of 3.0 from his raters. His self-assessment revealed a score of 2.8 for transformational leadership. His raters scored transactional leadership at 2.05 resulting from rewards achievement at 3.1 and Monitors Deviations and mistakes was 1.0. Fights fires again was scored very low at 0. This head of school scored 0.1 in the subcategory of avoiding involvement.

The third head of school studies was given a rating of 3.1 for transformational leadership by his raters. His self-rating yielded 3.4 for transformational leadership. Raters scored transactional leadership at 2.75 with the behavior sub categories of Rewards Achievement at 3.0 and Monitors Deviations and Mistakes at 2.5. Raters gave Fights Fires a 0.1 and Avoids Involvement at 1.0.
All three heads of school described themselves as transformational. Acting with integrity and building trust were characteristics and behaviors of the three heads of school. Andrew encouraged others and inspired innovative thinking a great deal.

**Discussion of Findings**

In terms of transformational leadership, each head of school rated themselves differently. Kyle rated himself the highest in the category of transformational leadership (3.4); Andrew had a median score of (3.0) while Jason rated himself at a 2.8 as far as being transformational in their respective leadership. These findings were certainly consistent with the interview data regarding each leader’s ability to be transformational. Both Kyle and Andrew, the two heads of school who rated themselves the highest in transformational leadership, were transformational in their leadership practices, but for varying reasons. Kyle was highly transformational in his curriculum leadership. His particular school was about to close when he was hired as head of school. Quick action needed to be taken immediately upon his arrival at Whitman Friends School. Kyle believed that he had to act quickly and make changes at the school. He did this by reorganizing the curriculum and the manner in which students earn academic credit. However, in terms of his fundraising efforts, few major innovations were noted. He had recently returned from a trip to the West Coast, mainly California, which he believed went well in terms of fundraising.

Others, such as the major donor, also corroborated this data. The major donor felt that he had not heard much about Kyle’s vision for fundraising and philanthropy since his arrival at Whitman Friends, although the major donor did describe Kyle’s curriculum
leadership as transformational. Andrew on the other hand, was highly transformational in terms of his fundraising and philanthropy efforts. Andrew spent the majority of his time travelling and meeting with major donors around the world. He described his fundraising efforts in Asia, Africa, South America, Europe, as well as locally in the community. He was highly visionary and believed very strongly in the power of relationship building.

Unlike Kyle, Andrew wanted nothing to do with curriculum. He delegated that to his head of upper school and head of the middle school. He felt that was something that they loved to do and that was their jurisdiction. Andrew focuses on building relationships with community members, church members, as well as those around the world having a connection with the Raymond School. Jason was in his second year as head of school. While he rated himself lowest in terms of transformational leadership, some transformational characteristics were apparent based on the interview. He maintained a high profile in terms of being visible to parents, students, and stakeholders in the school. He went along on fundraising trips with the development director and with the President/Director of Major Gifts of the school who was one of the legendary previous headmasters. This individual certainly seemed to complicate things for Jason, although it appeared that he did not intimidate Jason.

Still, it appears that the board of trustees places a higher level of confidence in the previous head of school in terms of fundraising than they do Jason. Jason involved himself in the philanthropy and fundraising such as in the One Day of Giving campaign, the phone-a-thon and by traveling to locations such as Washington, D. C., Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh to meet with major donors so that they could get to know him better. Still,
he traveled with the previous head of school as well as the director of development. He was not forging those relationships on his own merits. The data provided by the raters about their perceptions of the heads of school’s transformational leadership abilities were congruent with the interviews as well as the data provided by the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. The raters rated Andrew the highest in their perceptions of him as a transformational leader (3.5). Raters rated Kyle at in the median range at (3.1) and Jason the lowest at (3.0). The interview data taken together with the leaders’ ratings of themselves as well as the raters’ perceptions of the heads of school supported that Andrew was the highest in his transformational leadership abilities.

The sub-categories of building trust, integrity, encourages others, encourages innovative thinking, and coaches and develops people uncovered several specific behaviors that make a difference in fundraising. Andrew rated his highest behavioral characteristic as encourages others (3.5) followed by coaches and develops others as a close second (3.3). These two ratings coupled together are particularly noteworthy since the ability of the head of school to distribute his leadership to a development and advancement team provided the greatest fundraising and philanthropic success. Andrew rated himself the lowest for acts with integrity (2.5). While acting with integrity is very important as a head of school, it is really the ability to build long lasting and genuine relationships that seems to matter most. Therefore, it is not surprising that Andrew rated himself lower in this category. Andrew’s raters rated his highest transformational leadership behavior as builds trust (3.9), acts with integrity (3.9), and encourages others (3.9)—all equally while they rated him the lowest in encouraging innovative thinking.
Andrew’s ability to immediately connect with others and to delegate power to others was evident in the interview data that supports his ability to form relationships and to distribute his power to his fundraising team.

Kyle rated his highest transformational behavior as encourages others (3.8) and felt that his lowest behavior was coaches and develops people (3.0). Kyle’s raters rated his highest transformational behavior as encourages others (3.5). His raters gave him his lowest rating in the sub-category of coaches and develops other people (1.9). It is interesting to note that both Kyle and his raters were in agreement with the highest (encourages others) and the lowest (coaches and develops other people) transformational behaviors. Very little autonomy was afforded to others at Kyle’s school. He was not only the head of school but was also the director of development at the time of the interviews. Kyle did go on some trips to fundraise, but it was not his focus. Kyle was focused on changing the curriculum and making the physical plant more appealing to visitors. It is also quite revealing that Kyle was not rated high in building trust or relationship building, and he rated himself the lowest as did his raters as coaches and develops other people. Kyle tried to do it all, and did not delegate much of his responsibilities to others.

Jason rated all of his transformational behaviors equally at (2.8). However, his raters rated Jason’s highest transformational behavior as builds trust and encourages others (3.4) while they rated his lowest transformational behavior as acts with integrity (2.6). The Simsbury School did achieve some fundraising success in their most recent capital campaign, and they have worked to rebuild their endowment which is
approximately 13 million dollars. Jason is working to build trust with major donors as he travels with his development director and his director of major gifts on fundraising and philanthropic work trips. It seems, however, that his board of trustees has continued to employee a former head of school in the role of director of major gifts. Therefore, it is difficult for Jason to be the true identity of the school and thus be the ultimate authority in terms of those relationships. Jason also may not completely understand the role of distributing his leadership to others while maintaining his involvement since he rated himself equally in all transformational leadership subcategories. It may be difficult for others to fully realize Jason’s ability to act with integrity since he is somewhat overshadowed by a former headmaster employed as the director of major gifts. This situation also does not allow Jason to delegate these responsibilities to others, but rather his board of trustees delegates them for him. Jason did not comment much on this during the interviews, however, this data were supported by testimony from the director of development as well as by the major donor. It appears that Jason’s ability to distribute his leadership to his full potential is hindered by his board of trustees continued faith in a former head of school who has been placed in the role of chief fundraiser.

In terms of transactional leadership, Andrew rated himself the lowest as far as monitoring deviations and mistakes (0.0), while both Kyle (2.5) and Jason (1.0) rated their monitoring deviations and mistakes as on a more frequent basis. Andrew is highly involved with his development director and works with her as a team to coordinate fundraising trips, activities, and conferences. They work together to build relationships with major donors and potential donors. Andrew monitors this process very closely
while at the same time trusting Penelope’s ability to keep him informed of the work that she is doing with major donors and potential donors. As for Kyle, there are no deviations and mistakes to monitor in his development director because he does it all—he does not have a development director to monitor deviations and mistakes. His concern is more in terms of the technical core of the school in terms of teaching and learning. The technical core is immensely important in schools; however, focusing on it exclusively does not help the head of school to raise any money. Jason focuses on similar tasks of monitoring mistakes with his leadership team in terms of the technical core—in teaching and learning. Jason is in a difficult spot to monitor deviations and mistakes of a former head of school who was named the president of the school, is revered and admired by the board of trustees and has been at the school for more than thirty years.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire revealed that Kyle felt that he was highest in rewarding achievement, followed by Andrew and Jason. The raters felt differently. They rated Andrew the highest in rewarding achievement, followed by Jason, and then by Kyle. This data is key since rewarding achievement “provides others with assistance in exchange for their efforts; discusses in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance goals; makes clear what one can expect when performance goals are achieved and expresses satisfaction when others meet their expectations” (Bass & Avolio, 2015, p. 8). This behavioral characteristic is key in putting full faith and credit in others—in terms of delegating responsibility and setting clear expectations with them in terms of what they can expect if they accomplish the goal. Rewarding achievement results in employees who achieve a desired level of
performance. Bornstein (2005) advocated very strongly that transformative leadership is a key to fundraising success. Bornstein (2005) believed very strongly in a combination approach to fundraising success. Bornstein (2005) is regarded as one of the most successful college presidents in terms of fundraising in the history of higher education.

Andrew is providing Penelope and her development and advancement team all the assistance that they need in exchange for their efforts. Andrew stated during the interviews that he asks his team how he can be involved. He asks them what he can do to support their efforts and their work. Penelope also revealed during her interview that she will ask the major donors if they would like to meet with the head of school when they are on campus. Andrew has invested the authority in Penelope to let him know when he is needed and when he is not needed. Some major donors have a greater affinity at times for Penelope. This strong relationship in which Andrew gives his full faith to Penelope and her team provides them with the necessary assistance, if needed and expresses satisfaction when others such as Penelope meet expectations. Andrew stated during the interview that “Penelope is a firecracker.”

**Recommendations**

**Suggestions for future research.** This study was focused solely on day and boarding schools located in Appalachia. Future studies might include schools from different geographic areas of the United States or even outside of the United States. Gaining this perspective may provide a broader, richer context in which to understand the leadership styles of heads of school from a wider geographic perspective. While many independent schools are relatively small, varying size of the schools might also be an area
for future study. Including some of the elite independent schools such as Phillips Exeter, Choate, Sidwell Friends, or the Spence School could be yet another option that may provide a different perspective. Studying fundraising and philanthropy at an all-boys or an all-girls schools would be another option to explore in a future investigation. Independent schools located exclusively near major urban centers might yield a different set of results.

This study examined three independent heads of school. While all three heads had been at various schools throughout their careers, two of the three heads in this study were in their first headship. The other was only in his second headship. Therefore, studying schools with highly experienced heads of school exclusively might also provide other unexpected results. The three schools in this study included students in grades 5-12. However, a future study could look at only independent day schools that have a PK-12th grade population. This study included one school that did very well in fundraising, one school that was building its fundraising program back up, and another school that was struggling and on the verge of closing. Schools could be chosen that are either all struggling or all doing extremely well with a waiting list of students.

Researchers could also look at the number of scholarships that are issued and study schools with highly similar approaches to scholarships. Future research might also include fundraising and philanthropy in public K-12 schools. More and more public schools are setting up foundations in order to provide teacher professional development and even new athletic facilities. Private donations to public schools could be a rich new area yet to be fully explored. Additionally, a comparison study between public and
independent schools could be carried out to ascertain what, if anything one could learn from the other. Still, other leadership styles could be examined such as servant leadership or a new unexplored leadership style proposed by Hargreaves and Harris (2015) entitled Uplifting Leadership. The role that parents play in fundraising and philanthropy would be another possibility. To be sure, much more work can be done in this area in order to maximize fundraising in our independent schools.

Andrew did not reveal two sub-categories including rewards achievement and fights fires. Similarly, Penelope, the Director of Development, did not provide any evidence for rewards achievement, monitors deviations and mistakes, fights fires or in the category of transformative leadership. The major donor, Mary Ann also did not provide any evidence during the interview for encourages others, coaches and develops people, rewards achievement, monitors deviations and mistakes or fights fires. However, it is interesting to note that these sub-categories of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire further lend themselves to support that a distribution of leadership in addition to building trust and forming strong relationships were supported. Although transactional leadership is clearly utilized at times by Andrew, it is interesting that the sub-categories most frequently omitted were in the realm of transactional leadership. These omitted sub-categories frequently included fights fires, rewards achievement, and monitors deviations and mistakes. This would indicate, then, that distributive leadership along with transformational leadership, especially building trust and acting with integrity is critical in the head of school’s ability to raise funds and attract donor philanthropy.
In Jason’s case, no information was revealed during the course of the interview in the sub-categories of coaches and develops people, rewards achievement, or fights fires. Similarly, Dom, the major donor to Jason’s school, did not provide evidence for transformational leadership, coaches and develops other people, transactional, rewards achievement, or monitors deviations and mistakes. These categories provide insight into the fact that Dom believed that Jason was a new head of school with very limited experience. It also is interesting to note that Dom was a major player in the appointment of the director of major gifts to the school, who was a longtime, revered head of school, especially by Dom. Max provided limited support to encourage others, encourages innovative thinking, rewards achievement and fights fires. Taken together, these omissions in the qualitative data reveal a strong support for transformative and distributive leadership. The ability to build strong relationships and to act with integrity was also supported. While all three interviewees did believe that, a combination of leadership approaches were employed by Jason at times, the interviews provided limited support for transactional leadership since rewards achievement, fights fires, and monitors deviations and mistakes were not mentioned by these three interviewees. Dom also provided no evidence for the category of transactional leadership itself. These omissions, however, did support a team approach, distribution of leadership, relationships, building trust, and acting with integrity were critical in a head of school’s ability to raise funds and attract donations to the school.

In Kyle’s case, encouraging innovative thinking, coaches and develops others, rewards achievement, monitors deviations and mistakes and fights fires were not
supported during the interview. Robert, the major donor also did not reveal evidence to support encourages others, encouraging innovative thinking, coaches and develops people, rewards achievement, monitors deviations and mistakes, fights fires, or transformative leadership. What is very interesting here is that this school had limited donations and philanthropy to the school. In fact, the school was on the verge of closing due to declining enrollment and loss of revenue. While Kyle was being transformational in curriculum redesign, he was not encouraging innovative thinking, coaching and developing others, rewarding achievement, or encouraging others. Transactional behaviors of monitoring deviations and mistakes and rewarding achievement along with fighting fires were also not evident. Kyle had limited fundraising success and his school was indeed struggling, on the brink of closure. There is no doubt that Kyle is transformational; however, he did not allow others to help in the fundraising and donor philanthropy as he tried to also fulfill that role. Clearly, the lack of empowering others through distributing leadership to them, leaving the school to travel consistently, along with the focus of transforming the curriculum, took its toll on fundraising. Kyle had recently traveled to the West Coast to build relationships and to fundraise; however, he did not have the supports in place to allow others to help him. He did not distribute his leadership to a development director or a major gifts director.

Leading a school is a very complex task. Fundraising is also critically important to the success of P-12 independent schools. Even at smaller schools, there must be a team in place whereby leadership is distributed not only to advance the school through student retention and recruitment but also to attract donor philanthropy and major gifts.
In all three cases, the omitted behaviors and characteristics revealed as much about the need for distributed leadership as the evidence in support of distributed leadership revealed.

The “ah-ha” moment in this study is two-fold. During the visit with Penelope and Andrew, it became exceedingly clear that a distributive approach to fundraising leadership is of the utmost importance. The head of school must be free to travel as Andrew was. Andrew had put an organizational structure in place in which he was comfortable leaving for a week or two at a time. He knew that everything would run as expected. Andrew told me that he had hired several retired public school superintendents and other retired public school administrators to lead his upper, middle and lower school. Andrew said they loved to get involved in the curriculum and focus on curriculum and instruction. They enjoyed planning events and assemblies. With this organizational structure in place, Andrew and Penelope were free to travel—sometimes together, but usually individually—in order to meet with donors and to work on relationship building. Andrew told me that he was not particularly interested in curriculum. He was interested in going out, meeting with community members, alumni, and potential donors to just get to know them. In stark contrast was Kyle. Kyle was also a transformational leader in terms of the curriculum. He was bent on fixing the school’s problem of low enrollment by transforming grading, assessment and curriculum. He was also working on a large scale project to create standard protocols and procedures for running the school day to day. Kyle was also fixed on revamping the school’s website. Kyle was successful at his endeavor of revamping the curriculum, grading and assessment, but also tried to run the
school and the development and advancement office at the same time. From an organizational perspective, it was extremely challenging for him to travel and to be away from the school. Clearly Andrew and Penelope used a team approach and Andrew had a clear purpose in his organizational hierarchy such that leadership was distributed across the organizational levels of the Raymond School.

The other “ah-ha” moment came from the intersection of fundraising and philanthropy in public and independent schools. The importance of this study resonated in terms of its application to public schools. Public school leaders can learn much from this study about fundraising and philanthropy in our schools. Independent schools have been playing on the public playground for a while. Now it is time for the public schools to start playing on the private playground. The question becomes why aren’t public schools thinking about fundraising and friend-raising? With the increasing privatization of education and increasing charter schools diverting public monies to privately run schools, public school leaders must consider ways to increase funding to their schools. Public schools continue to lose monies from state and federal programming. School vouchers are on the rise in which public school money is diverted to a private school of a parent’s choice.

Public schools are faced with levies and bond issues as they face declining state and federal funding. It is time for public school administrators and public school leaders to learn from the independent school financial model. Public school superintendents need to learn the skills of fundraising employed by independent schools. It is time for superintendents and boards of education to embrace the annual fund, charitable giving,
life estates gifts, and capital campaigns. This is radically different from the public school financial model for the past century which relies heavily on a local taxpayer base.

However, public schools find themselves in the midst of a battle of privatization of the public schools. School district leaders should not only consider and learn from the independent school model, they should also implement fundraising and friend-raising in the public schools. Public school officials should attend training sessions in fundraising such as those offered by Indiana University’s Lilly School.

Fundraising is a skill that can be learned and taught to new principals and superintendents. Public school superintendents must educate their stakeholders and policymakers on the independent school financial model and the benefits that can be reaped in the public schools facing a loss of revenue. Rural schools, in particular, have been hit especially hard with the loss of revenue. Many rural schools face declining enrollment and with declining enrollment comes a loss of state and federal funding. In order to continue operating, these public schools should consider fundraising and friend-raising. Superintendents should learn from independent heads of school how to form relationships with alumni, friends in the community as well as nationally who are potential donors. Some public schools already have foundations set aside for teacher grands, teacher professional development and even for athletic facilities. However, the difference that I am recommending is that public school superintendents become strategic about fundraising in a systematic way. Our public school students and families deserve no less.
The Indiana University Lily School of Philanthropy located in Indianapolis offers numerous training seminars year round. Universities with educational administration programs preparing principals and superintendents need to consider adding a fundraising component to their program of studies. The Klingenstein Center at Columbia University Teacher’s College offers a fundraising and philanthropy course as part of their master’s program in independent school leadership. It would serve public school superintendents and principals well to have access to the same information as taught in independent school programs in terms of fundraising and philanthropy. Central Michigan University offers a program in philanthropy and fundraising. The Peabody School at Vanderbilt University also offers a philanthropy and fundraising component in their training program for independent heads of school. Again, public school superintendents need to have access to this same knowledge. Superintendents need to know how fundraising is done in a setting where there is no federal or state money awarded to the school. In this way, public school policy makers and administrators will be on the playgrounds of private schools and the playing field will

**Suggestions for practice and leaders.** Several suggestions for independent school practitioners as well as school leaders are evident from this investigation. Independent schools and their boards of trustees will want to pay close attention to the results of this study when making hiring decisions about their next head of school. There must be a dynamic team in place that works collaboratively on philanthropic projects at the school. The head of school must set the overarching goals and work closely with his or her development director. The head of school must have organizational hierarchies
clearly in place at the school in order to be free to travel to meet with alumni and potential major donors. This is absolutely critical to the success of the fundraising program. Boards of trustees should consider school leaders who have the capacity and ability to be transformational leaders. Heads of school must be able to build trust, coach and develop others as well as encourage others as well as innovative thinking. Moreover, the most successful heads of school couple transformational leadership with distributive leadership. This is tantamount in that it gives the head of school the ability to travel and to meet with major donors. The head of school can leave the school and be comfortable knowing that the organizational hierarchy that they have put in place will carry out the administrative tasks of running the school on a daily basis. Heads of school must be able to form genuine relationships. They need to just casually converse with major donors and alumni alike. Heads of school need to be comfortable going to dinner with potential donors without asking for money immediately. After time, however, heads of school must be comfortable making the ask. But long before that, a genuine relationship must be developed over time that includes trust building and acting with integrity.

Heads of school must understand the power that relationships unleash. Heads of school must be willing to meet with donors and just get to know them. They should listen to the donors by listening to their stories about the school. Heads of school need to be able to figure out what motivates a donor to want to donate. School leaders need to understand the power that forming a close relationship with a potential donor has in the long term success of the school. It is important to just get to know them and to go be friends with them as Andrew said over and over.
Heads of school need to understand the power that traveling to other regions has on building trust and acting with integrity. The power of trust building and acting with integrity is highly important in forming genuine relationships over the long haul. Heads of school also need to encourage others to the point that they are motivated to donate to the school.

**Suggestions for donors.** Several suggestions are recommended for donors. Donors should find ways to become involved and to serve the school. Some major donors serve on the board of trustees, with some donors serving as chairman of the board. It is important for the trustees of the school to also donate to the school. Not only does this demonstrate loyalty to the school, it demonstrates a vested and committed interest in the long term future of the school. Donors can remain connected to the school on a daily basis through volunteering at the school or by serving in a leadership role such as a trustee. In turn, donors who become board members are charged with hiring and firing of the head of school.

Donors serving in the role of a trustee should be aware of a number of factors when selecting, recruiting, and hiring of a new head of school. In fact, there are several behavioral characteristics that they should desire in their next head of school. For example, they want a leader who is transformational. Transformational leaders heighten donor awareness by keeping the eye on the mission and vision of the school. Transformational heads of school encourage others and encourage innovative thinking. They think outside of the box frequently. Major donors would want to look for a successive head of school that builds trust and acts with a great deal of integrity.
Moreover, donors should look for potential heads of school that are not afraid to
distribute their leadership amongst an administrative team. Donors who become trustees
should look for future heads of school who are collaborative and can distribute their
approach to leadership knowing that the head of school must travel a great deal to meet
with other potential donors and alumni. Donors who are trustees should hire heads of
school who are team players and can work closely with their development directors and
development teams to secure major gifts from donors and alumni alike.

Finally, donors should expect to engage with the head of school several times a
year to listen to the current needs of the school and to be fully engaged in what is
occurring at the school at this particular moment in time.

**Suggestions for policymakers.** State and federal policymakers will want to have
an understanding of how independent schools are financed. Several states such as
Georgia now allow public school tax dollars to be diverted to an independent school of a
particular taxpayer’s choice. This diversion of funding from public schools to
independent schools will impact the financial resources of public schools while at the
same time will impact the bottom line of independent schools.

Policymakers within the independent school include the board of trustees.
Policymakers within the independent learning organization need to consider a number of
factors when working with their current head of school. They should allow their head of
school to travel to meet with potential donors and alumni alike. Policymakers should
encourage their heads of school to work in close collaboration with their development
teams. In particular, there must be a close collegial relationship between the head of
school and the development director. There should be a synergistic relationship between
the head and the development director. At times, the development director should be able
to take the lead when working with a major donor whereas at other times it will be the
head of school himself who works directly with the donor. Policymakers should ensure
that there is a strong organizational hierarchy in place so that the head of school is free to
tavel across the country and around the world to meet with donors. The head of school
must feel comfortable leaving the physical plant and have confidence in his or her
leadership team. Policymakers must understand the dynamics of distributive leadership
and understand the power that it can unleash.

Suggestions for public schools. Public schools and public school leaders can
learn much from independent school finance. If nothing else, it is important for public
school leaders to know and understand how independent schools are financed. More and
more public schools are seeking private donations in order to pay for things that they
could not otherwise finance. As costs continue to rise and public schools depend on local
property taxes and money from the state and federal governments, public schools are
becoming more dependent on private donations to pay for such things as athletic
facilities. Many public school districts have educational foundations already set up to
fundraise for unmet financial needs. Public school leaders can learn much from heads of
school in terms of how they go about fundraising.

One important suggestion from this study for public schools is to look closely at
the local and surrounding community for possible major donors. It is important to
identify potential sources of money that could be tapped for the school foundation. A
second recommendation for public schools is to form relationships with various members in the community. These relationships can result from business interests, community organizations as well as from local churches. Public schools have alumni too that can be identified and tapped as potential major donors. It is also suggested that school leaders be trained to look for funding sources other than those in which the public schools are entitled. Athletic facilities such as a new high school football field or a natatorium that otherwise would be impossible are examples of projects which can be funded through private donations. It is further suggested that public schools learn about the annual fund, capital campaigns, and fundraising in general.

Conclusions

In regard to considerations for the leadership style, behaviors, and characteristics associated with strong fundraising and philanthropy in independent K-12 schools, several conclusions may be drawn from this research. First, the ability to utilize distributive leadership proved key to the school leaders who had the ability to recruit and to attract the biggest donations to the school with the most frequency. Secondly, transformational leadership and the characteristics and behaviors associated with being a transformational leader were also very important in terms of fundraising. Thirdly, the ability to integrate both transformational and transactional leadership in addition to distributive leadership was the key component to a successful fundraising program.

Andrew’s leadership was distributive as evidenced in several comments that he made during the interview. Andrew set his vision and goals in conjunction with the board of trustees. He says that he participates in development work when and if needed.
He does not want to get in the way of his development director and her team. Andrew stated that he empowers his development director to do her work and tries not to get in the way of the development director’s work. He prefers to be called in after the development director and her team have done their work. He believes that he should be called in, at times, to make the final ask and to meet with the major donor. Presently Penelope and her team are working with a three to six million dollar donor on a major project. Andrew told her, let me know how I can be of help. He told Penelope that he could be in the meeting with the major donor or not be, just to let him know what she wanted him to do. The development organizational team includes a major gifts officer, an inner funds person, another person doing planned giving and service giving, and a database manager. There is a clear team in place. Andrew and Penelope are both working on a future capital campaign layout in tandem. Andrew feels that his role in the campaign layout is to identify needs and to figure out what the campaign will look like. He also is trying to figure out how to go about doing the project. Another important aspect of the distribution of leadership is the amount of time that the head spends on traveling related to fundraising and making those connections with potential donors. Andrew believes strongly that heads must be free and able to leave their schools to travel for the purpose of fundraising. Therefore, clear teams must be in place that enables the school to run efficiently while the head of school is away from campus, meeting with donors. Spending too much time on campus, micromanaging the day to day operations of the school is another key to avoid. Heads of school need to be able to leave their schools with comfort in knowing that those they have empowered and entrusted to run the day-to-
day operations of the school are able to do their jobs with efficiency. Penelope pointed out that Andrew does not micromanage other departments. Rather, he empowers those different levels to be guided and directed by their directors. The major donor at the Raymond School noted that they have a fabulous development director in Penelope and together she and Andrew act as a partnership in their fundraising efforts. It is a very collaborative approach. The major donor at the Raymond School reported that Andrew is a very collaborative leader, and feels that makes the fundraising more effective. It is also important for the head of school to know when to step out and when to step in—when to become involved and when not to be involved in seeking philanthropy for the school.

The ability of the heads of school to build relationships was also another key aspect in terms of fundraising and philanthropy. Andrew felt that one of the most important pieces to his preparation in becoming a head of school was being involved in external relations in his previous work. Andrew believes that most of his time as head of school is built around traveling, admissions, development, board relations, and community relations. One of the key aspects of Andrew’s leadership is that it is highly relational. He stated and believes that the head of school must establish trust with the donor in such a way that it is not intentional. He believes that you have to really get to know the person and want them to know him and the school. Andrew said that if you get to be friends with them and they like you and the school, then asking for the donation becomes easy. Effective fundraising is based on being highly relational. It is all about building relationships. Building that relationship so that it does not appear phony is based on a mutual trust in which the head of school comes to the potential donor and asks
what can the school do for you so that you feel engaged and knowledgeable about the school. The donor then wants to write a check for a million dollars. Relationship fundraising is critical, especially for the large donors. Jason believes that building trust is also critical, and that most donors want to feel a connection. He believes that potential major donors want to know that the head of school today cares about what their experience was like—what values they obtained at the school are still important today. Jason tries to approach people as individuals and to get to know them and to learn about their experiences and these approaches have proven successful for him. Likewise, aggressive, matter of fact fundraising does not work according to Jason. Kyle, too, feels that fundraising is predicated on having strong relationships and having people feel valued and included before there is any mention of money or any kind of solicitation of money. Traveling to visit with major donors and alumni is another key aspect in building and developing trust. Kyle went on a trip to the West Coast, which was well received by major donors and alumni.

The ability to encourage others and to coach and develop people was also key traits of transformational leaders. This researcher would like to add that these two transformational behaviors were also key aspects of distributive leadership. In order to distribute their leadership to others within the organization, they had to employ these two key transformational traits of coaching and developing others and encouraging others. Dom, a major donor, stated that the head of school “must be enthusiastic, and you won’t raise a dime if you are not enthusiastic.” Andrew sees himself as a consultant to his staff. He tells them that he is there and to call on him if they need him. He does anything that
he can to make them successful. Andrew spends an enormous amount of time building up personal capital with people, working with them on a relational basis, making them know that he wants them to be successful. Encouraging others and coaching and developing people are key behaviors of a transformational leader. Even more important, they are the key to distributive leadership. Leadership can only be distributed after subordinates are coached, developed, and encouraged to be leaders in their own right.

Being transformative, that is both transformational and transactional is another key component to successful fundraising. Andrew believes that good heads use a combination of approaches depending on the setting and the situation, but he does not subscribe to one particular style. Again, Andrew stated that what he is driven by is relations and life situations, and he feels that he can read people and relate to them very well. Mary Ann, a major donor, believes that the most effective heads of school are the ones that can adapt and have elements of all styles of leadership, but one may be more dominant than another at certain times. Jason said that without a doubt, a combination of leadership approaches in different meetings is a major component of heads of school acting as fundraisers. One major donor, Dom, coined it like this. You have to be a jack-of-all trades and that heads of schools use a combination of approaches. Kyle feels strongly, too, that different leadership styles and different personalities are required at different times for different schools.

Implications for Future Research

One school was highly successful in its ability to attract donor philanthropy; another school had been successful, but was working to rebuild its endowment; the third
school was struggling and could potentially close. One of the schools has been highly successful in fundraising; however, the other two have struggled in more recent years. Other schools may have had more successful capital campaigns or stronger donors.

Future studies might include schools from different geographic areas of the United States or abroad. This study focused on schools that were only located in Appalachia. As evidenced in the interview transcripts, Appalachia brings its own set of challenges and opportunities. It would be interesting to investigate the leadership styles of heads of schools related to fundraising and philanthropy in a cross section of the United States such as a school located in the east, west, and Midwest. In turn, this perspective could be connected back to the findings in the present study to see if it would also be fascinating to examine the leadership styles of heads of school internationally in terms of their behaviors and characters on fundraising and philanthropy. Varying the size of the school could be an area for future study. The schools studied here were varied in size; however, comparing extremes cases such as a very high student population school with an ultra-low population might provide for additional opportunities and challenges as well as other insights. Student recruitment issues and advancement can be overarching issues facing independent schools. Even though the size of the schools in the present study did vary, they were all under 450 students which is relatively small. Some independent schools have thousands of students and an infinite number of alumni. The exponential number of alumni could dramatically impact a schools ability to attract donors. One of the schools in the present study has approximately fifteen graduating seniors annually. If a large independent school is examined with hundreds of graduates,
the ability to connect with their parents in the future is both varied in terms of economic diversity and ability to influence donors.

Fundraising and philanthropy in gender specific schools could provide another perspective. People are passionate about their schools, especially ones that have a unique tradition. One of the schools in the present study was formerly an all-boys military school. In order to survive, the school adapted to the times and dropped the military philosophy and became coeducational. It would be interesting to investigate whether or not an all-boys or an all-girls school or a military school had additional challenges or opportunities in regards to their fundraising. It would also be interesting to explore how the head of school at an all-boys or an all-girls school approached alumni, parents, and major donors in regards of fundraising and philanthropy. In the case of the present study, one of the schools was a former military school. Even though it is no longer a military school, alumni who donate still like to know that there are still people in power such as the current head of school (Jason) who understand military schools. Jason is a product of a military school himself. For many alumni, having a connection with the philosophy and background of the school is highly important when donating money. Independent schools located exclusively near major urban centers or only in rural areas could provide another perspective.

According to Penelope, one of the challenges of the Raymond School is getting major donors to come to campus as it sets in a rural, isolated mountain setting. There are several other schools that the Raymond School competes with in a nearby major urban center. It may be the case that those schools located near major urban centers have more
access to major donors. The schools under investigation in this study were located in very rural areas, while one was located in an urban area in Appalachia. The urban schools might be more on the radar of potential donors. Studying heads of school with numerous years of experience could provide another unexplored area. Two of the heads of school in this study were in their first headships. One was in his second and had been a head of school for many years.

However, conducting a study where all heads had many years of experience could provide rich insight into how heads with significant experience lead their development offices. It would also be interesting to see what behaviors and characteristics would result from a study conducted with heads of school with many years of experience. In the present study, the heads with the fewest years of experience had a larger impact in terms of fundraising and philanthropy in their respective schools. A similar study could be conducted in public PK-12 schools. This study has a number of implications for public schools in terms of fundraising and philanthropy. There are implications for public school superintendents and principals. It would be interesting to explore how public school superintendents and principals behave in regards to their leadership related to fundraising and philanthropy. I am making this recommendation because public schools are faced with an ever increasing deficit of state and federal funding. Superintendents must consider other ways to raise money if shortfalls exist due to a loss in revenue.

The ability to successfully raise funds is becoming increasingly important for public school leaders. Unexplored areas of leadership such as servant leadership or uplifting leadership could serve as a basis of future study. Many job descriptions for
independent heads of school list servant leadership as a leadership style desired by the school. It would be good to explore leaders who describe themselves as servant leaders in terms of their ability to successfully raise funds in independent schools. Servant leadership was not considered in the present study. I also wonder how servant leadership would allow for a distribution of leadership and what the impact would be on the organizational hierarchy that was found to be so critical in the team dynamic between the development director and the head of school in terms of fundraising, travel and philanthropy. I also wonder about uplifting leadership.

Uplifting leadership has been studied and examined by Harris (2014) who has done much work with distributive leadership. Uplifting leadership has been described as a recently emerging leadership style. How uplifting leadership influences fundraising and philanthropy could be examined. In this study, the ability to encourage others and encourage innovative thinking was an important behavioral characteristic that had an influence on successful fundraising. Uplifting leadership remains under studied as related to a leader’s ability to raise funds successfully.
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Appendix A: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire

MULTIFACTOR LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE SELF FORM

This survey will help you and your raters describe your leadership style. Starting with question 1, judge how frequently each statement fits you. If an item is irrelevant, or if you are unsure or do not know the answer check the Unsure box.

Use the rating scale on the right to indicate your answers: Unsure, Not at all, Once in a while, Sometimes, Fairly often, Frequently if not always.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Fairly often</th>
<th>Frequently, if not always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>I re-examine critical assumptions to questions whether they are appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I fail to interfere until problems become serious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions and deviations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I avoid getting involved when important issues arise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I talk about my most important values and beliefs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am absent when needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I seek differing perspectives when solving problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I talk optimistically about the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I instill pride in others for being associated with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I wait for things to go wrong before taken action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I spend time teaching and coaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I show that I am a firm believer in ”If it isn’t broke, don’t fix it.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I act in ways that build others’ respect for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I concentrate my full intention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I keep tracks of all mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I display a sense of power and confidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I articulate a compelling version of the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I avoid making decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I get others to look at problems from many different angles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I help others to develop their strengths.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I delay responding to urgent questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I express satisfaction when others meet expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I express confidence that goals will be achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I use methods of leadership that are satisfying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>I get others to do more than they expected to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I am effective in representing others to higher authority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I work with others in a satisfactory way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I heighten others' desire to succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>I am effective in meeting organizational requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I increase others' willingness to try harder.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>I lead a group that is effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Interview Protocols

For: Head of School, Development Director, and Major Donor

1. Introduction

1.1. My name is Michael Eicher, a Doctor of Education candidate at Ohio University at Athens writing my dissertation. The topic I am exploring is about transactional, transformational, transformative, and distributive leadership approaches used by heads of independent schools in relation to their successful philanthropic activities.

1.2. The interview should take about sixty to ninety minutes.

1.3. I will be taking notes and audio recording this interview. Please know that the identities of the individual respondent’s responses can be kept confidential anytime you desire.

1.4. What questions would you like to ask me before we begin?

2. Background Information

2.1. I would like to begin the interview by asking you about your background before you became head of school.

2.2. Where did you receive your education and what degrees do you hold?

2.3. Did any of your college or graduate school experiences prepare you for the position of head of school?

2.4. What professional positions prepared you for your role as head of a P-12 school?

3. Leadership

3.1. Describe your leadership style.

3.2. Do you consider yourself more of a transformational (bold, visionary, inspirational), transactional (collegial, interactive, collaborative) or distributive head of school?

3.3. What behaviors or characteristics do you associate with this leadership style?

3.4. Do you consider the leadership styles’ of most heads of school as more transformational, transactional or distributive?

3.5. Do you see leadership styles of heads of school as one or the other or do you believe heads of school use a combination of approaches? Why?
3.6. How do you distribute leadership in regards to your development and fundraising activities?

3.7. How do you create opportunities for distributed leadership to emerge in your school?

4. **Fundraising**

4.1. How would you describe yourself as a fundraiser?

4.2. How does your style of leadership contribute to fundraising?

4.3. Please provide me with an example of a time when you directly contributed to a successful fundraiser. What role did you play?

4.4. How important is successful fundraising in your role as head of school? Will it be more important in the future?

4.5. What ways are you involved in planning for a fundraising campaign? How do you connect the strategic plan to fundraising? Can you give examples of how you connect the past (history), present (needs) and future (dreams) of your school in the fundraising process?

4.6. In what ways do you communicate the vision of your school? Does the use of story help you as a leader to facilitate the fundraising needs of the school?

5. **Future Implications**

5.1. What strides do you think heads of school have made in recent years that are strengthening fundraising?

5.2. What do you feel the new topics and priorities are that impact the head of school’s role in fundraising?

5.3. What needs to be addressed to help heads of school prepare for the external role of fundraising in the future?

5.4. What advice would you give to an individual aspiring to be head of school in relation to leadership and fundraising?

(Nicholson, 2006)
Appendix C: Informed Consent Form

Ohio University Adult Consent Form with Signature

Title of Research: The Influence of Leadership Style on Fundraising and Philanthropy in Three Independent Schools

Researchers: Michael D. Eicher, Primary Investigator; Dr. Krisanna Machtmes, Advisor

You are being asked to participate in research. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected. Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to sign it. This will allow your participation in this study. You should receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Explanation of Study
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This study is important to science/society because fundraising and philanthropy is critical to the success of educational organizations, in particular, independent P-12 schools. Leadership style has not been studied as it relates to fundraising and philanthropy in independent P-12 schools.

Individually, you may benefit by gaining a better understanding of how leadership style influences philanthropy and fundraising at independent P-12 schools. The three heads of school will gain a better understanding of their individual leadership style. You may not benefit, personally by participating in this study.

Confidentiality and Records
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Additionally, while every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:
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By signing below, you are agreeing that:

- you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered;
- you have been informed of potential risks and they have been explained to your satisfaction;
- you understand Ohio University has no funds set aside for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this study;
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- your participation in this research is completely voluntary;
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## Appendix E: Qualitative Data Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>Builds Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB</td>
<td>Acts with Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Encourages Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Encourages Innovative Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>Coaches and Develops People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Transactional Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Rewards Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEA</td>
<td>Monitors Deviations and Mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBEP</td>
<td>Fights Fires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFA</td>
<td>Transformative Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Distributive Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Coding Analysis

an annual fund gift of about 100 bucks, um, for about seven—six years during that, so I had a lot of opportunity to be involved in that.

The other piece about this is that my mother was the Head of School, um, at two schools, and prior of that was the secretary of education at Virginia, and was in politics, so raising money is [laughter] something that is genetically [laughter], we’ve done that for a long time.

Interviewer: That’s very interesting and that would contribute a lot to your—

Interviewee: Oh, absolutely

Interviewer: - background, certainly. Describe your leadership style, please.

Interviewee: Um, I tend to be very relational. I don’t like email. I like to have conversations ha—typically have really quick meetings, but I, uh, I tend to, like to pull people together, um, and engage with them, uh, I spend an enormous amount of time building up personal capital—working with people, um, working with them on a, um, relational basis, making them know that I want them to be successful. I’m not gonna micromanage; but I wanna be—I wanna do what I can to make them successful, so I’d describe it as highly, highly, kinda, uber-relational. Which you can probably tell, after having a conversation with me. I’m pretty verbal?

Interviewer: Okay, thank you. Uh, do you consider yourself more transformational, transactional, or a distributive Head of School?

Interviewee: Probably transformational. I think success is locked in; certainly here. I’ve had a real challenge here, we’re working on what we’re gonna do that’s been created with the, um, on what the board. Uh, this school has a really, defined mission, um, that’s had since 1963, and just kinda sharpening that, and moving forward, to see that it can be functional today, but sort of have to lay out a roadmap of how we’re gonna get there.

Interviewer: What behaviors that—or characteristics do you associate with transformational leadership?

Interviewee: I think they’re—what’s the transition of—from that—what’s the transition, the ability to communicate to the people, the ability to talk about where I, where I think we’re going well as the school, where I think about how I can get people engaged with me around that. And I think having the ability to engage people that are on the right direction, very helpful.
Interviewer: Do you consider the leadership styles of most Heads of School to be transformational, transactional, or distributive?

Interviewee: Probably transactional. Uhh, we’re dictatorial [laughter]. I think that dictatorial maybe, uh, I mean in many cases, um—I think it’s successful heads that I know of are both interpersonal and visionary, but they have a real sense of what their school’s basic value and culture is, and are able to, to, to conform to that.

I think unsuccessful Heads typically go in and want to change the institution to meet their needs or they just have no understanding and connection to the fact that there’s a fundamental culture of a school, and as a head, you’re a shepherd of that. Now if it’s a bad culture, there are problems where that you might have to change it, but all in all, I mean in most schools that I’ve been involved with, and most schools I’ve been involved with, they’re old, so and long—and long, historic—there’s a basic, fundamental culture, and you know, if you think you’re gonna come in and change something like that, and if it doesn’t wanna be changed, you’re gonna be unsuccessful.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm. Do you see the leadership styles of heads of school one or the other, or do you believe that heads of school use a combination of approaches?

Interviewee: Good ones use a combination of approaches depending on the setting of the situation, but I don’t ever—think that there’s one type of—way that I use, and I don’t spend a whole lot of time thinking about my leadership style. I mean I, I very much apply that as, as I’ve said earlier, driven by relations and life situations, and if there’s one thing I feel good about that I can do is I can read people and situations really well, uh, having spent a lot of time in politics. Can, how—I have a pretty good, within a couple minutes, I can have a pretty good understanding of emotional context of what most situations are occurring.

Interviewer: Important skill, certainly—

Interviewee: Oh, absolutely.

Interviewer: - for a school leader. Um, how, how do you distribute your leadership in regards to your development and fundraising activities?

Interviewee: Define that a little bit—well, how, what do you, what do you—
Interviewer: Sharing leadership, uh, yeah, empowering others to be be leaders—

Interviewee: My view on development is, and my relationship with Paige, my development director, is, she’s terrific, she’s terrific, but um, I am 100 percent in as needed. Um, I’m not gonna sit and manage that program because I think as a head if you do that, you get in the way. Your development director needs to know and be empowered to be the chief developer and executor of your development plan and for the head to get involved becomes very distracting and to their work, um, so I think the head is called in when our campus really needs them, and you wanna get a major donor, you wanna get a major donor, and she may take that role, uh, but we have 500 donors right now, we’re working with 500 donors, and what we have in our donor base, and she’s very interested in a major project, probably a three to $1,000,000 $6,000,000 project.

Uh, Paige has done the bulk of the work. Paige does constant interaction with her, but when she came to campus, and I get along great with her, but I said to Paige, “You tell me what you want me to do, I will do whatever it is you want.” If you want me in the meeting, great. If you don’t want me in the meeting, fine. You know, I’m not super-involved in it and she needed me for a moment and then I was gone, so um, I think it can be easily directed by you, now, that does depend on the relationship of your development director and a really good relationship between the Head of School and the Development Director.

Interviewer: Along those lines, is there a team in place in your development office?

Interviewee: There is. We have an in-house fund manager, and we’ve got a—just hired an Major Gifts Officer, we’ve got a communications person, we’ve got our doing that giving and uh, kind of consultants asking giving, and we have a managing, so there is a team and Paige completely manages that herself.

Interviewer: Thank you. Do you create opportunities for distributive leadership to emerge in the school?

Interviewee: Um, yeah, I mean I’m a big fan of helping people, you know, in leadership in a school is that everyone in the school should be working to help them find a job, everyone in the senior leadership at another school as a Head of School, you know, whether they want to do that or not, you know, that part of it is...
Interviewer: Okay, thank you. We'll shift our conversation now to fundraising. How do you describe yourself as a fundraiser?

Interviewee: Um, I am a highly — I believe in fundraising that is highly relational, that you’ve got to establish trust with the donor, and that it is not intentional, so if you go into a relationship with someone with the pure idea that you are going to raise money from this person, you will not be successful. If you go into the idea that you really want to get to know the person, or you want them to know you and the school, you will win, and so — and it may take a long time, depending on what that personal relationship is. It may take three, four, or five years. Um, but that’s what it’s all about, I mean if you get to be friends with them, they like the school and they like you and they feel comfortable in your leadership, they’re going to give, and it doesn’t take a whole lot of asking.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm. How does your style of leadership contribute to fundraising?

Interviewee: Um, I, I mean I like people. I like relations. I like talking to people. I like engaging with them um, my wife is a huge part of my fundraising efforts. We entertain in our home constantly so um, you know I bring people to the house, I introduce them to my kids, take them through the house, let them see the house, um, as a function of it being a representation of the institution. Uh, and so that part of it, I think, opens — I’m very open to having donors,